



WHAT IF? WHAT NEXT?

SPECULATIONS ON HISTORY'S FUTURES

SESSION 1A

MODES OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

Ecologies of History: Histories of Ecology

TO CITE THIS PAPER | **Scott Woods**. "The Problem with Resolution: Colin Rowe's Oppositional Urbanism." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand: 37, What If? What Next? Speculations on History's Futures*, edited by Kate Hislop and Hannah Lewi, 56-63. Perth: SAHANZ, 2021. Accepted for publication December 11, 2020.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND (SAHANZ) VOLUME 37

Convened by The University of Western Australia School of Design,
Perth, 18-25 November, 2020

Edited by Kate Hislop and Hannah Lewi

Published in Perth, Western Australia, by SAHANZ, 2021

ISBN: 978-0-646-83725-3

Copyright of this volume belongs to SAHANZ; authors retain the copyright of the content of their individual papers. All efforts have been undertaken to ensure the authors have secured appropriate permissions to reproduce the images illustrating individual contributions. Interested parties may contact the editors.

THE PROBLEM WITH RESOLUTION: COLIN ROWE'S OPPOSITIONAL URBANISM

Scott Woods | University of Melbourne

William Ellis', criticism of Colin Rowe's urban design theory, as he writes in the Fall 1979 issue of Oppositions, derives from the ever-increasing resolution of his urban projects. The higher the resolution, claims Ellis, the more his project moves away from the perceptual ambiguity he is attempting to achieve.

Criticisms of Rowe after Collage City are beset by discourses of opposition, like that above. This paper identifies and evaluates the origin of this form of criticism within the work of the American architect and theorist William Ellis and hypothesises that two of Ellis' essays – "The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu", first published in Casabella in 1971, and "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism" from Oppositions 18 – were fundamental to the construction of arguments forwarded in the late 1990s that sought to devalue Rowe's urban and architectural criticism further.

Ellis' later article, in particular, provides an early critique of Rowe's urban theories that, to this day, is eclipsed by similar forms of criticism which came much later, including George Baird's "Oppositions in the Thought of Colin Rowe." Ellis' article appeared approximately one year after the release of Rowe and Koetter's magnum opus, Collage City in 1978, but hasn't garnered the attention one would expect given the plethora of Rowe scholarship since. Investing in the oppositional structure posed by the less infamous, yet as influential, "Introduction to Five Architects," Ellis surveys the theoretical trajectory of Rowe's late urbanism, and in so doing captures the prevailing sentiment of the anti-postmoderns who have since positioned history, in the present, as a form of idealism which fails to reconcile the human dimension of our cities.

Introduction

The late urban design theory of Colin Rowe and the oppositional framework which sustained it, was crucial for the development of postmodern architectural discourse in America. The reception of Rowe's writings and associated urban design projects vary, however there are a number of interconnected responses which when taken together offer a unique insight into the development of his urban theory and its effects on a younger generation of theorists.

No scholar in the field has more succinctly articulated the distinction between Colin Rowe's early and late period than George Baird. Baird's two-part analysis begins with his "Oppositions in the Thought of Colin Rowe"¹ which first appeared in *Assemblage* in 1997. This essay would infamously exclude Rowe's later urbanistic work which was primarily derived from his urban design studio teaching at Cornell University. Baird's second follow-up essay titled, "The Work, Teaching and Contemporary Influence of Colin Rowe: A 1999 Status Report"² would focus on the previously excluded urban theory and unapologetically engage the problems he saw with it. Such was the distinction between Rowe's late urban work from the *Collage City*³ era and that work which preceded it that Baird, in his introduction, admits to the difficulty of dealing with the later work, and the serious problem of its oppositional framework.⁴ Baird would effectively mark the moment Rowe turned from hero to villain.

An early manuscript of *Collage City* had been informally circulating since 1973, it was then first published in condensed form in English *Architectural Review* in 1975 and later released as a book in 1978.⁵ Throughout this period Rowe was tenured at Cornell and developing his urban theories in the studio with his students. William Ellis, one of Rowe's former Cornell students, would frame the development and culmination of this period by its discourses of opposition in two essays nearly eight years apart. Ellis' first essay of 1971, "The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu"⁶ contextualises the intellectual activity leading up to *Collage City*, whilst his "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism"⁷ from 1979 illustrates *Collage City*'s reception following its publication in book format. These largely overlooked essays, it is proposed, are critical for interpreting Baird's later essays and the early criticism generated from within the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies that sprang from and responded to Rowe's broader project.

Ellis' "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism" was published approximately six years after the first informal circulation of *Collage City* and one year after its release in book format. It was published in *Oppositions 18*, the journal of the Institute for Architecture and Urbanism (IAUS), a private architecture school and think-tank in New York. Ellis' essay, although appearing after *Collage City*, provides an important early response to the book due to the author's direct association with Rowe and Baird, but also because it can be read as an institutional response by the IAUS. It is worth mentioning that both Rowe and Baird were at one time affiliated with the IAUS and its director Peter Eisenman. Ellis' Cornell - IAUS connection is therefore not unexpected given Rowe's earlier mentorship to Eisenman at Cambridge, their work together on CASE (the Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment) and elsewhere. Eisenman and Rowe's ideological split, however, would be later symbolically inscribed by Rowe's final essay for *Oppositions* in 1976: "Robert Venturi and the Yale Mathematics Building."⁸

Ellis' article for *Oppositions* is, however, buttressed by his preceding essay which appeared in the special issue, n. 359-360 of *Casabella* magazine titled *The City as an Artifact* guest edited by the IAUS. The issue was important because it highlighted a parallel transatlantic intellectual project connecting history and the developing city. *Casabella* had for some time nurtured these themes during Ernesto Rogers' previous editorship at the magazine in the 1950s and 60s. At the time of the special issue Ellis and another one-time Rowe student, Thomas Schumacher, were IAUS fellows. Both men, in this issue, would frame the early developing urban discourse which would culminate with *Collage City*.

Ellis' *Oppositions* essay can be understood as both a reformulation and repositioning of arguments made within his earlier *Casabella* essay. The later writing is considerably more critical. Although rich in content and idea, the essay indexes the politicisation of *Collage City* after its release, from within the IAUS, whilst also exploring the development of Rowe's urban position.

Oppositions

Ellis' *Casabella* essay "The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu" most notably challenges planning psychology and in particular the will to limit, if not eliminate, unprogrammed urban space for the benefit of speed, efficiency and productivity. An understanding of how urban objects and urban space impede the productive and efficient organisation of the functional city provides Ellis an opportunity to endorse an opposing theory of the city. The contemporary city, according to Ellis and analysis of then recent new towns by the IAUS, is constituted by two opposing ideological and diagrammatic models, "those conceived as 'artifacts', emphasising physical relationships in space; and those which appear to have been conceived in terms of 'process' emphasising operational relationships in time".⁹ The location of both concepts (artifact and process) within the contemporary city underscores the concern of a generation of architects and theorists in Italy since Rogers to decipher the meaning of the coexistence of history and modernity in the city. Ellis' staging of a debate between space and time is therefore prefaced by a debate between history and modernity. Although Ellis' artifact belongs to space and history it is conspicuously free from any overt association to a historical formal language, whether building or otherwise, which may locate the artifact in time, and consequently out of style. The artifact is, it would seem though, the destitute figure of an architectural body because "It has always been the function of architecture as a form of artifice, and the products of architecture as a form of artifact..."¹⁰ Ellis is careful to avoid history because he does not want to appear to champion it in the present for fear of appearing retrograde. Consequently, the essay is illustrated by a plethora of diagrammatic urban plans rather than conspicuous architectural buildings that would act to shift the discourse to questions of style. Buildings are pictured but only as a foil to emphasis the anti-artifact techno-formalisms of Archigram, Cedric Price and others. In this respect the locus of history stays stored as an implicit identity within the artifact itself suggesting a proto-formal device which "emphasise physical relationships in space."¹¹ The ideal artifact city then is a composition comprising artifact relationships, and in essence a 'city of architecture'.

The inverse of Ellis' artifact is his process. Process is endemic to the techno-operational antics of a wayward contemporaneity. Evidence of process within the cities of the 1970s are, for Ellis, multiple, and derived from the modernist systemisation of the social and technological incorporating "mathematical rationality, to concepts of extreme mobility and flexibility." It is here that one can locate Rowe's anti-zeitgeist argument.

Formulations of the contemporary city are then reliant on the dialectical tension between artifacts and processes in-turn derived from a more nuanced re-articulation of the traditional / historical city and that of the developing / future city. In a strange sleight of hand Rowe's figure and ground project derived from Nollie have become conceptualised in Ellis' artifact and process. Figure and ground for Rowe always remained separate, as artifact and process do for Ellis, yet their combinatory potential, although unresolved, constitutes the singular line of thought to be pursued.

Ellis attempts to reconcile these oppositional forces active within the contemporary city in order to produce an "equivocal balance of opposites." The architecture of the city must confront its modern counterpart rather than capitulate to its teleological force. Here, Ellis' complimentary approach echo's Rowe's own "combinatory" approach to the dilemma of the contemporary city. Out of time, therefore neither retrograde nor futurist, the dialectical forces comprising the city are what Ellis is looking to firstly point out and then to exploit. Nothing can be done with history and contemporaneity alone, so it is necessary to seek their constitution and balance at the junction of their interactions. In this attempt to retire the binary pair by hypothesising modes of possible synthesis (never unity) Ellis shifts his focus to urban 'qualities', including where they are found

and how they are configured within the production of the city. Value, along with history and artifact, are assets of the medieval town, whereas fact, future and process constitute the modernist city. Ellis realises the ideological and aesthetic dimension of these two models yet looks to space and experience for a qualitative assessment of rational town planning and the historical town. A spatial/experiential project is therefore identified as the requisite tool for revealing a synthesised relationship between history and modernity, artifact and process, architecture and city.

Importantly, artifact and its hyper-localised spatial diagram claims an ideological advantage over process for Ellis because the historical building and its milieu “brings some device to empirical reality which both argues with and organises that reality according to its own order.”¹² The spatial artifice of the historical city is therefore counterposed to the sprawl, ubiquity, and repetition of the modernist city. This effect of spatial excess produced by the artifact is an affront to the efficiency and productivity diagram of the modernist city. These spatial effects produced by the architectural object within the context of the contemporary city are for Ellis, and his colleagues at the IAUS, an alluring and productive obstacle for speculation on the future city. Yet, an adequate project beyond one of theory for the artifact is still to be deployed.

Oppositions Again

Ellis’ earlier writing for *Casabella* is expanded in his 1979 *Oppositions* essay: “Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe’s Contextualism.” A primary difference between the two essays, outside the time elapsed, is the obvious debt to Rowe. Rowe was not mentioned in the first essay, even if it is clear that his ideas are heavily utilised.

Artifact, in this essay, moves from concept to the discipline of architecture through its identification as ‘type’ and it is this extrapolation of concept which effectively rewrites the earlier essay. Architectural buildings in the city are now considered to contain differences. This difference is spatialised within the city through both experiential and diagrammatic relationships with other building types and those forces of modernity (process, for Ellis) which complete the context. Architectural typology affords a more specific and nuanced account of objects and their relationships to each other and to the city. Ellis’ activation of type is a direct response to Rowe’s extensive typological method employed within *Collage City*. This development in Rowe’s project is critical, and it is not lost on Ellis, because the concept of architecture as artifact in the city emphasises its resistance to efficient planning policy. Typology introduces specialisation and differentiation into the discussion of artifact. In so-doing, typology as a subtext of artifact begins to question the binarisation of artifact and process observed by the IAUS’ research on the contemporary city stated in the opening paragraph of Ellis’ *Casabella* article.

Type as a classification system establishes a priori organisations which operate within and for a particular socio-cultural order. The resultant conceptual stability over time of individual building types is buttressed by formal consistency which afford Rowe and also Ellis the opportunity to reference different typologies and their immanent formal affects. Rowe’s identification of typology as an ancillary instrument for the delineation of formal oppositions in the city enabled him to introduce a highly differentiated, yet stable series of formal logics that could act as a foil to the immaterial (yet highly organised) functions of the modernist city. For Rowe’s studio at Cornell, and his own urban design projects, typology would introduce a specific kind of determinism into the design process, and thereafter stabilising contours within the experience of the city. The overt use of typology would be criticised as historicist, yet the supposed ‘ideal’ within typological method; Ellis’ artifact, would for Rowe be beset by contextual and operational mutations. Peter Eisenman, the director of the IAUS at the time of Ellis’ writing, suggests that privileging stasis through the instrumentalization of historical building typologies returns one to recuperating a dead historical language. This historical language is ‘dead’ because it is asynchronous – its formalisms are out of time so to speak.¹³ The potential for these typological models to mutate according to their site conditions means, for Eisenman, that they still carry, no matter how affected by their context or differentiated from each other collectively, a dormant and anti-modern

legacy presented in the contemporary moment. Rosalind Krauss, also associated with Eisenman's IAUS, and here reading Eisenman's house projects through Rowe's earlier "Transparency" essays¹⁴ makes a similar argument this time through replacing typology with 'object'. Krauss reads Rowe's method "... as a way of using the object as a lever on reality in order to essentialize a certain part of it. It is a moment of essentialisation or reduction back to an ontological absolute."¹⁵ These criticisms inadvertently relegate Rowe's type project to a reactionary opposition against the modernist city, rather than containing the possibility for synthesis within the oppositional structure. Ellis echo's both Eisenman and Krauss' sentiments by asserting that Rowe's late urban design project is the argument between type and context, and between ideals and continuity.

Ellis' commentary on Rowe's Lower East Side urban design project of 1967 provides a poetic synthesis of Rowe's architectural forms and their conceptual affects at the urban scale: Rowe's "play between type and context, change and persistence, blatant collision and delicate resolution, is elaborate and convincing."¹⁶ The escalation of the encounter between type and context in *Collage City* is emphasised when large fragments of isolated context are re-conceptualised as typological entities. The transformation of a large city scale fragment to the status of typological entity illustrates a further attempt to resolve the composite nature of the contemporary city. This new configuration of the typological element is invested in the coordination of its edge. If the oppositional discourse staged between artifact and process in Ellis' *Casabella* article is localisable to a zone which approximates a synthesis between a building and its context, this new urban type becomes attentive to a discourse of edge. Edge is the place that at once solidifies oppositional difference whilst prophesising its break-down through 'contact'. Edge can be understood as a mediation of things and a mediation of concepts, and as such the idea of the centre is a logical development of Ellis' thought once edge has become an important figure for the articulation of those oppositional logics central to his thinking about the contemporary city. Centre, or Ellis' "core" can be read as the invisible figure in the earlier article, whilst it is crucial to his investigation of Rowe's urban theory in the later article:

It is usually a complex building or a coherent grouping that can be imposed upon a context, undergo a mutual deformation with that context, and become something new. It sustains a general typological identity, usually through geometrical regularity at its core, and promotes a local particularity of composition, usually through irregularity at its edges.¹⁷

Resolution

The focus on "raw collision" of objects and contextual fragments within *Collage City* has overshadowed its opposing project of "complex and refined resolution of parts."¹⁸ This alternative project, as critical to *Collage City* urbanism as collision is, escaped the imagination of the American neo-avant-garde which first took up and then extended aspects of its strong visual regime through collision aesthetics. Ironically though, the type of artifact of Rowe's *Collage City* is for Ellis definitively portrayed by its robust formal character even under duress. When these type elements collide, and their composure is tested or stressed to the point of deformation their image has the capacity to endure, if not strengthen. Here, Krauss' essence coincides with Ellis' regular core geometry, leading to the perseverance of shape for the typological building rather than its deterioration.

Rowe's "complex and refined resolution of parts" is best exemplified by his *Roma Interrotta* competition submission from 1978. This project, completed the same year as *Collage City*'s release, is important for ascertaining the development of oppositional frameworks within *Collage City*, and would for George Baird be critical for interpreting Rowe's late urbanistic project. Baird locates Rowe's late urbanism through its privileging of the abstract, pictorial, and compositional features of the city's organisation. Such a hypothesis necessarily draws attention to the marginalisation, if not exclusion, of an embodied experience of the city from within. Thus, it is from an elevated and disembodied position that Rowe's collision and resolution, Ellis' two concepts, are attempted. A project for a completely resolved articulation of elements within the larger urban spatial field is, for Ellis, a foil to discuss the effects of the collision project. However,

Ellis notes the significance of a resolution project for Rowe when he says that “In his work the first and perhaps more wholesome concept seems to predominate.”¹⁹ In recognising this “wholesome concept” he refers to resolution as a political project coordinated and read visually through Rowe’s project drawings as a ‘gentile urbanism’ tensioned to the more violent formalisms of its collision partner. An equivalent project to that of the picturesque new town movement in the work of Rowe is not forthcoming for Ellis, although Rowe’s flirtation with it and resistance to it is acknowledged.²⁰ The genius loci of Christian Norburg-Schulz is also equally distant, as are other phenomenological derivations of place. Rowe’s visual emphasis on the pattern of the plan as a way to conceptualise the city is pitted against immersive perceptual systems by both Ellis and Baird. Rowe’s externalisation of the city, free of experiential and sensorial objectives aims to produce visual resolution through pattern recognition.

Rowe’s earlier “...responsiveness to external stylistic developments” and his later “...struggle against external stylistic influences”²¹ aligns Ellis with Baird and the problem of the later work. As a consequence of this attribution much of the criticism of Rowe’s late urban theory is lambasted as politically conservative. Rowe’s perceived resistance to the ‘outside’ is interpreted as a resistance to context (the modernist context) and a retreat to the stabilising forms and to the ‘centre’ of typological buildings to suppresses the urgency of process. Through these claims Ellis takes the reader back full circle to re-constitute the firm oppositions outlined in his *Casabella* article. Here, any resolution of an edge condition, any conscription of the poche in servitude to internal stability or external dynamism returns to the argument of historicism because typology retreats into itself.

As Rowe approaches the detail of the city, his conceptual project must adjust if it is to survive. Much of the criticism of Rowe’s late urban project rests for Ellis, as it does with Eisenman and others, on the image catalogue of historical building types and their combination included within *Collage City*’s Excursus. It is here that Rowe’s ‘problem of resolution’ is identified. The necessity to address the building façade and its specific formal, spatial and programmatic effects is urgent. For, if the oppositional logics of the city coalesce at the thick zonal interface of the building façade, then it is here that the effects of the dialectic are both produced and registered. If this is the case, there must be a commitment to get to this level of design analysis, yet, nowhere does this sufficiently materialise. Baird notes this point too.²² Rowe’s seeming disinterest to engage the differentiated envelopes of typological form suggests for Baird that the specificity of these architectural objects, generated historically, remain at a general level of articulation akin to Ellis’ artifact. The problem is so great for Baird, he allocates it one of the three major deficiencies of *Collage City*. Ironically, as Ellis notes, the closer Rowe gets to this level of detail the higher the level of design control required. Inevitably, this control relegates the potential synthesising affects created to managed effects falling into stable or anticipated dialectical relationships. Perceiving spatial ambiguity and diagramming conceptual ambiguity are much more difficult at detail. Even if richly illustrated, *Collage City* keeps the typological façade at a distance to the reader through open-ended musings of its potential to engage with the city. The problem of resolution anticipates the question of resolution today. Critic Thomas Schumacher has taken up this question and offers an alternative project, one more sympathetic to Rowe’s *Collage City* urbanism which places the legacy of this oppositional discourse to the façade of the historical building. Schumacher’s earlier work, an explication of dialectical design and its effects on program, would investigate the idea of high and low resolution within the context of the Italian city. Schumacher’s work is not the focus of this paper, but it is of note that his project was expanding concurrently alongside Ellis’.

Postmodern Conclusions

In conclusion, the failure of Rowe’s late urban project rests paradoxically on both an undersupply and oversupply of resolution. At the scale of spatial relationships in the city his typological categories fail to adequately address zonal behaviours between objects and affects belonging to façade and other edge conditions. Whereas his conclusive taxonomy of typological artifacts generates a city of autonomous and idealised form.

George Baird, at the 1976 IAUS round-table, *Forum Number Three*, celebrating the opening of the Beaux Arts exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art asked, “how far, creatively speaking, should we expect to be able to go in our new, mature, and disillusioned enlightenment?”²³ In asking this question Baird probes the acceptability of a continued program of postmodern architectures, but also enquires about the relevance of a complete and unbridled experimentation with alternate architectural responses as a solution to the disenchantment with conventional modernism. Rowe is absent from this meeting and could therefore offer no direct response. The positioning of Rowe’s history / modernity opposition is critical to this context as Robert Somol would note much later when he states that “...no critic has been as instrumental as Rowe... in establishing the framework and readings within and against which a neo-avantgarde would become possible.”²⁴ Somol’s “within” could easily refer to Rowe’s earlier work and to his urban design theory prior to typology, whilst his “against” may approach Ellis and Baird’s evaluation of his later work beginning with the first murmurs of *Collage City* in 1973. The rejection of Rowe’s so-called historicist project was, given Baird’s question, already underway. The Beaux Arts exhibition, by further fuelling the debate between history and modernity would also resurrect the figure-ground discourse, and with it the possibility for figural affect that Rowe so cherished and Ellis, in his *Casabella* essay of 1971, admired in the form of the artefact.

Anxiety about whether the Beaux Arts building, and its autonomous, balanced formal composition could engage the city at all was a poignant question to emerge, and a question at the heart of Ellis’ examination of both the artifact and the typological building. Paul Rudolph, present at the round-table meeting, dismissed the possibility for Beaux Arts style buildings to connect or interact with their outside, with their city. For Rudolph, Beaux Arts Urbanism was in fact impossible.

Endnotes

¹ George Baird, *Writings on Architecture and the City* (London: Artifice Books, 2015), 196-207.

² George Baird, *Writings on Architecture and the City* (London: Artifice Books, 2015), 208-219. This essay was originally presented as a lecture at Milan Polytechnic in 1999.

³ Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, *Collage City*, (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1978).

⁴ Baird notes the prevalence of oppositional logics within Rowe’s writing over time and acknowledges his Introduction to the book *Five Architects* as critically important, however, he cites “Europe/America, high art / low art and modernism / anti-modernism” as those oppositions most readily requiring further examination. George Baird, *Writings on Architecture and the City*, 198. Those “ambiguous oppositions” identified by Baird within *Collage City* include utopia / tradition, exhibit / scaffold and object / context.

⁵ K. Michael Hays, “Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, From *Collage City*,” in *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998), 89.

⁶ William Ellis, “The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu,” *Casabella*, n. 359-360 (1971): 63-70.

⁷ William Ellis, “Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe’s Contextualism,” in *Oppositions Reader*, ed. K. Michael Hays (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), 226-251.

⁸ This article appeared in Issue 6 of *Oppositions* published in 1976 and has since been republished in *Oppositions Reader*. Colin Rowe, “Robert Venturi and the Yale Mathematics Building,” in *Oppositions Reader*, ed. K. Michael Hays (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), 135-153.

⁹ Ellis, “The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu,” 63.

¹⁰ Ellis, “The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu,” 67.

¹¹ Ellis, “The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu,” 63.

¹² Ellis, “The Natural Town and the Spaceless Milieu,” 68.

¹³ Peter Eisenman, “Autonomy and the Avant-Garde: The Necessity of an Architectural Avant-Garde in America,” in *Autonomy and Ideology: Positioning an Avant-Garde in America*, ed. R. E. Somol (New York: The Monacelli Press Inc., 1997), 68-79.

¹⁴ Colin Rowe and Robert Slutsky, “Transparency: Literal and Phenomenal,” *Perspecta*, vol. 8 (1963): 45-54. and Colin Rowe and Robert Slutsky, “Transparency: Literal and Phenomenal Part 2,” *Perspecta*, vol. 13-14 (1971): 287-301.

¹⁵ Rosalind Krauss, "Death of a Hermeneutic Phantom: Materialisation of the Sign in the Work of Peter Eisenman," in *House of Cards*, ed. Peter Eisenman, Rosalind Krauss and Manfredo Tafuri (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 184.

¹⁶ Ellis, "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism," 236.

¹⁷ Ellis, "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism," 231.

¹⁸ Ellis, "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism," 248.

¹⁹ Ellis, "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism," 248.

²⁰ Ellis, "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism," 231.

²¹ Ellis, "Type and Context in Urbanism: Colin Rowe's Contextualism," 250.

²² Baird, *Writings on Architecture and the City*, 212. The problem of Rowe and Koetter's use of typology within *Collage City* leads Baird to consider it as one of three main insufficiencies in the argument of the book. The others are: "the conceptual problem concerning the status of hypothesis," and "the insufficiently theorised view of the profession."

²³ William Ellis, "Beaux," *Oppositions: A Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture* (Summer 1976): 131-134. The exhibition "The Architecture of the Ecole des Beaux Arts" at the Museum of Modern Art in New York was organised by Arthur Drexler and opened October 29, 1975 and closed January 4th, 1976.

²⁴ R. E. Somol, "In Form Falls Fiction: Misreading the Avant-Garde in Contemporary Architecture" (PhD Diss., The University of Chicago, 1997), 20.