S A J

serbian architectural journal

REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON URBAN
MORPHOLOGY (ISUF2023)

S A J   C O M M U N I T Y : R O L E S

G E N E R A L _I N F O R M A T I O N ▬

C O N T E N T S

REFLECTIONS

THE ITALIAN SCHOOL OF PROCESS MORPHOLOGY. ROOTS, METHODS AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

The following three texts intend to summarize the formation, development and future prospects of the Italian school of urban morphology. The problem is not simple, since the related debate never established a common ground. However, one can recognize a shared aim to use the analysis of the built environment for operational purposes. These studies are, therefore, "architecturally oriented", showing a complementarity of methods, with other schools of thought, among them, the geographers of Conzenian traditions.

The following texts inevitably refer to the specific field of study of the authors, which is that of process morphology. Nevertheless, we believe that this presentation, albeit partial, contains matters of interest for our foreign colleagues, especially those who are investigating built form to plan its transformation. The three texts address, in order: the origin of process morphology studies, focusing on the Roman school, where some notions that guided subsequent studies were born; the formation of a new science of building based on an innovative method of reading and design ing the existing reality, mostly thanks to Gianfranco Caniggia's contribution; future prospects, which open up new fields of investigation, new specificities, (and also differentiations) within ongoing research.

Giuseppe Strappa

Sapienza Università di Roma, Italy
gstrappa@yahoo.com

Matteo Ieva

Polytechnic. University of Bari, Italy
matteo.ieva@poliba.it

Nicola Marzot

Technische Universiteit Delft (TU Delft), Netherlands
studioperforma.marzot@gmail.com

A. THE ORIGINS OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL STUDIES IN ITALY

Giuseppe Strappa

Sapienza Università di Roma, Italy
gstrappa@yahoo.com

Particularly in the current conditions, I believe, it could be useful to go back to reflecting on the roots of morphological studies in Italy as they are, in fact, the evidence of a concrete approach to the architectural design based on logical and didactically transmissible bases. These studies were aimed, especially in the Roman School, at the formation of general and shared methods derived from the reading of built reality and were aimed at the positive study of how it could be transformed. Studying them is useful, precisely in a period like the present one in which, on the one hand, morphology studies are gradually assuming an increasingly abstract and independent drift from design and, on the other, professional practice is aimed, instead, at the marketing of architecture through interpretations based on the perception and spectacular communication of the results.

The studies from which the researches on the formative processes of the urban form in the Italian area have been developed are above all known, abroad, through the texts of Gianfranco Caniggia. It is also known that these derive from the teachings of Saverio Muratori, whose texts, however, are less known for having never been translated into English. Even less known is the fact that the origin of this school of thought dates back much earlier, at least to the interwar period and to the studies of innovators such as Gustavo Giovannoni, Giovan Battista Milani, Enrico Calandra and others. The common thread that binds these researches, developed largely through teaching in the Faculty of Architecture, is the "reading" of the built reality which not only has the project as its aim but, in many respects, is itself a project.

The method which, starting from the 1930s, will be coherently developed over time, explicitly starts from a critique of the Modern Movement, of the new conditions deriving from the emergence of new uncritically accepted modes of production, the internationalization of design tools, the widespread serialization of forms, the loss, above all, of the synthetic and unitary notions of organism and process. These notions are inextricably linked to each other as it is not possible to think of the form of architecture and of the city detached from the principle of becoming. They are the founding notions on which reading, criticism (i.e. interpretation and the resulting choices) and the very way of working of the architect are based.[1]

The definition of organism, and that of organicity derived from it, have very little to do not only with the naturalistic matrices used throughout the history of architecture, but also with the Cartesian analogy between organism and machine.[2] The new meaning of the term captured, in fact, that "forming" capacity recognized by Kant, which every organism possesses, in which the

individual elements are not simply assembled, according to a finality, to form the whole, but are themselves shaped by the whole. Basically, it is the difference between Le Corbusier's conception of the house understood as a" machine for living", where the building is an organism through the mere subordination of the parts to its function, and the house understood by Muratori as the result of a formative process in which the part adapts, proportions, updates through successive phases which become part, in the critically contemporary age, of the conscience of the builder.[3]

These notions run across all the research conducted in Italy and their use is not only cognitive, but substantially architectural. The interpretations of historical buildings by Gustavo Giovannoni (1873-1947), the great urban and territorial conceptions of Saverio Muratori (1910-1973) and the studies on the transformation of urban fabrics by Gianfranco Caniggia (1933-1987), are related by not being only descriptions or explanations of constructed reality: they are readings oriented by a general, unifying and operative thought that distinguishes them from the studies of other disciplines such as history or geography.

In order to place these studies historically, it is essential to take into account how they started from a close criticism of the fact that not having taken account of the organicity itself of history leads to the formation of many contradictory forms of modernity, which can be found in the discord between the intuitive technical-analytical and artistic component. For this reason, the method had to be transmitted to the students through the exercise of "restitution" as a technique for extracting, from the multitude of forms transmitted by history, some general rules. It should be noted that there is an evident link between the premises of the Roman School between the two wars and the "redesign" exercises proposed by Muratori and Caniggia in their courses, through which the student had to retrace, with the means of the architect, the logical and typological formative processes of urban fabrics and buildings.[4]

Against the specialist drift of modern architecture, according to Giovannoni, the method of investigation of the built reality had to be "integral", that is to say by examining the phenomena that contribute to the formation of the organism as a unit, under the various aspects"... constructive and aesthetic, of practical spatial and financial needs and expressions in external representation, of relationship with civilization and social conditions".[5]

In other words Giovannoni identifies the center of the problem, in other words, in the splitting of the original organic nature of the project into different, dedicated aspects of modern thought on architecture, starting from the positivist line of thought, identified in the sequence that originates in Schopenhauer's affirmations of *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*[6] on the struggle between weight and rigidity in architecture. It develops with the constructivist theories of Viollet le Duc exposed in *Entretiens sur l'Architecture*, (Viollet le Duc, E. 1863) ending with the questions posed by new building experiments and from new materials to

which the new theorists, such as Le Corbusier in *Vers une Architecture nouvelle*,[7] give an answer in terms of machine aesthetics and industrial production.

Alongside this line of thought, Giovannoni identifies other strands of theories that favour aesthetic rules (the allusion to the arbitrariness of modernist composition of the facade is evident and to its hidden derivation, through Hermann Muthesius, from the Anglophone picturesque tradition) or the use of psychology à la Wolfflin.

This interpretation of modern architecture as a laceration of an original, shared totality is a prelude to the Muratorian interpretation of modern history, as it was set out in the period that coincides with the first phase of critical elaboration of Caniggia's thought, in his first post-war writings and in the lectures given at the Faculty of Architecture in Rome at the end of the 1950s.

The ideas of Giovannoni, Foschini, Milani, Fasolo are often accused by modern Italian historiography of "traditionalism".

In fact, theirs is a completely up-to-date critique of contemporary internationalism, fertile in its consequences, inserted with full awareness into the climate of the current debate. It is not a question, in other words, of the contrast between conservatives and innovators, as Caniggia observes "on the one hand people unaware of the European cultural framework, and on the other hand informed and participating people. If anything, it can be ascertained that the apparent autonomy of the former with regard to the diatopic developments of architecture and the intentional result of their attention to a relative autochthonous experience, of their continuous referring to participation in the 'place' obliging a continuous critical choice which leads to the exclusion of ways and behaviors deemed incongruous to the place itself; rather preferring, from the external experience, to assume the values that are openly non-oppositional to the Roman building".[8]

Moreover, it is enough to read what Giovannoni writes about the modern city understood as a "cinematic organism", where the new role of routes and the potential future urban structure is recognized, to realize how he was fully aware of the conditions induced by modernity.[9] He admits how the theoretical innovations of the Modern Movement, although disregarded by the results, constituted an attempt to overcome the eclectic drift of the late nineteenth century by attempting to reconstruct a form of new totality of the project.

The dichotomy between "architectural imagination" and construction operated by eclecticism and, to an exasperated extent, by the modernism of the beginning of the twentieth century, constitutes in fact the origin of that decadence of the principle of truth which had historically constituted the ethical centre of the architect's practice. Giovannoni does not reduce the problem to a simple cause-effect relationship, introducing that notion of implicit, non-mechanical relationship that Caniggia will develop with great clarity in the exposition of

the forms of "direct and indirect" legibility of architecture especially in the second of the two volumes dedicated to the design of base building design.[10]

A prominent figure within the School in the period between the two wars is that of Enrico Calandra, a Sicilian architect who, from 1930 to 1950, held in Rome the chair of *Building characters* and who had Saverio Muratori as assistant from 1944.[11]

Calandra's teaching shared Giovannoni's idea of an "integral" study of the built environment aimed at architectural design. It was a completely counter-current position with respect to the parallel teachings given in other faculties, based on classifications of a functionalist nature. Calandra spoke of an "operating idealism"[12] meaning, precisely, the necessary passage from the pre-war materialistic conception (of an economic-industrial and scientific-technical nature) to abstraction and spirituality which leads the architect to aesthetic synthesis, freeing it from the excessive weight of contingencies.

Muratorian thought, right from the first syntheses of the 1940s, seems to largely take up and develop some of the themes posed by Calandra and to define in scientific terms those intuited by Giovannoni, not only substantially recognizing the same splits in modern history and including modernism among the eclecticisms (environmental aestheticisms) that have lost the order that regulates the unitary formation of architecture, but reconsidering, more generally, the fragmentation of language that precedes the First World War as the origin of the crisis of modern language.

Saverio Muratori, however, within the framework of the innovative conception of the Roman School, introduced a key notion that would substantially change the point of view on studies of urban form. Indeed, in his cyclical idea of history, a fundamental role is played by the condition of crisis of architecture as an expression of a radical social change. In the widespread meaning before the Muratorian definition, the term "crisis" had the meaning of sudden and decisive modification that breaks established equilibriums, generally producing negative effects. In fact, the Greek term κρίνω, in its original meaning of "to distinguish", provides the meaning that comes closest to the Muratorian connotation. For Muratori, transformations in architecture always refer to a civil crisis and are understandable only within an "organic historicity" in which each phase of change must be read within the framework of a structure of correlated facts. In other words, there is a general ratio that allows us to outline the succession of the different cycles and historical phases. Claude Henry de Saint-Simon had already intuited the theme of the succession of organic epochs, in which the structure of knowledge is static, centred on an apparently immutable dominant idea, alternating with critical epochs, in which that same idea suddenly changes, creating the conditions of a social transformation.13 In the years in which Muratorian definition developed, the notion of crisis was, moreover, at the centre of reflections on the dramatic transformations

that were taking place in post-war Europe. In the climate of the Ricostruzione (Reconstruction), the same optimistic ideas of progress and modernity, with their apparently rational implications, began to be questioned. The translation, in 1946, of Josè Ortega y Gasset's book on the subject14 had a great influence in Italy in spreading the recognition of possible organic epochs that follow phases of conflict. But, more generally, Muratorian research took place in the climate of the "crisis literature" that had pervaded European culture since at least the 1920s, when the argument appears, in the cultural environment of Germany economically and socially destroyed by the war, with Der Untergang des Abendlandes. Umrisse einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte (The Decline of the West. A morphology of world history outlines), a monumental work by Oswald Spengler, of immediate success throughout Europe. It is a pessimistic text, which considers the crisis that Western civilization is going through as a decadence: "We cannot change the fact that we were born as men of an incipient winter and not in the solar heights of a mature civilization of the time of Phidias or Mozart" (Sprengler 1918 - 1922). In Sperngler's thought, alien to any idea of progress, civilizations are born, develop and decay as in a natural cycle. According to an interpretation not very different from the one proposed by Muratori, history has its own periodic structure, a general "organic logic" which must be understood starting from the immense reservoir of concrete data.

In 1935 Johan Huizinga published a fundamental text defining the notion of crisis. His *In de schaduwen van morgen (In the Shadows of Tomorrow)*, translated into Italian by Einaudi in 1937 with the title *La crisi della civiltà* (The Crisis of Civilization), he tackles the theme of the massification of industrial society and the decline of spiritual values that will lead to the disaster of dictatorial populisms. Huizinga, however, still considers the idea of development fundamental and: "... we know this with certainty - he says -, a return to the ancient, in general, cannot be given".[15]

If Muratori has Spengler's cyclical vision of history in common, he does not share his catastrophic conception, just as he does not share the ideological interpretation of mass-man, proposed by Huizinga, which leads us to interpret the crisis as decline. The crisis for Muratori is, instead, a regeneration.[16]

Muratori identifies four cycles of the critical process, starting from the antecedent of the Renaissance, which run through European thought, from the Enlightenment to the contemporary need for an organic critique.[17] The understanding of the crisis occurs only in the definition of the whole of society as a totality whose history unfolds cyclically through a law of permanence and a law of change. Every rapid transformation, in society, as in the territorial and urban organism, indicates the inadequacy of the previous cycle to the new conditions, which is "necessary" as a presupposition for the new conditions of equilibrium.

This notion of crisis, which was to become central to the research of the Muratorian school, was in reality misunderstood, I believe, by contemporaries

who have criticized this system of thought as "mechanical": linked to an idea of urban structure formation and transformation as a continuous, linear, uninterrupted development. Muratori, on the other hand, states that crises are anything but exceptional phenomena in the life of a society but "on the contrary, they become its typical aspect".[18]

The entire increase of an urban entity is the locus of a crisis. Hence the corollary that the study of a city consists in the study of its formative process[19] and only its critical interpretation allows choices for the future.

In conclusion, the critical reading of the built world has a not only hermeneutical value, but an ontological one. It concerns the principles and causes of operating, the study of the design as a transformation of the existing and the conception of the past as "storia operante" (operating history).

In the last phase of his intense production, Muratori was above all interested in developing the general part of his system of knowledge rather than in the form of the city and architecture. A central notion was that of "civil ecumene", a notion linked to the time in which it was formulated, but which, with the globalization crisis, should perhaps be reconsidered in a new light. According to Guido Marinucci's synthesis of it, ecumene is the vast civil area understood in historical and geographical terms, which generates a common culture[20]. The Chinese, Indian and Western Mediterranean ecumenes, which Muratori studies in his texts, are spatio-temporal unities corresponding to as many categorical aspects of consciousness.[21]

As will become clear from Matteo Ieva's following text, Gianfranco Caniggia systematized and innovated the complex Muratorian legacy by deepening the problem of understanding not only the cultured language of monuments, but also the "speech" of base building, founding a new discipline whose value it will be all the greater the more the cultural climate in which his didactic and design experiments were carried out is taken into account.

Caniggia warns of how it is necessary to extract the hidden meanings behind the surface of things, to trace their profound significance. The world inhabited by man, houses as well as monuments, becomes, along this path, not a simple construction, but *writing*, and the task of the architect-constructor is to be able to read not only the message that writing transmits, but to decipher behind the appearance of what the built reality appears to be, the shape of how it will, or should be.

In this, therefore, Caniggia seems to have inherited, and in turn transmitted, the most profound and authentic teaching of the Roman School. In the ability to grasp the individual aspect of architectural and urban phenomena, their being unique and unrepeatable, and to recognizing, together, its belonging to the great vital flow of the anthropized world, returning it to us as a constituent and inseparable part of a shared heritage.

In conclusion, I believe that a pervasive rhetoric of contemporaneity and multidisciplinarity has today overshadowed some founding convictions not only of the morphological-proces school, but of Italian architectural culture in general. The main one among these, I believe, is that the present condition is the result of remote causes that generate it: that it is the outcome of a process

For this reason, the history of the origin of morphological thought in Italy, based on the concrete experience of the existing built reality and its formative processes, could provide to the contemporary architect very topical matter for a general reflection, starting from the definition of his discipline and warning him against the rhetoric of multidisciplinarity. If architecture is syncretic by nature, its science is not the sum of other sciences. For this reason, the architect should derive from the exegesis of the text (which for us is the built world in its becoming, considered in its historical and social context) his own organic system of knowledge. It would be useful to go back to the origin of things, to the real and concrete problems of our profession, since theory for the architects is not a series of general, rational and rigidly consistent principles from which logically derive indications for operating. It is, above all, a stratification of experiences, generalizations of what one does.

For an architect, the method is still ultimately the attempt at systematization of the practice that laboriously tries to bring back, through the comprehension of the forms (morphology), the fragmented and particular aspect of each gesture to the generality and totality of knowledge, however changeable and contradictory.

NOTES

1. G. Strappa, *Unità dell'organismo architettonico. Note sulla formazione e trasformazione dei caratteri degli edifici* (Bari: Dedalo, 1995).

2. R. Descartes, *Discours de la méthode* (Leiden: Jan Maire, 1637). Italian transl. *Discorso sul metodo* (Editori Riuniti, Rome, 1978).

3. G. Strappa, *Unità dell'organismo architettonico. Note sulla formazione e trasformazione dei caratteri degli edifici* (Bari: Dedalo, 1995); G. Strappa, *L'architettura come processo. Il mondo plastico murario in divenire* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 2014).

4. G. Giovannoni, *Questioni di Architettura* (Rome: Biblioteca d'arte editrice, 1929); L. Vagnetti, and G. Dell'Osteria, eds. *La Facoltà di Architettura di Roma nel suo trentacinquesimo anno di vita* (Rome: Edizioni della Facoltà di Architettura di Roma, 1955); V. Franchetti Pardo, *La Facoltà di Architettura dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza" dalle origini al Duemila. Discipline, docenti, studenti* (Rome: Gangemi, 2001).

5. G. Giovannoni, *Questioni di Architettura* (Rome: Biblioteca d'arte editrice, 1929).

6. A. Schopenhauer, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* (Leipzig: Brodhaus, 1859). trad. Italian transl. *Il mondo come volontà e rappresentazione* (Bari: Laterza, 1997).

7. Le Corbusier. *Vers une Architecture* (Paris: G. Cres, 1923).

8.   G. Caniggia, "Permanenze e mutazioni nel tipo edilizio e nei tessuti di Roma (1880-1930)," in *Tradizione e innovazione nell'architettura di Roma capitale.1870-1930*, edited by G. Strappa (Rome: Kappa, 1989).

9.   G. Giovannoni, *Vecchie città ed edilizia nuova* (Turin: Unione Tipografico Editrice Torinese, 1931).

10.   G. Caniggia, G.L. Maffei, *Composizione architettonica e tipologia edilizia. 2. Il progetto nell'edilizia di base* (Venice: Marsilio, 1984).

11.   A.B. Menghini, V. Palmieri, *Saverio Muratori. Didattica della Composizione architettonica nella Facoltà di Architettura di Roma 195–1973* (Bari: Polibapress, 2009); P. Barbera, and M. Iannello, *Enrico Calandra, ritratto di un architetto* (Syracuse: Lettera Ventidue, 2020).

12.   E. Calandra, *Caratteri degli edifici* (Rome: Appunti delle lezioni a cura di M.Campanella, Libreria Castellani, 1934-35).

13.   C.-H. De Saint-Simon, *Introduction aux travaux scientifiques du XIXe siècle* (Imprimerie J.-L. Paris: Scherff, 1808). Italian transl. 2005, in: Introduzione ai lavori scientifici del secolo XIX e altri scritti del periodo napoleonico, Olschki, Florence.

14.   J. Ortega y Gasset, *Esquema de las crisis y otros ensayos* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1942). First Italian edit. *Schema delle Crisi* (Milan, Bompiani, 1946).

15.   J. Huizinga, *In de schaduwen van morgen* (Haarlem: H.T.Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1935). First Italian edit. *La Crisi della Civiltà* 1937, Einaudi, Turin, second Italian edit., 1962, same publisher.

16.   G. Strappa, "L'universo organico di Saverio Muratori," in *Saverio Muratori architetto*, edited by G. Cataldi (Florence: Aión, 2013).

17.   S. Muratori, *Architettura e civiltà in crisi* (Rome: Centro Studi di Storia dell'Urbanistica, 1963).

18.   Ibid.

19.   G. Strappa, "L'architettura come organismo e processo," in *Nuovo realismo/ postmodernismo. Dibattito aperto tra architettura e filosofia*, edited by P. Gregory (Rome: Officina, 2016).

20.   G. Marinucci "Glossario," In *Metodologia del sistema realtà-autocoscienza,* Muratori S., Rome: Centro Studi di Storia dell'Urbanistica, .1978.

21.   S. Muratori, *Metodologia del sistema realtà-autocoscienza*, a cura di Marinucci. G. (Rome: Centro studi di Storia dell'Urbanistica, 1978).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barbera, P., M. Iannello. *Enrico Calandra, ritratto di un architetto,* Syracuse: Lettera Ventidue, , 2020.

Calandra, E. *Caratteri degli edifici.* Rome: Appunti delle lezioni a cura di M.Campanella, Libreria Castellani, 1934-35.

Caniggia, G., "Permanenze e mutazioni nel tipo edilizio e nei tessuti di Roma (1880-1930)." In *Tradizione e innovazione nell'architettura di Roma capitale.1870-1930*, edited by G. Strappa. Rome: Kappa, 1989.

Caniggia, G., G.L. Maffei. *Composizione architettonica e tipologia edilizia. 2. Il progetto nell'edilizia di base.* Venice: Marsilio, 1984.

De Saint-Simon, C.-H.. *Introduction aux travaux scientifiques du XIX*ᵉ **siècle**. Imprimerie J.-L. Paris: Scherff, 1808. Italian transl. 2005, in: Introduzione ai lavori scientifici del secolo XIX e altri scritti del periodo napoleonico, Olschki, Florence.

Descartes, R. *Discours de la méthode*, Leiden: Jan Maire, 1637. Italian transl. *Discorso sul metodo*, Editori Riuniti, Rome, 1978.

Franchetti Pardo, V. *La Facoltà di Architettura dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza" dalle origini al Duemila. Discipline, docenti, studenti.* Rome: Gangemi, 2001.

Giovannoni, G. *Questioni di Architettura.* Rome: Biblioteca d'arte editrice, 1929.

Giovannoni, G. *Vecchie città ed edilizia nuova*. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1931.

Huizinga, J. *In de schaduwen van morgen*. Haarlem: H.T.Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1935. First Italian edit. *La Crisi della Civiltà* 1937, Einaudi, Turin, second Italian edit., 1962, same publisher.

Le Corbusier. *Vers une Architecture.* Paris*:* G. Cres, 1923.

Marinucci, G. "Glossario," In *Metodologia del sistema realtà-autocoscienza,* Muratori S., Rome: Centro Studi di Storia dell'Urbanistica, .1978.

Menghini A.B., V. Palmieri, *Saverio Muratori. Didattica della Composizione architettonica nella Facoltà di Architettura di Roma 195–1973*. Bari: Polibapress, 2009.

Muratori, S. *Architettura e civiltà in crisi*. Rome: Centro Studi di Storia dell'Urbanistica, 1963.

Muratori, S. *Da Schinkel ad Asplund. Lezioni di architettura moderna. 1959-1960*, edited by G. Cataldi, and G. Marinucci. Florence: Alinea, 1990.

Muratori, S. *Metodologia del sistema realtà-autocoscienza*, a cura di Marinucci. G., Rome: Centro studi di Storia dell'Urbanistica, 1978.

Ortega y Gasset, J. *Esquema de las crisis y otros ensayos*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1942. First Italian edit. Schema delle Crisi. Milan, Bompiani, 1946.

Schopenhauer, A. *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. Leipzig*:* Brodhaus, 1859. trad. Italian transl. *Il mondo come volontà e rappresentazione*. Bari: Laterza, 1997.

Spengler, O. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. *Umrisse einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*. München: C.H. Beck, 1922-23. Italian transl., *Il tramonto dell'Occidente. Lineamenti di una morfologia della Storia mondiale*. Parma: Ugo Guanda, 2002.

Strappa, G. *Unità dell'organismo architettonico. Note sulla formazione e trasformazione dei caratteri degli edifici*. Bari: Dedalo, 1995.

Strappa, G. "L'universo organico di Saverio Muratori." In *Saverio Muratori architetto*, edited by G. Cataldi. Florence: Aión, 2013.

Strappa, G. *L'architettura come processo. Il mondo plastico murario in divenire*. Milan: Franco Angeli, 2014.

Strappa, G. "L'architettura come organismo e processo." In *Nuovo realismo/postmodernismo. Dibattito aperto tra architettura e filosofia*, edited by P. Gregory. Rome: Officina, 2016.

Vagnetti, L., and G. Dell'Osteria. eds. *La Facoltà di Architettura di Roma nel suo trentacinquesimo anno di vita*. Rome: Edizioni della Facoltà di Architettura di Roma, 1955.

Viollet le Duc, E. *Entretiens sur l'Architecture.* Paris*:* A. Morel et cie, 1863. Italian edit. *Gli architetti e la storia. Scritti sull›architettura.* Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 1996.

THE ORIGINS OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL STUDIES IN ITALY

271

2. GIANFRANCO CANIGGIA'S THOUGHT AND THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE ITALIAN SCHOOL OF URBAN MORPHOLOGY

Matteo Ieva

Polytechnic. University of Bari, Italy
matteo.ieva@poliba.it

The reconstruction proposed by G. Strappa on the origin of typological-morphological studies in Italy in the School of Architecture of Rome clarifies the interest of S. Muratori, first, and his pupil G. Caniggia, later, in the multiple theme of reconstructing anthropized space. This reconstruction goes beyond the traditional positivist heritage that had produced noteworthy studies but failed to grasp the sense of the phenomena processuality. As is well known, Caniggia's education in the school established by Giovannoni cannot simply be attributed to the close connection and line of reasoning with his master, although evident. The fertile teachings he received encompass a wide range of interests which nourish his judgment in various ways, even in the realm of modernity principles. This is noteworthy considering that Muratori had given up on the "willingness" towards modernity after Venetian experience and his remarkable research on the city of Venice, which was integrated into the work titled "Studi per un'operante storia urbana di Venezia". A climate of critical thought, expertly summarized by Strappa, characerized the Roman School and represented a dialectic vision of modernity. This view was both complementary and opposing, as the individuals of that era perceived modernity with disillusionment and caution, refraining from being enticed by the allure of the new while still upholding traditional values.

The teaching of G. Giovannoni, G. B. Milani and V. Fasolo inside this didactic dialectic will be particularly noteworthy for Caniggia. He borrows the notion of "organism" fro them, which S. Muratori later develops into a general theory of interpretation of reality. Caniggia also develops the concept of "legibility" of buildings that in an original way, expanding on the idea with a critical perspective. He aims to prevent subjective interpretation by considering the built environment and architecture in general in expressing the "essential" contents, as an expression of a civil culture. Instead, he recognizes the value of Muratori for understanding the type as a concept and articulating it through the construction of a comprehensive theoretical-methodological system, which is essential for the studying various anthropic manifestations at all scales (such as territorial, urban, aggregative, and building). This powerful legacy has attracted the attention of his main students, who are committed to understanding and disseminating it in its almost indefinite variations. Particularly, these students, who were trained by Muratori's renowned assistants - P. Maretto, A. Giannini, G. Marinucci, G. Caniggia, G. Cataldi and the brothers R. and S. Bollati – have endavored to apply the principles of his school to the systematic study practice

of the built reality practiced today in the Italian academia. At the same time, Caniggia made a original and important contribution to the topics of basic and specialized building through his intense but relatively short research activity from 1960s to the 1980s. In subsequent sections, his theory will be explored in detail, along with his extensive teaching and design experience.

Caniggia is therefore an interpreter of the teachings of the Modena master, projecting them into a personal perspective that contemplates knowledge. In this dual relationship, which can be understood as two pathways, it is possible to recognize the true meaning of the fusion of horizons that unifies two parts: the study (including the conception and method), framed within the problematic trajectories of Muratorian theory, and the subject (interpreter-pupil) who reconstructs a potential sense of the broad speculative scope. This scope covers a horizon that originates from the same source and integrates with something else that can be acknowledged as a shared awareness of knowledge.

The process of understanding, It is, after all, an operation that can be framed in the essential features of the "hermeneutical circle" generated by the interaction between the interpreter and his "subject" since the critical action of understanding determines a fusion in "ever new" forms and vital", arriving at a correlative link that takes into account the continuous dialectic: question and search for the answer.

According to H. G. Gadamer, this fusion can be described as a "circle that encompasses and includes everything visible from a certain point". Therefore, it cannot be considered fully accomplished in its recognition of a potential identity without considering the hypothesis of otherness. For Caniggia, this is not a programmatic contradiction, as it stems from the same "principles" that could be tentatively defined as the "first" in articulating the theory (including aspects such as type, organism, ethics, and aesthetics). However, it represents a diversity in the enduring imprint left by Muratori, presented as an objective perspective on the points considered uncertain or in need of updating, if not somewhat redundant in the context of architecture. Caniggian research can be seen as the "deconstruction" of Muratori's work, specifically questioning the foundations of Muratorian phenomenology, which is then reexamined with a focus on reconstructing its tangible impact as a distinct "realist ontology".

As it is known, deconstruction is only applicable to what can be recognized as unified and continuous. The presence of an organic framework within Muratori's thesis undoubtedly provides Caniggia with the opportunity to proceed cautiously in the process of dissecting its components. From this perspective, we can reinterpret Caniggia's work as a deliberate exploration of the acquired themes, seeking multiple meanings with the aim of diversifying their significance, particularly in the realm of architecture. By closely examining the "lines" and line spacing in Muratorian statements, we can grasp the diverse content contained within them. It is important to assume that

truth is not always found in apparent evidence because, at times, there lies an "unmanifested" aspect, of which the visible represents only a "trace."

It is within this line of reasoning that Caniggia's work retrospectively reinterprets Muratorian's, providing a personal framework for the development of his own idea-cogito. This framework serves as an avenue towards a renewed approach, connected to certain lines of study proposed by the master, while simultaneously directing complementary research efforts to establish a distinct stance in the ongoing debate of that era.

Furthermore, Caniggia exhibited perseverance and passion in his teaching endeavors, which, along with his projects, formed the experimental foundation for his intellectual growth and the formulation of a theory that engages with the prevailing trends fueling the discourse of those years.

In this concise allusion to both figures, we already observe the diverse objectives that Caniggia pursues, alongside what he deems significant in Muratori's teachings. While he aligns himself with the paths that reflect the master's interests, there is an evident departure that becomes more pronounced at a certain stage. Muratori's interests progressively gravitate towards a philosophical and speculative trajectory, exploring grand systems of the world and their application to comprehending global phenomena. However, Caniggia chooses not to unconditionally endorse the validity of Muratorian ideas, deliberately focusing on aspects closely related to architectural themes—those that hold complete meaning within historical expectations and possibilities. These aspects captured the attention of the entire scientific community during his era.

For instance, Caniggia dedicates extensive study to urban fabrics and the "language" of the built environment, initiating thorough investigations into specific built contexts with a "scientific" outlook. His aim is to examine and grasp the tangible reality, providing evidence of the temporal and spatial aspects. This approach allows him to approach the quest for "truth," seeking to uncover the intricate "rules" that grammatically and syntactically govern the structuring of anthropic systems. In other words, it involves a reversal of the man-nature relationship, manifested in various "forms" such as buildings, aggregates, urban areas, and territories. These forms are defined and generate structural phenomena that concretely manifest their specific identity within the laws that have determined and expressed their essence throughout history.

Based on the concept of architecture as a language, Caniggia builds upon the Muratorian perspective of interpreting the built space. This perspective relies on the undeniable assumption of a historical process, supported by the structural mechanics that perceive the individuality of phenomena as the result of distinct spatial-temporal conditions.

Within this research context, Caniggia recalls the notions of spontaneous consciousness and critical consciousness, which he explores through the

adoption of a principle recognizing the specificity of localized architectural language. This language carries within it a presupposition of continuity and diachrony, signifying its temporal evolution as an identity entity. By doing so, he explains that the main reason behind the progressive expansion of architectural work, driven by a critical approach, is the contamination of languages that occurred during the transition to late Enlightenment rationalism. Additionally, this expansion is influenced by the gradual introduction of specific building elements into the "language" of fundamental construction.

This deduction aligns with continuous investigations conducted in the field of knowledge and interpretation of the distinctive languages belonging to different cultures. Caniggia delves into the unique nature of spatially identified "langue," demonstrating a deep cultural interest. This engagement leads to the construction of a structured thought on the foundations of a complex set of rules, deeply rooted and codified within every linguistic-architectural entity, necessary for the project as a means of collective communication. Caniggia discovers idioms to be used critically in the individual act of the project, understood as an "invention" in its etymological sense of discovery or revelation, emphasizing novelty rather than parasitic "creativity." In this context, creativity is seen by linguists as the individual's ability to utilize language independently, implementing their own words.

Thus, the past becomes an inherent component of the project, reflecting qualities of persistence, stability, constancy, extension, and succession of (linguistic) characters. It embodies an ongoing process that encompasses the concept of type in continuous transformation, continuously sought as a historical "judgment."

Caniggia methodologically organizes the orderly recognition of linguistic diversity in Western Europe, dividing it into two primary cultural areas for interpretive purposes. The first area encompasses the Mediterranean regions, characterized by continuous masonry construction systems that possess an idiomatic conception, being simultaneously heavy, plastic, load-bearing, and enclosing. The second area is the Northern/Middle European geographical region, distinguished by discrete, light, load-bearing, and non-enclosing systems with a wide range of nuances and hybridizing accents. This division contributes to the construction of a theory on the project, proposed with a hermeneutical foundation closely intertwined with interpretation.

The perspective employed signifies a "judgment" that leads us to view reading as an operative process. This reading is based on a logical and historical-processual assumption, not delving into secondary aspects of reality, such as the epiphenomena arising from the search for "sensations" evoked in individuals by the shape (visible or apparent) of architectural objects or the suggestions derived from their analysis. Instead, it is grounded in the existentialist style of thought within phenomenology.

Caniggia's engagement with phenomenological systematics, although influenced by structuralism, diverges from the current of thought that seeks to explain phenomena in architecture using psychological foundations as an interpretative exercise. The paradigm of his work lies in investigating reality through an awareness of the world as a "common perception," providing the basis for the existence of a given phenomenon and effecting meaningful change through collective participation. For instance, he considers every civic achievement as the outcome of a collective endeavor, with the individual author (and their work) merely serving as the means of progress.

Based on these postulates, Caniggia conducts numerous analyses of urban organisms (such as Como, Florence, Venzone, Benevento, Isernia, etc.), reconstructing their original framework and subsequent phases of diachronic transformation, ultimately leading to the exploration of the project theme. These readings significantly contribute to the advancement of scientific knowledge in urban analysis.

The two monographs on basic building, co-authored with Maffei, elucidate the fundamental concepts essential for interpreting the structure of aggregates. These concepts consider their spatial and temporal location, analyze their interrelationships, and establish hierarchical connections within the urban system.

The thesis that Caniggia presents aims to clarify the complex system of laws governing the formation and progressive transformation of aggregates. It is based on the idea that the consciousness of the result, preceding its realization, encompasses the notion of interconnected union among building organisms along a predetermined path. This a priori synthesis reflects collective action translated into the organic unity of the concept-judgment/thought-representation system, which interprets and describes the totality of components and characteristics involved in the process, ultimately defining the constructed outcome. In this case as well, Caniggia employs an interpretative method of reality supported by the application of a valid concept on an intuitive-perceptive and practical level. This approach manifests in a logical and comprehensive evaluation derived from the experience of civil culture.

In a similar vein to the distinction made between the building (object) and its concept (type), Caniggia proposes a scale-based understanding of the aggregate as a collection of buildings (objects) connected along a route. He also introduces the concept of urban fabric, which elucidates the governing law of the association among these elements within a specific historical process. This concept recognizes their variable formal and structural outcomes.

By researching the constitutive differences of fabrics that result in diachronically differentiated outcomes, Caniggia constructs an intricate array of typical cases, variants, and budding manifestations. These findings gradually enhance the wealth of acquired knowledge. The parallel reconstruction of processes,

distinguished by their spatial and temporal characteristics, reveals the genesis of courtyard houses, pseudo-rows, terraced houses, row houses, palaces, churches, convents, and more. This reinforces the thesis that the stratified palimpsest of the city and its fabrics, despite not always being organic and continuous, can, when interpreted with appropriate tools, unveil the composite accumulation of stratified processes manifested in diverse ways.

Caniggia ardently develops a method for studying urban phenomena, drawing from extensive research conducted in various cities that serve as significant representations of how the aforementioned concepts are realized. The reconstruction of identified urban fabrics and hierarchies gradually leads to the recognition of a specific syntax intrinsically connected to the semantics of the systems comprising urban space. The syntax can be observed in the mutual relationships established between structurally distinct elements within different temporal phases of a single city, representing an "identified" building type with its specific mode of aggregation. The semantics, on the other hand, encompass the meaning (including symbolic meaning, such as churches, palaces, libraries, museums, theaters from the nineteenth century onward) inherent to each element and their collective significance. Culturally distinct syntax and semantics contribute to the recognition of a specific "urban" identity characterized by its own rules, dynamic typicalities, exceptions, and an authentic message that defines its raison d'être and serves as a means of community and communication.

In concluding this brief overview of Caniggia's speculative and research trajectories within the school of urban morphology in Italy, we acknowledge his commitment as an active architect. Reflecting on his design experiences, as discussed in the introduction to the volume "Modern non Modern," it becomes apparent why his projects can be considered "modern" within the framework that emphasizes his cautious participation in the Movement itself. The Movement is defined not as a style but as a collection of widespread needs, symptoms, and aspirations aimed at achieving a renewed unity of the architectural organism.

Considering current trends, Caniggia's rigorous pursuit of architectural rules continues to hold relevance for fostering reflection. In a landscape where the prevailing notion seems to be chaos, embraced by many architects and paradoxically transformed into intentional expression, an excessive form of freedom emerges where creativity plays a significant role, sometimes leading to indiscriminate use of means and techniques. Caniggia's idea of creativity aligns with Gregotti's expression defining it as the "consciousness of modification." The term itself implies the imperative presupposition of consciousness, which extends beyond self-reflection and represents the interconnection of all things with each other—an understanding rooted in science and knowledge founded on solid and demonstrable foundations. It involves a profound awareness of

the essence and representation of things "ontically" in their presentation to the world. In other words, the role of the architect who seeks "creative doing" today must be accompanied by a full awareness of current events and a necessary foundation for launching into the future as a critique of the present.

To highlight some significant projects, we can mention the fabric projects referencing cases in Pescara, Venice, Florence, Rome, and Genoa. These projects exhibit a direct relationship with concepts such as formation, transformation, congruence, and yield. The project involving a special type, explored through experiences in Bagno di Romagna and Bologna, delves into the emergence of architectural relationships, the principle of unity/distinction, and the necessity of sharing. Noteworthy projects also include "urban planning" projects and restoration projects, evident in consultancy work for certain cities and interventions on important buildings.

Finally, the tragically "interrupted" project on the expansion of the headquarters of the "Valle Giulia" Faculty of Architecture represents a distinct case and serves as Caniggia's final reflection, albeit a bittersweet one. It resembles Michelangelo's "unfinished" works, embodying a complex legacy that heralds the opening of a new horizon in design research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T.L.W. *Teoria Estetica*. Torino: Einaudi, 1975.

Caniggia G., and G.L. Maffei. *Lettura dell'edilizia di base*. Venezia: Marsilio Editori, 1979.

Caniggia G., and G.L. Maffei. *Il progetto nell'edilizia di base*. Venezia: Marsilio Editori, 1984.

Caniggia, G., and G.L. Maffei. *Moderno non Moderno. Il luogo e la continuità*. Venezia: Marsilio, 1984.

Gadamer, H. G. *Il cammino della filosofia. Hegel l'estetica*. (http://www.emsf. rai.it/gadamer/interviste/21estetica/he-estetica.htm).

Gregotti V. *L'architettura nell'epoca dell'incessante*. Bari: Laterza, 2006.

Heidegger M. *Essere e tempo*, curat. Volpi F., tard. It. Chiodi P.. Milano: Longanesi, 2005.

Ieva, M. *Architettura come lingua. Processo e progetto*. Milano: FrancoAngeli, 2018.

Ieva M. *Morfologia urbana e linguaggio nell'opera di Gianfranco Caniggia*. Milano: FrancoAngeli, 2020.

Maffei, G.L. (a cura di) *Gianfranco Caniggia architetto (Roma 1933-1987). Disegni – Progetti – Opere*. Firenze: Alinea Editrice, 2003.

Marzot, N. *Il contributo di Gianfranco Caniggia alla teoria del progetto urbano contemporaneo*, in D'Amato Guerrieri, C. e Strappa, G (a cura di) "Dalla lettura di Como all'interpretazione tipologica della città", Bari: Adda, 2003.

Montuori, M. *L'insegnamento di Saverio Muratori*, Dottorato di Ricerca in Composizione Architettonica, triennio 1983-1986, CLUVA Università, IUAV, Venezia, 1985.

Pigafetta, G. *Saverio Muratori architetto. Teoria e progetti*. Venezia: Marsilio Editori, 1990.

Purini, F. *Saverio Muratori tra unità e molteplicità*, pubblicato in Cataldi, G. (a cura di), *Saverio Muratori architetto*. Firenze: Aión Edizioni, 2013.

Scardigno, N. "Morfologia urbana e progetto. Il rinnovamento del pensiero tipologico-progettuale e la didattica della Scuola di Bari." *U+D Urbanform and design* N. 15/2021 (2021). *La ricerca di morfologia urbana in italia. Ripensare la morfologia urbana, 1. Tradizioni e nuove scuole*, L'Erma di Bretshneider, Roma.

Severino, E. *Il destino della tecnica*. Milano: Rizzoli, 2009.

Sini, C. *Introduzione alla fenomenologia*. Milano: Editore ShaKe, 2012.

Strappa, G. "Tipologia degli organismi seriali e nodali nel ciclo progettuale dei Palazzi di Giustizia di Gianfranco Caniggia." In *Bollettino del Dipartimento di Architettura e Analisi della Città*. Rome: dell'Università Sapienza di Roma, 1994.

Strappa, G. "La nozione caniggiana di organismo e l'eredità della Scuola di Architettura di Roma." In *Gianfranco Caniggia architetto (1933-1897). Disegni – Progetti – Opere*, edited by : Maffei G.L. Alinea Editrice. 2003.

Whitehand, J.W.R. "Gianfranco Caniggia. Dalla lettura di Como all'interpretazione tipologica della città." In *D'Amato Guerrieri, C*, edited by G. Strappa, "Dalla lettura di Como all'interpretazione tipologica della città", Bari: Adda, 2003.

C. CRISIS, INDIVIDUAL, ORGANISM AND TYPE. THE OPEN CHALLENGES OF URBAN REGENERATION

Nicola Marzot

Technische Universiteit Delft (TU Delft), Netherlands
studioperforma.marzot@gmail.com

One of the founding principles of the so-called 'processual typology'[1] is the identification between 'reading' and 'project'. As noted by Saverio Muratori in one of his seminal texts, perceived as a forerunner of the urban studies to come,[2] this connection arises from the inherent intentionality of all human behavior, specifically, from its inescapable projectual bearing. The aforementioned identification should therefore be understood as the subordination of 'reading' (which is always intentional) to the legitimizing presupposition (the intention) conveyed by the project itself (constantly intending).[3] However, this principle of legitimation can face a crisis. Hence, this is where Urban Morphology comes in as an as an autonomous discipline that investigates the underlying causes fof this crisis and which, particularly in Italy, and has sparked a fruitful long-lasting and internally articulated debate.[4] If the 'reading' is always intentional and if the intention is the outcome of the project, the loss of the principle of mutual subordination implies the loss of the "why" of things and of our actions, or of their intimately political motivation. Therefore, this crisis as a loss of values is an inevitable opening to 'nothingness'. If, however, in the Rossian Tendency,[5] this opening is seen as an end in itself (the ancient Greek σκοπός), that is, the freeing fulfilment of the identification between "reading" and "project",[6] in the "processual typology", and in Gianfranco Caniggia in particular, it becomes the necessary transit to find a new form of future identification.[7] The "processual typology" therefore views the crisis as the engine of History. This is evident in general terms in all epochs, but is particularly confirmed in contemporary times through the abandonment of disused building stock and the consequent phenomenon of urban regeneration. This is, in fact, an incremental process triggered by the financial crisis of 2007; accelerated by the pervasive diffusion of information technologies in the workplace and consolidated with the pandemic event, because of which the emerging urban contraction has freed a substantial stock of real estate from any pre-existing constraint of instrumentality, making it available again for experimental purposes. As a result, the urban landscape of the European city has become increasingly fragmented, incoherent and internally torn, due to the pervasive incremental expansion of terrain vague[8] infiltrated among the fragments of the urban fabric in constant proliferation, where the former progressively assume the character of infrastructures at the service of the latter. The paradoxical aspect of this process is that the act of crisis that separates "reading" and "project" simultaneously arises as a field of the possible, or rather the pure potential, of future relationships of reciprocal determination. The latter will

therefore materialize through the continuous renegotiation of the relationships between the fragments themselves, according to a process of profound sharing that will make them inextricably linked. While some current literature on the phenomenon ideologically and prejudicially tends to separate these aspects as distinct and figurativly autonomous,[9] almost interpreting one as the negative pole of the other. Nonetheless, the growing interest in reclaiming abandoned places confirms their high regenerative potential, opening, in fact, to an unprecedented and fertile season of design.[10] For the purposes of the reasoning carried out here, it is important to note how this project, which is in the process of development, whose effects cannot yet be fully measured, elucidates several questions that direct the 'processual typology', helping to critically illuminate its underlying assumptions, such as the notions of 'individual' and 'organism'. The 'individual' referst to the inseparable relationship between the living being and the world it exists in (from the Latin indīvĭdŭum, meaning 'not divisible', which translates the corresponding ancient Greek term ἄτομος). As such, nothing can be said about the living being or the world outside of this relationship. It follows, therefore, that a) the living, as well as the world, in itself are not knowable and b) that only the living/world relation is knowable. Similarly, nothing can be taken away and/or added to the relationship that does not affect the terms resulting from the relationship itself and vice versa, nothing can be taken away and/or added to the latter that does not affect the quality of the former. Knowledge of the living is therefore approximated to that phenomenal-existential limit constituted by its concrete 'grasp' on the world,[11] which therefore guarantees its possible understanding (from the Latin comprĕhensĭo, compound of cum- and prĕhensĭo, from prehendĕre, meaning 'together' and 'grasp').[12] The individual, therefore, fully expresses that 'being in relation' from which, by successive approximations, all derived terms are generated, among which, for our purposes, both 'subject' and 'object' take on a particular meaning.[13] Because of these premises, regeneration, which is at the same time human and urban, immediately reveals its unprecedented character. It happens at the moment in which, bringing the interest of the relationship to the center, it gives it the value of a founding event through which it begins to give "form" both to the agentive dimension, which has not yet reached the rank of completed subject, and to the realizing dimension, aimed at obtaining the recognisability of defined object. The shared project is, consequently, the regenerative project that, in its phenomenological unity, tentatively reveals, that is to say, proceeding by trial and error, the emergence of three terms, the intermediate of which corresponds to the conventional character of the "type".[14]

The notion of 'organism' is closely related to that of 'individual', being in some ways inseparable. The use of the term (from the ancient Greek οργανον, meaning 'instrument') clearly evokes 'that which as part of a whole' also presents itself as 'a whole articulated in parts'. The becoming of the "organism" is therefore evoked by a process each phase of which repeats the

relational presuppositions of the one that preceded it and, in turn, stands as the origin, "relatively" open, of the one destined to follow, according to a modality that recalls the rhetorical figure of the chiasm. Within this process, which is necessarily finalistic in character, by virtue of the progressive closure of its field of possibility, the project remains as a relationship that progressively implies its terms and is conditioned by them.[15] Processual typology translated the understanding of the phenomenon synthetically evoked, arriving at a description of constructed reality ordered asymptotically according to (strictly relational) 'degrees' and 'scales'. Gianfranco Caniggia's work has brought a new level of systematicity to this approach, with buildings, fabric, city and territory seen as "parts of a whole" - the (knowable) anthropic space resulting from the interaction between body and environment (in itself not knowable) - individually understood as a "whole articulated in parts", each of which is the provisional and perfectible outcome of a relationship: elements, structures, systems and organisms. In this way, processual typology confirms not only that we can only know what we experience, but above all, that the latter is always 'situated', i.e. necessarily conditioned by precise circumstances of space and time. Urban regeneration takes this awareness to an unprecedented level of clarification. As a relation, i.e. a project, it articulates a whole, unknowable and indivisible (abandoned objects and bewildered subjects who, by virtue of the condition of 'disgrace' into which they have fallen, are no longer bearers of value) into parts, scalarly differentiated, knowable and reciprocally separable (regenerated objects and subjects). However, this can only be achieved by crossing a space of diminishing undifferentiation and indeterminacy (from the maximum degree of origin to the minimum degree of the beginning of a new historical epoch). Regeneration therefore emphasizes this interval,[16] phenomenologically showing its richness of implications as well as its implicit fragility, not always destined to achieve the desired result. The novelty character of the regenerative process is therefore that of operating between different historical epochs, and the relative materials, revealing their uncertainties, ambiguities and exceptionality, to show the depth of the intuition contained in Muratori's seminal text recalled in the introduction. The title *Life and History of Cities*,[17] not by chance, draws the reader's attention to the relationship between two non-comparable conditions, which only the relational capacity of the project can bring into a relationship of reciprocal tension. Nevertheless, this also implies the impossibility of reducing the nature of the project itself to the world of 'representation', conditioned by the subsistence of 'language', and the need to search for its (historical) premises within the aforementioned interval. Regeneration, both urban and human, cultivates intermediation[18] as a founding condition to be taken care of, not yet bound by the regulatory system of a socially constructed reality.[19] Regeneration is therefore distinguished from any other transformative strategy by its ability to establish itself its own rules and full decision-making autonomy through the making of the project. For these reasons, regeneration cannot be confined within a given formal system, which

programmatically exceeds, and requires a "state of exception"[20] in order to unleash its potential. In the history of national town planning, such recognition was legitimized, for the first time, by the Law of the Emilia-Romagna Region, no. 24 of 2017, titled 'REGIONAL DISCIPLINE ON THE PROTECTION AND USE OF THE LAND'. In a particular way, art. 16 "Temporary Uses", establishes the possibility to intervene on the disused building heritage through a process of agentive claim derogating the constraints provided by the discipline of uses, standard and building regulation applied to the control of current production. It is, therefore, a condition of experimentation in potency that, at the end of a period of suspension of all forms of cogency, no longer than a five-year period, will have to be translated into action, based on the outcome achieved through the regenerative negotiation project. The project, understood as the search for a point of equilibrium between multiple instances, both material and immaterial, thus becomes the inescapable premise for the attainment of a stabilized conventional value, i.e. the 'type'. The epochal scope of this recognition not only definitively overcomes the aporias of a Modernity incapable of coming to terms with the social, political, economic and cultural significance of History and its articulation in 'phases' and 'cycles'.[21] Above all, it also confirms the primacy of processual typology in giving a full account of the process of transformation of the city and the territory according to a model that, temporarily interrupted by industrial society, today finally seems to be regaining its course.[22] The persistent call for the circularity of the project,[23] the reduction of land consumption[24] and the recycling of the existing building stock,[25] as well as of the related materials, no longer instrumental to a historically consolidated reality,[26] are clear and unequivocal signs of a cultural revolution that has now translated into a widespread civil conscience. In this perspective, uncertainty and fragility become the symptoms of an unprecedented project, subjected to progressive decantation and aimed at the pursuit of a common good no longer rhetorically understood but rather 'individually' shared, in the profound meaning that the term implies, as we have tried to argue. A project whose understanding presupposes an inevitable simplification of that interval of experimental suspension, now commonly referred to as regeneration: a necessary transition.[27]

NOTES

1. Anne Vernez Moudon, the first president of the ISUF (International Seminar on Urban Form) since 1997, coined the expression. It is currently used internationally to indicate the strand of studies and research on the form of the city deriving from Saverio Muratori's teaching, in order to enucleate its distinctive trait of continuous critical renewal of inherited building structures, compared to other schools of thought, similarly interested in the study of urban phenomena.

2. Saverio Muratori, "Vita e storia delle città," in *Rassegna Critica di Architettura*, edited by various authors (Roma-Milano: Fratelli Bocca Editori. Anno III, n. 11-12, 1950), 3-52.

3. Nicola Marzot, "Ripensare il nesso tra Architettura e Piano. L'eredità del metodo tipologico: convenzione, crisi, abbandono ed effimero," *U+D* 15 (2021): 52-57.

4. Nicola Marzot, "The study of urban form in Italy," *Urban Morphology* 6/2 (2002): 59-73.

5. Aldo Rossi, *L'architettura della città* (Padova: Marsilio Editori, 1966).

6. Marco Biraghi, Progetto di crisi. Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea (Milano: Marinotti, 2005).

7. It is therefore, in the processual typology, an *entelechy* (from the ancient Greek, compound of ἐντελέχεια, from ἐν- τέλει-ἔχειν*en*, meaning 'in itself', 'purpose', 'possessing'), i.e. an internal purpose in the becoming of the process itself.

8. Ignasi De Solà-Morales Rubio, "Terrain Vague," in *Anyplace*, edited by Cynthia Davidson, (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995): 118-123.

9. Pier Vittorio Aureli, "Toward the Archipelago. Defining the Political and the Formal in Architecture," *Log* 11 (2008): 91-120.

10. In this perspective, the project is configured as a relational practice with an experimental character, which, by tentatively renegotiating the relationships between the parts, alters their full meaning, semantically and expressively disorienting them from their founding relationships, being contextually conditioned and altered by them. This specific way of understanding the project is not reducible, as many think, in the terms of a structural reading of the project, as it precedes it, constantly placing itself between the unspeakable and the sayable, which is, separating them by holding them together.

11. Jeanne Hersch, *Essere e Forma* (Milano: Bruno Mondadori, 2006).

284

12. In this perspective, it is worth recalling how even the term 'concept' (from the Latin *conceptus*, composed of *cum-* and *căpĕre*, meaning 'together' and 'to grasp') clearly bears traces of the ontological primacy of the material grasp over the relative conceptualization. The same discourse, not surprisingly, applies to the German *begriff*, which derives from the verb *greifen*, with the value of 'to grasp'.

13. The individual, thus described, seems to correspond to what in Leibniz's philosophy is called a *monad*, in that it has in itself the perfect organic end of its development.

14. It follows that the crisis of the relationship between 'reading' and 'project' presupposes that of the type, which precedes it, i.e. the dissolution of the constitutive link (as relational) through which the terms implied in potency are progressively translated into act, becoming 'subject' and 'object' respectively.

15. It is, therefore, a paradoxical 'ephemeral permanence', since in the becoming of the organism, the project understood as a relationship is preserved through the continuous transformation of the terms involved. These, in turn, are nevertheless related in a manner that is always different from the one that triggered before, and perpetuated after, the process, which is always the same even though it is not the one.

16. In this sense, it differs from processual typology. While the latter emphasizes the type's character of stability, as a conventional, collectively accepted relationship that defines its terms by successive gemmations, the former emphasizes the ephemeral and transient character of the individual, implying a condition of reciprocity in constant becoming, of which nothing can be said, but which in its organicity can only be evoked. This relationship well expresses the Latin meaning of *spatium* as 'distance' and 'interval'.

17. Saverio Muratori, "Vita e storia delle città," in *Rassegna Critica di Architettura*, edited by variousauthors (Roma-Milano: Fratelli Bocca Editori. Anno III, n. 11-12, 1950), 3-52.

18. Mario Perniola, "Pensare il Between. Sul pensiero di Hugh J. Silverman", in Ágalma– Mano, Maniera, Manierismo, edited by various authors. N.13 (2007).

19. Maurizio Ferraris, *Manifesto del Nuovo Realismo* (Bari: Laterza, 2012).

20. Giorgio Agamben, *Lo stato di eccezione. Homo sacer. Vol. II\I* (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 2003).

21. Regeneration, although it constitutes an autonomous strategy of intervention, recognized as such since the 2010s, actually expresses the way in which, in a process perspective, one transit from a previous cycle, whose impulses have now been exhausted, to the always-fallible possibility of the next one.

22. Bruno Latour, *Non siamo mai stati moderni. Saggio di antropologia simmetrica* (Milano: Eleuthera, 1998).

23. Michael Braungart and William McDonough, *Cradle to cradle. Remaking the Way We Make Things* (London: Vintage, 2009).

24. Urban Task Force (edited by). *Towards an Urban Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1999).

25. Pippo Ciorra, and Sara Marini, *Re-cycle. Strategie per la casa, la città e il pianeta* (Milano: Electa, 2011).

26. Nicola Marzot, "Ripensare il nesso tra Architettura e Piano. L'eredità del metodo tipologico: convenzione, crisi, abbandono ed effimero", in U+D, edited by various authors, pp. 52-57. Anno VIII, n.15, 2021.

27. The philosophical approach that best interprets the meaning of regeneration is the one developed in Mario Perniola's reflection. In this perspective, we recognize ourselves in the words with which Giuseppe Patella recalled him in the pages of *Rivista di Estetica*, n.70 (available online): "...In this sense his (Perniola's, ed.) could be defined as a philosophy of between, of the intermediate, which strives to think of that "in-between" that represents precisely the mediation that separates but also the distance that unites, that middle ground that indicates both a state of separation and a movement of approach. A philosophy of *transit*, to recall precisely one of those concepts elaborated in one of his pioneering books of 1985 (*Transiti. Come si va dallo stesso allo stesso*), in which the relationship between the inside and the outside, the here and the there, between staying and going is thought of neither in terms of radical opposition nor in the manner of a dialectical resolution, but in the form of an intermediate that holds the terms together through the emergence of their distance..."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agamben, Giorgio. *Lo stato di eccezione. Homo sacer. Vol. II\1*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 2003.

Aureli, Pier Vittorio. "Toward the Archipelago. Defining the Political and the Formal in Architecture." *Log* 11 (2008): 91-120.

Biraghi, Marco. *Progetto di crisi. Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea*. Milano: Marinotti, 2005.

Braungart, Michael e McDonough, William. *Cradle to cradle. Remaking the Way We Make Things*. London: Vintage, 2009.

Ciorra, Pippo e Marini, Sara. *Re-cycle. Strategie per la casa, la città e il pianeta*. Milano: Electa, 2011.

De Solà-Morales Rubio', Ignasi. "TerrainVague." In *Anyplace*, edited by Cynthia Davidson, 118-123. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995.

Ferraris, Maurizio. *Manifesto del Nuovo Realismo*. Bari: Laterza, 2012.

Hersch, Jeanne. *Essere e Forma*. Milano: Bruno Mondadori, 2006.

Latour, Bruno. *Non siamo mai stati moderni. Saggio di antropologia simmetrica*. Milano: Eleuthera, 1998.

Marzot, Nicola. "The study of urban form in Italy." *Urban Morphology* 6/2 (2002): 59-73.

Marzot, Nicola. "Ripensare il nesso tra Architettura e Piano. L'eredità del metodo tipologico: convenzione, crisi, abbandono ed effimero." *U+D* 15 (2021): 52-57.

Muratori, Saverio. "Vita e storia delle città." In *Rassegna Critica di Architettura*, edited by variousauthors, 3-52. Roma-Milano: Fratelli Bocca Editori. Anno III, n. 11-12, 1950.

Perniola, Mario. "Pensare il Between. Sul pensiero di Hugh J. Silverman." In Ágalma– Mano, Maniera, Manierismo, edited by variousauthors. N.13, 2007.

Rossi, Aldo. *L'architettura della città*. Padova: MarsilioEditori, 1966.

Urban Task Force (edited by). *Towards an Urban Renaissance*. London: Routledge, 1999.