

INDEX

THE LEGACY OF BRUNO ZEVI FOR THE XXI CENTURY

Paola Ardizzola, scientific editor

Olimpia Niglio, scientific director

HISTORY WILL TEACH US EVERYTHING

BRUNO ZEVI AND THE INNOVATIVE METHODOLOGY FOR FUTURE DESIGN

Paola Ardizzola

5

ARCHITETTI D'ITALIA. BRUNO ZEVI IL NARRATORE

Luigi Prestinenza Puglisi

13

RISCOPIRE ZEVI ATTRAVERSO I SUOI MODELLI

Teodora Maria Matilda Piccinno, Alberto Coppo

17

BRUNO ZEVI'S 'SPEAKING ARCHITECTURE': ITS LEGACY IN AUSTRALIA

Paola Favaro

27

LA ARQUITECTURA CONTEMPORÁNEA

UNA DISTINCIÓN ENTRE MÍMESIS/VISIBILIDAD

Giovanni Castellanos G.

41

ORGANIC ARCHITECTURE ALWAYS

BRUNO ZEVI'S INTERPRETATION OF RENAISSANCE

Jie Zhang

49

ZEVI SU ASPLUND. LA RISCOPERTA DI UN MAESTRO

PER LA NUOVA CRITICA ITALIANA (1930-1948)

Marianna Gaetani, Sofia Nannini

61

SAPER VEDERE BRUNO ZEVI

Sebastiano D'Urso

73

TRACCE NOMADICHE ALLA PERIFERIA DI CASABLANCA

Francesca Privitera

81

INDEX

BRUNO ZEVI E LE COLLANE EDITORIALI DI ARCHITETTURA (1945-1980) Fiorella Vanini	89
PLASTIC TEMPERAMENTS: NOTES ON THE HISTORICAL PROJECT OF PETER EISENMAN FOLLOWING BRUNO ZEVI Michael Jasper	99
UN'IDEA DI CULTURA, UN'IDEA DI SPAZIO LA BIBLIOTECA LUIGI EINAUDI A DOGLIANI Lavinia Dondi	109
BOGOTÁ-ROMA. ANGIOLO MAZZONI SCRIVE A BRUNO ZEVI Olimpia Niglio	119
PHOTO CREDITS	131

Dio, in quanto tale, avrebbe potuto plasmare un mondo perfetto, nitido, incorrotto e incorruttibile, dove l'uomo, condannato all'estasi, avrebbe sbadigliato fino alla nausea, sentendo di essere un elemento futile, decorativo, uno spettatore passivizzato, prono ad applaudire sempre la stessa recita. Dio invece ha agito come un artista d'avanguardia: ha dipinto il quadro a metà, ha scritto lo spartito a metà, o se volete a tre quarti, lasciando al fruitore il compito di integrare la sua opera, di cooperare con Lui, magari imprecando quando non ne capta il disegno, o disperandosi nel constatarne la polivalenza e l'ambiguità.

BRUNO ZEVI
EBRAISMO E ARCHITETTURA, 1993

Londra

F. L. Wright

Contrastoria

Temporalizzazione spazio

Grado zero

Architettura Organica

Machu Picchu

Visione anti-prospettica

Urba-tettura

Venezia

Action-architecture

Cambridge, MA

Giustizia e libert 

APAO

Edificio - citta - territorio

Codice anticlassico

Sette invarianti

Dimensione

Gropius

Roma

Critica operativa



HISTORY WILL TEACH US EVERYTHING

BRUNO ZEVI AND THE INNOVATIVE METHODOLOGY

FOR FUTURE DESIGN

PAOLA ARDIZZOLA

Lebanese American University, Beirut

paola.ardizzola@gmail.com

Accepted: February 15, 2018

ABSTRACT

Bruno Zevi is one of the most important Italian theorists of architecture. His counter-historical and critical reading of the classical historiography has highlighted a different architectural geography, recognising the merits of that architecture which had been improperly defined minor or peripheral. His reading method aims to minimise the contemplative attitude in favour of involvement and actualization of architectural history far from a historicist approach, that prevents from reading the past as irreplaceable occasion to understand contemporary architecture. In his vision of history as "methodology of architectural doing" he draws not a philological portrait of the past, but a breeding ground for extracting its "forgotten subversive components". According to Italo Calvino's statement, a classic art piece is something that never finishes saying what it has to say; Zevi strengthens the concept emphasizing that when architecture of the past was built, the solutions adopted were extremely modern, so they are worth to be analysed to understand processes and ideas they subtended, still valid in contemporaneity. Therefore, it is essential to learn history of architecture by investigating what the masters of the past wanted to achieve rather than the final building just in its components. It is a complex and engaging method because related to "how to look at architecture" with new categories of judgement, that enable to evaluate contemporary architecture by actualization that becomes immediate. It is very useful to unleash oneself, as Zevi suggests, from that compact vision of the historiographical process like the ones handed down by the various Giedion, also by reconsidering the contributions which would make the architecture of countries considered peripheral, substantial. This useful means of reinterpretation can be of educating in universities, considering that it can define new aspects and contradictions in history of so-called official architecture. This paper focuses on strong interaction suggested by Zevi between the architectural design education and history of architecture, as methodology for teaching architectural praxis.

Keywords: counter-history, zero degree, Judaism and modernity

Architecture has value not
for its image, but for its use
Bruno Zevi

INTRODUCTION

Bruno Zevi, born Jewish in 1918 and died in 2000, is one of the most important Italian theorists of architecture. His counter-historical and critical reading of the classical historiography has highlighted both a different architectural geography, recognising the merits of that architecture which had been improperly defined as minor or peripheral, and the limits of an architectural practice that is subordinated to those "classicised" patterns, that were to lead first to International Style and to Post-Modern afterwards. In a critical battle undertaken with extreme lucidity over an entire lifetime dedicated to architecture, he always stressed how classicised patterns annul not only the peculiarities that create a unique relationship between idea and space, but they also invalidate the very idea of architecture as a space suited to accommodate the social function it was designed for in a pantomime, a façade, that displays the monotony of repetition and denies the design from the inside out. His reading method aims to minimise the contemplative attitude in favour of the involvement and the actualization of history of architecture, far from a historicist approach that precludes the reading of the past as an irreplaceable chance to understand and deal with the contemporary season of architecture. In his vision of history as methodology of architectural practice, he draws not a philological portrait of the past, but a breeding ground for extracting "the forgotten subversive components" of it. It is a complex and engaging method because it is not

only about (as one of his book titles sounds) knowing “how to look at architecture” but he sets forth new categories of judgement that enables to learn and judge, for instance, the vernacular architecture as well as contemporary architecture, the urban layout of a city but also the landscape which connotes it, in a continuous actualisation that each time becomes extremely effectual.

AGAINST ACADEMIC STEREOTYPES

Determined supporter of the organic architecture, in 1945 he founds APAO, the Association for Organic Architecture, fully cognisant that the organicism, at its height in the works of Frank Lloyd Wright, is a diachronic factor that is widely acknowledgeable in architecture, from the origins up to the Modern Movement. Its uniqueness lies in the conception of space which tends first to think the voids, the inner cavities, and then to conceive the plans and the volumes structured according to them. This type of logic favours to accentuating both micro and macro social spaces - the house, the city - where people live and where the collective theme is more emphasised; thus the spatial inventiveness, according to Zevi definition, focuses on the content rather than the space-containing, in an architectural design where human fruition comes first and foremost. Social spaces to live in are in fact the central and innovative theme of the urban Charter of Machu Picchu of 1977, promoted by Bruno Zevi as new base to be considered for a different approach to design, more holistic and human-oriented. Forty-four years after Le Corbusier's Charter of Athens, Zevi sets up a milestone, starting from the choice of location for under-signing the new Charter: it was not a fortuitous decision because, compared with Athens, «Machu Picchu symbolises the cultural contribution of another world. Athens implied the rationality of Plato and Aristotle, the Enlightenment. Machu Picchu represents everything that escapes the categorical thinking typical of the Enlightenment and is not classifiable as to its logic». (Zevi, 1998, p. 137).

With the word “Enlightenment” Zevi means all those academic stereotypes that the architectural design has submitted itself to for centuries: proportion, assonance, perspective, the idea of the “finished” artistic object, etc.; in opposition, the Italian historian proposes a reinterpretation of architecture based on the so-called “constants” or “principles” or “anti-rules” or “linguistic invariants” that cast light on new and innovative aspects, and proving to be an effective tool for the contemporary design. It is worth to recall them, considering that Zevi extrapolates them like a synthesis experienced by the complex phenomenon of the Modernism, starting from William Morris:

- «1) List of contents and functions. The shape of the building must fulfil the functions to be accommodated.
- 2) Asymmetry and dissonance. Symmetrical design is synonymous with laziness and anti-social attitude. No two identical halves exist in nature. The dissonance enables us to identify individual functions and annuls the monotony.
- 3) Anti-perspective three-dimensionality. The observer's point of view is dynamic, neither longer fixed a priori nor still, as was the case in the Renaissance.
- 4) Four-dimensional decomposition. The building box is decomposed into planes that are then reassembled.
- 5) Projections, structural tensions, membranes. The contribution of structural engineering has to merge with the architecture without disguising itself.
- 6) Timing spaces. Fluidity of the various spaces that becomes compressed, dilated, exploded but reassembled.
- 7) Continuity among buildings, city, landscape, territory». (Zevi, 1988).

The last one is related to the neologism “urba-ecture” Zevi coined, an overall vision where urbanism and architecture are fully integrated, one indivisible from the other.

These new categories of judgement are a sort of litmus test for re-reading the whole historiography. He cannot accept anymore that there are two different criteria for modern and ancient architecture. There must be a methodology, a way of reading history of architecture which has same valid criteria of judgement for both. This is the aim of the seven invariants. Moreover, four new architectural subjects, according to Zevi's analysis, should be included in history of architecture: history of minor buildings, as they are important for the “democratisation of history of architecture”; history of city-planning, “a grandiose bridge between socio-economic history and art history”; history of landscape, “the outcome of a symbiosis between agrarian modifications and architectural interventions” and history of the extra-European architectural experience, that has to “break the psychological barrier that encloses history within the European area”. (Zevi, in Muntoni, 2002, p. 23). The anti-rules penalise and condemn all the architecture of perfectionism, ideal Renaissance theories, Cartesian rigour of the rationalists where there is no true expression of space. Indeed in all the Zevi's writings, the definition of space as the primary element that distinguishes architecture is central: «Authentic architecture, Wright teaches, of the future, but also of the present and the past, affects, moulds, invents liveable human space, the space per se at the service of the individual and the community. Space is not a mere ingredient of the shaping process of architecture. It is the filter through which all the elements and components derive their architectural legitimacy. A site, a place achieves its architectural identity only when it relates to the status of space; otherwise it is just a character in search of an author. A plastic form is sculpture; it becomes architecture only if it is involved in the space (...). Space is the void, the artistically animated cavity, the negativity of the building transformed into the most poignant and creative action». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 183).

Experiencing architectural space, whose first character - according to Zevi's definition - is its social content, the individual can connote every single part of architecture and materialises the semantics attributed to it by who

conceived it. The concept of counter-history coined by Zevi is the means to proceed for a rigorous interpretation of architecture from modern to ancient perspective rather than the contrary, precisely because doing contemporary architecture nowadays necessitates a backwards analysis but through contemporary eyes, in so far one can perceive targeted and critical angles. The historian emphasises: «How many books on architecture exist in which this current awareness of history of architecture really vibrates, in which the author addresses to the Egyptian temple or the monuments of Mycenae with an interest matured in the light of consciousness of modern architecture? Who found an aesthetics of architecture, and therefore a method of judging the monuments of the past, according to the contributions of the functionalist movement of organic architecture?». (Zevi, 1993b, p. 146).

Such is the case, for example, of the hymn to the zero degree of the prehistoric era: the historian emphasises that caves are architectural spatialities intrinsically different from one other, autonomous, free from models, while with the beginning of the history, the typology will become dominant, and only great architectural personalities - among them Zevi includes Michelangelo, Borromini, of course Wright and few others - will have the courage to reject it. Using a paradox he stresses the fact that, from a linguistic point of view, modern man, either consciously or unconsciously, strives to bring back the spatiality of prehistoric caves; indeed it is interesting to note in them before what there is, all that there is not, in other words everything that is negative, that is super-structure, and will be accumulated as necessity over the centuries to come. Architecture is a space-time mechanism, but throughout history for centuries men were scared of time, space, emptiness and cavity, and could not develop a spatial consciousness of these specific elements which compose architecture (Zevi, 1993c). Thus in the prehistoric informality of the caves, the Italian historian recognises those features that are strictly tied to that obstinate research on contemporary spatiality: the voids, the non-angles, the asymmetry, the crevices and shelters provide a continuity of individual space episodes which, taken in their complexity, offer a multiple, holistic vision of space. In addition: «The cave has no façade. It does not need to shut itself behind a wall; it opens itself wide to the outside. Today the aim is to open the "inside" to the "outside", maybe shielding it with transparent plates; [the cave] does not distinguish among floors, walls and ceilings. It enhances the continuity that enfolds the space, without trying to box it in, (...) it does not standardise the lights. It captures them, filters them, possess them, it handles them refracting in every direction on the rough boulders (...); triumphs in their thickness. Everywhere we find cracks, holes, cuts and lacerations, obsessive gradients. You go up and you come down, you never walk on a flat surface. There are no right angles like in the dull academic purisms; it has no volume. It is not set on the ground, it belongs to it and it is camouflaged in it. Wright once warned: not on the ground but of the ground». (Zevi, 1998, p. 11). Of course, the semantic value of the cave also includes the "unfinished", a concept that Bruno Zevi discovers primarily in the genius of Michelangelo as a sort of defeat of the form when the great Italian artist, aware of the crisis and the subsequent fading of the Renaissance, anticipates and in some of his projects even exceeds the Baroque, developing an architectural language free from any linguistic coding affirmed during the Renaissance. The "unfinished" can imply the possibility of completeness to be carried out. Therefore, the user is called to be an active actor of architecture, completing the sense of the unfinished space by his actions and motions, that can change each time.

ZERO DEGREE AND PROPHECY OF ARCHITECTURE

Zevi's architectural theory explores the existence of a reality of the form that is totally independent from the stylistic point of view, a signs-less reality: it refers to the zero degree theorised by Roland Barthes. The French semiologist, in the last chapter of the broad essay "Mythologies", states that «In the end, only the zero degree can resist the myth». (Barthes, 1991). Zevi notes how perhaps the zero degree releases from all the bonds to a state of a pre-ordained language, but a no longer dependency at the service of a triumphant ideology is itself a myth. Stemming from this are those authentically spontaneous buildings that do not take into account any of these rigid compositional features like symmetry, geometry, the static and controlled conception of the space that imposes a precise perception and fruition, the light canonically designed to enter from apertures that are all symmetrically identical. Thinking of a building according to the zero degree leads rather to an imaginative concept of space to be followed. Zevi affirms: «All the great architects, in one period or another of their research, long to find the mythological birth point of the building. (...) Perhaps the symbols are unavoidable. But they are either inherent to the place, relative to the spaces, volumes, and specific tools of the architecture, or they are merely decorative and artificial, nauseating like in the post-modernist works. John Johansen attempted to extract from a "Dictionary of Symbols" those which, in his opinion, are the most significant in architecture: the cave (return to pre-natal state), the house (female warehouse of wisdom), the forest (mystery, the unknown of trees, columns or mega-structures); the labyrinth (adventure, unawareness of success or failure), the tower (aspiration beyond the norm), and the rocket (escape from the ground). He is confident that these symbols can persuade architects to neglect their personal indulgences, exotic references and senseless decoration». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 171). The symbols identified by Johansen fit the zero degree and encourage the creation of good architecture as devoid of all those pre-conceived models - classicism, eclecticism, nostalgic folklore, cosmic allegories and totemic symbols - as defined by Zevi, that in the complexity of the scenario city-environment-contemporary landscape, can guide to reflect on the concrete quality of architecture or on what Zevi defines, in a succeeded content portmanteau of etymology, "urba-ecture" which is urbanism plus architecture conceived as a unitary element characterising the building-city-territory scale in its whole.

In his essay "The seven myths of architecture", 1984, the historian places questions that nowadays appear as prophesy. He writes in facts: «If the metropolises we know today are destined to disappear, what kind of community, or city will we have, if we have one? And what architecture is suited to them? Those are the questions that require prophetic imagination, utopian fantasy and new myths. Our culture seems to be based on old myths and on the repetition of the same old errors. We need to invent new risks. Otherwise, just like before, city planning and architecture will become paid evasion, simple shelters, escape for the loss of old, real or supposed mythological values». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 166).

An attempt at a response can be sought once again by re-reading official historiography, especially the Twentieth Century, as many valid scholars are currently doing. The persistence of Western-centric, Euro-centric approach has indeed led to the omission, to a lack of knowledge of how to understand the architectural literature discoverable in some other geographies. Thus it is true what Edoardo Persico wrote in "Prophecy of Architecture": «I do not tell you that modern architecture is an attempt -maybe it has been an attempt - of modern organization of Europe: this is beyond architecture. (...) Modern architecture is not that thing cynically believed by Americans: "The engineering solution of the building problem" it is not the standard of Le Corbusier, or the "sozialen Fragen" of Taut. Its destiny, its prophesy, it is to claim the fundamental freedom of the spirit». (Persico, 1964, p. 235). To this aim, it is very useful to unleash oneself, as Zevi suggests, from that compact vision of the historiographical process like the ones handed down by the various Giedion, to reconsider the contributions that would make the architectural periods of countries considered peripheral, substantial. This useful tool of actualised reinterpretation can be of educating and stimulating for designing in these days, considering how it can define new aspects and contradictions in the history of so-called official architecture. Giving some examples, starting even only with renowned figures, they pluralise in the analysis of events that are often overlooked: for instance, which was the impact of the great Bauhaus exhibition, organized in 1922 in Calcutta? And what is the legacy of Bruno Taut in Turkey, where the famous architect of the Neues Bauen taught and designed far from the sound constructive innovation of Berlin during the Weimar Republic? In the light of a possible revision of the field, of geography, what really is modernism? In the rethinking process of the contemporary historians, they de-construct and relativise the terminology that characterises it, to make room for more complex concepts like duality, displacement, hybridity, translatability, alternative modernity, bi-directional process, peripheral modernism. The concepts behind the new terms can sure improve the methodology, by relativising those concepts based on the otherness.

In the short but dense writing "Architectural pieces for the Third Millennium", Zevi considers the values that the Modern Movement has bequeathed to the XXI century, as a basic lexicon to be used in contemporary architectural practice: «The modern movement hands the Twenty-First Century in the results of a battle that defeated academic canons, proportion, assonance, the rhythm of the "octave", perspective, the idea of the "finished" and perfectly executed consoling artistic object. The de-constructivists are putting on trial those architects intent on producing pure forms, based on the inviolability of elementary geometrical shapes, uncontaminated, emblems of stability, harmony, safety, comfort, order, unity. In their works, from Eisenman to Gehry to Koolhaas and Libeskind, architecture is expressly an agent for instability, disharmony, insecurity, discomfort, disorder and conflict. It rejects the ideologies of the golden ratio, the immutable "scientific" establishment, eternal and universal, to defend the rights of a "disturbed planning" to fit reality. Impure forms, crooked geometry, no right angles, diagonals, twisted volumes, concave-convex surfaces, patchworks of etymologies and motifs. The architect no longer pursues super-structural abstract values: he speaks in prose, accumulates re-semanticised terms, avoids all forms of synthesis, and achieves a full poetry, persuasive, and intrinsic to things». (Zevi, 1998, p. 38). To reach this target, Zevi attributes a fundamental role to expressionism, which seemed to have faded by 1924, defeated by a triumphant rationalism, but instead has remained as an incorruptible fil-rouge throughout the whole Twentieth Century: through the pioneer Gaudi first, then in the historical period of Mendelsohn, Poelzig, Taut and Scharoun, in Alvar Aalto as a response to the International Style, up to what Zevi calls the blasphemous scream of Rochamp where Le Corbusier smashes principles, grammar and syntax of the rationalists, and then with Scharoun, Saarinen, Michelucci and still others. «Expressionism engages the entire century resulting in that "action-architecture" that qualifies our working as well». (Zevi, in Muntoni, 2002, p. 33).

Frank Lloyd Wright stays for the Italian historian as the chief deity of modernity, the depository of all that architectural wisdom from which drawing the most meaningful and lasting lesson. Zevi states: «In the process of disengagement from the doctrine of the International Style, many fragments of Wright's lesson were absorbed. From a richer perception of aesthetic signs to the discovery of popular subcultures, from the hypothesis of an "action architecture" qualified by the uncertainty principle to questions of personalisation and pluralism, from numerous and symptomatic Mannerisms to a taste for randomness and the phenomena of de-planning, de-technologism, de-architecture, several direct or indirect suggestions of Wright's have been assimilated». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 185). Assimilated, which does not mean copied in a non-sense revival, but used for reifying that search of freedom of appropriate architectural expression with obstinacy sought after Zevi.

A NEW METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING ARCHITECTURE

Zevi taught several years at universities of Rome and Venice. About specific aspects related to Zevi's methodology of teaching, he considers as absolutely necessary to learn judging architecture through the critical filter of art history; the continuous "poiesis" of the artistic realization guarantees a reading and a judgement of architecture free from restrictive constraints and prejudices. History has to be reconsidered, and rewritten, always in the light of contemporary categories of thoughts if we really want to grasp a profound understanding of it. Indeed, he was insisting on this issue: «I cannot conceive the criticism if not as historic criticism. (...) From Vasari to Baudelaire, the authentic critics are individuals who have a creative potential and, at the same time, a profound historical culture. Only through the modern historic criticism one can demonstrate that Michelangelo and Borromini have to offer to the modern architect more than Gropius or Aalto because, in their linguistic context, they were more courageous and creative». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 154). The historian adds: «Clearing the ground from historical mythology and taboo, adhering to art in its doing, reading with the eyes of living artists in the past work, judging Borromini with the same lack of scruples, with the same confidence with which Neutra is judged, it means not only to open the road to modern architecture, but also to that of the past centuries». (Zevi, 1993b, p. 146). To the aim of an architectural reading which can be able to actualise the spatial concepts of the buildings constructed in any time, Zevi considers to furnish the students both theoretical categories of judgement (for instance the seven invariants) but also an extremely structured method, in order to achieve a deep knowledge on academic level: his didactics indeed is based on the historical comprehension of the monument through the graphic restitution, the architectural survey and the realisation of models, that he calls "critic models" (Zevi, 1993a, p. 93). During his years of lecturing, professor Zevi invites the students also to do documented and bibliographical research on the architectural monuments, a useful practice also for creating a specific archive of faculty. He wishes to stimulate a strong critical approach in the students, but also to be sure that they can achieve a complete knowledge of protagonists, places and dates of architectural history. By inviting students to draw and realise models, he forces them to have a direct experience of measures, plan layouts, sequence of spaces rather than focusing just on theoretical and stylistic aspects. He states: «The models of the Medici Chapel, the Laurentian Library, the fortifications of Florence, the Campidoglio, San Pietro, the Sforza Chapel in Santa Maria Maggiore, up to Santa Maria degli Angeli, translate Michelangelo's works in signs, strength lines, corrugated walls, dynamics suggestion, spatial patterns, volumetric built up area and informal concretions. Especially the profiles of the walls which contain and define the living-spaces become sufficiently abstract traces on which setting new layout solutions, altering of course the recognisability of the model». (Zevi, in Duilio, 2008, p. 99). Furthermore, he seeks to reify an "operative criticism" - another key-term of his innovative approach to history - through the graphic, drawing, and three-dimensional approach, in order to teach the student how to thinking architecturally. Zevi encourages joining the courses of History of Architecture and Architectural Design, thus the students can have an immediate double reading of the architectural issues. Zevi points out that: «The school can offer at least in the link, rather in the fusion between courses of history and architectural design, a substitute of the experience that every young person would gain if he could attend the ateliers of the old and modern masters to assimilate the method of their making». (Zevi, in Muntoni, 2002, p. 21). Hence, history and design have a mutual relationship and each one is strictly necessary to the other. History of architecture, using the methodology of understanding the design process, epitomizes what the masters of the past wanted to achieve rather than explaining just the final building as a successful solution; architectural design instead need a continuous critical revision through the lesson of history, for developing right approaches and interpretations in the light of contemporary problems. Understanding the design process is as important as the final result of the architectural object; that is why the building must be analysed in its tectonic from micro (the details such as the moulding) to macro (the relationship with the landscape and the urban context) scale within the phenomenology of architecture, and not as a mere static object.

Zevi emphasizes the necessity for the architects of the historical studies, in case of lack of them «The university would fall to the level of a professional technical school, in addition not allowing the student to become an architect in the more cultured and noble sense of the word, less than ever a modern architect». (Zevi, in Duilio, 2008, p. 79). As part of the militant criticism, since the beginning of his career as critic, Zevi fights the concept of teaching history as uncritical teaching of styles and explains that for this reason Walter Gropius excluded it bravely from the Bauhaus courses. A constructive reading of history of architecture must rather necessarily deal always with the contemporary art environment. Zevi does not grant any doubt about the importance of the role of the professor in the capacity of having a participatory attitude related to contemporaneity: «A comparative analysis of several European and American schools of architecture provides the following result: when the history of architecture is taught by modern enthusiastic professors, participating the contemporary doing, architects who derive from them are more informed, articulated and thoughtful; when one stays in the kind of academic lecturing, they are less cultured, more primitive». (Zevi, in Muntoni, 2002, p. 20). His enthusiasm and belief for delivering knowledge based on militant criticism, and it is a matter of fact that many of his students are nowadays protagonists of the contemporary architectural scene, is clearly expressed in this statement: «As professor of history of architecture first at university of Venice and then in Rome, for thirty years I tried to teach the history in the light of contemporary art and culture. For thirty years, at the beginning of each class, either about the ancient Egypt or the Romanesque or the XIX century, I asked the students and myself: why do we deal with this? And only after having found a modern key to the reading of the past, I was able to

identify the operative interest of analysing its products. After a class on Villa Adriana in Tivoli or a Sinar's mosque in Istanbul, Biagio Rossetti in Ferrara or on rural farms in the south of Italic peninsula we were able to discover unexpected and stimulating suggestions about today's design commitments. In such way, history was not anymore a boring compulsory passage within the students' curriculum; it was the most valid and scientific workshop of designing». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 154). The pureness and enthusiasm of this extremely intellectually honest approach to students in architecture, together with Zevi's scientific rigour, is missed in many schools of architecture today; it would be beneficial for architects and citizens of the future society.

A SUGGESTION: THE INTRINSIC JEWISH COMPONENT OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE

According to Zevi's thought, at dawn of modernism, values and signs of Jewish culture influenced many non-Jewish architects. The path of architecture since then is «the history of the struggle aimed at disengaging the space from its static, to temporalise it». (Zevi, 1993c, p. 28). A struggle that brings into play the freedom of architectural form against the constraints of traditional forms, moving from a static spatial fruition to a dynamic game of sequences. Architecture of modernity arises refusing pre-ordained schemes, imposed dogmatism, classical canons and focusing on space as a living, contradictory form, in metamorphosis, a space which can grow or decrease, components that refer to Jewish thought. Architecture ceases to be homologated for expressing a diversity that often indicates disorientation, estrangement, dis-identification, rapid change, all distinctive signs of Jewry. It is in the sociology of Jewish scholars of the early twentieth century that the codification of signs and archetypes of Jewish culture can be traced. When Simmel speaks of the "Stranger" who is at the same time near and far; when Benjamin talks of "Renewal opposed to always same", when Kracauer speaks of "Memory, form of space and social reality", they describe the condition of the individual in their coeval metropolis, starting from the "historicized" condition of the Wandering Jew, of his estrangement and otherness. Values that transmute in the new conception of architectural space, which thus becomes anti-dogmatic and democratic. Not just in architects as Erich Mendelshon, who was Jewish, but likewise in Hans Scharoun, Hugo Häring, Alvar Aalto, Frank Lloyd Wright and many others. Indeed «The majority of Jewish architects does not pursue at all the timing concept, the Hebrew cities are almost all rationalist, while the Jewish message culminates in the work of the greatest genius of architectural history, non-Jewish: Frank Lloyd Wright». (Zevi, 1993c, pp. 28-29). This is a seminal subject which still has to be deeply investigated. We often get the impression of this powerful link while lecturing on Bruno Taut, who was also exiled during part of his life...at the end the recurrent question from the audience is: "Was he Jewish?" He was not, but it is evidently possible to identify part of Taut's thoughts, concepts, design ideas with those values related to Jewish culture. Because the zero degree of twentieth century architecture is also based on Einstein's physics, Freud's psychoanalysis, Schönberg's new tonal system, all Copernican revolutions that introduce a completely new space-time vision, thanks respectively to relativity, unconscious and dissonance. (Zevi, 1993c). In architecture, they are translated into the creation of a new space, where man, his movement, his critical fruition complete the space with the incisiveness of his actions. It is the essence of Jewish thought which is translated into architectural language: no longer an architecture that has value for its image, but which openly shows its use within society, which becomes its protagonist in every single individual. As Zevi states, the Jewish prodrom finds fertile ground in expressionism, but the full accomplishment is in organicism and the informal. Contemporary architecture's milieu lacks the awareness of this important gnoseological debt to Jewish culture.

OBSERVATIONS IN FORM OF CONCLUSION

According to one of Zevi's latest definitions, modernity is the everyday vocation of turning a crisis into value (Zevi, 1996). He showed how the new values must then express an architectural lexicon of substance, capable of conceiving narrative spaces that can relate, contain and stimulate the social content for which they are designed. Thus the elements of crisis of the contemporaneity - consumption of resources, overpopulation, climate change, refugees, etc. - in Zevian terms epitomise the stimuli of modern architectural design, thought-provoking motivations of access to a newborn language of architecture. When he states that only the modern architects are in constant crisis, because they are alive (Zevi, 1993a, p. 152) he refers to any architect of the past, who was able to conceive innovative architectural solutions for the time in which they were built. Only in these terms an architect can be considered to be modern: Andrea Palladio when he destroys the symmetrical and hierarchic design approach in villa La Malcontenta for an appropriate dialogue with the surrounding landscape, Michelangelo when must rethink the archaeological space of the Diocletianus thermal bath in Rome by designing inside Santa Maria degli Angeli church with great respect and sensibility toward the features of the ancient building, and Le Corbusier when left behind all the theoretical principles of rationalism for a true humanized architecture, the Rochamp chapel, as pure space of contemplation and spirituality. These architectures can all be read according to the Zevi's invariants, satisfying all of them. They imply different factors, as the consideration at once of tradition and the social instances which can reconcile the dichotomy of *kultur* and life, and this is the approach of organic architecture Zevi always supported. To whom was asking him what organic architecture is, he used to reply: «It is a functional architecture not only according to technics and aim of the building, but also to psychology of the users. All the rest is content, go and study». (Zevi, 1993a, p. 57). Therefore, it is still possible to accept Zevi's challenge and apply these categories for the architecture of the future.

John Cage, one of the most innovative contemporary musicians, declared: «I do not hear the music I write. I write in order to hear the music I haven't yet heard» (Cage, retrieved 14.02.2018). A prophesy for the architecture of the future that Bruno Zevi would have undersigned.

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. 1991. *Mythologies*. (or. Ed. 1957). New York: The Noonday Press
- Cage, J. *An Autobiographical Statement*, in http://johncage.org/autobiographical_statement.html retrieved 14.02.2018
- Duilio, R. 2008. *Introduzione a Bruno Zevi*. Bari: Laterza
- Frisby, D. 1985. *Fragments of Modernity. Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer and Benjamin*. Cambridge: Polity Press & Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Persico, E. 1964. *Tutte le opere (1923 - 1936)*, Milan: Comunità
- Zevi, B. 1988. *Il linguaggio moderno dell'architettura. Guida al codice anticlassico*. (or. Ed. 1973). Turin: Einaudi
- Zevi, B. 1993a. *Zevi su Zevi - Architettura come profezia*. Venice: Marsilio
- Zevi, B. 1993b. *Saper vedere l'architettura*. (or. Ed. 1948) Turin: Einaudi
- Zevi, B. 1993c. *Ebraismo e Architettura*. Florence: Giuntina
- Zevi, B. 1996. *La chiesa del duemila*, talk gave at Lateranense University, Rome
- Zevi, B. 1998. *Contro storia e Storia dell'Architettura*, vol. II *Personalità e opere generatrici del linguaggio architettonico*. Rome: Newton & Compton
- Zevi, B. 1998. *Contro storia e Storia dell'Architettura*, vol. III *Dialecti architettonici - Architettura della modernità*. Rome: Newton & Compton
- Zevi, B. 2002. *La storia come metodologia del fare architettonico*, Prolusion by prof. arch. Bruno Zevi held at Rome University, Congress Hall of the Rectorate, on December 18 1963; in Muntoni A. (edited by), *Bruno Zevi per l'architettura*, Proceeding of the International Conference. Rome: Mancosu
- Zevi, B. 2002. *Paesaggistica e grado zero della scrittura architettonica*, Conference held in Modena on September 19 1997; in Muntoni A. (edited by), *Bruno Zevi per l'architettura*, Proceeding of the International Conference. Rome: Mancosu

Bruno Zevi
Saper vedere l'architettura



Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi