Architectural History in Schools of Architecture

Stanford Anderson

The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol. 58, No. 3, Architectural History 1999/2000. (Sep., 1999), pp. 282-290.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0037-9808%28199909%2958%3A3%3C282%3AAHISOA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7

The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians is currently published by Society of Architectural Historians.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/sah.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org
Sun Jun 24 20:41:29 2007

Architectural History in Schools of Architecture

STANFORD ANDERSON
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Today architectural history thrives in schools of architecture and yet its situation is as ambiguous as ever. This is not to assert some timeless condition, for ambiguity can take many forms. And yet again, the issues underlying these ambiguities do display certain consistencies: Is history germane to architectural production, or education? Or not? Is history an autonomous discipline or a "service"? If the former, is it nonetheless valuable as a source of critical insights into the position of architecture in society? If the latter, is it a trove of available forms, an array of formal paradigms awaiting transformation, a breeding and testing ground for architectural hypotheses, or . . . ?

Our theme is stocktaking at a purportedly epochal moment, an exercise the timing of which would itself be appropriate for historical deconstruction. Let this simply be a stocktaking, not a millennial one. And let us turn, very briefly, to reflect on architectural history in schools of architecture in two preceding eras: prior to, and during, the period of Modernism.

Whether architecture was taught in academies, most notably in France after the Revolution, in polytechnics French or Germanic, in a professional association as in London, or in the university-based schools proliferating in the United States in the late nineteenth century, history was in some way integral. Architecture might be a discipline of remarkable autonomy, handed down through the classical tradition.[1] History might be a repository of both spatial and tectonic typologies available for use and transformation. History might reveal the rootedness of ways of building and being that inspired national or racial loyalties. One could not embrace all these ideas simultaneously, but from a time of the dominance of academic classicism around 1800, through all the historicisms and eclecticism of the nineteenth century, history was in some way intimately wedded to the practice and teaching of architecture.

The first school of architecture in the United States was one of the five original departments (along with civil engineering, mechanical engineering, mining and geology, and chemistry) of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) as it matriculated its first students in 1865. The head of the school was William Robert Ware, the designer with Henry Van Brunt of Harvard's Ruskinian Gothic Memorial Hall (1868–1880). Yet Ware quickly brought his new school under the sway of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.[2] A series of graduates of the Paris school taught at MIT, beginning with Eugène Létang in 1871. The other new American schools adopted the same standard. There was no independent discipline of history, but it was deeply embedded in the work at the drafting board.[3]

In England the hold of classicism was challenged early in the nineteenth century by the recognition of indigenous medieval architecture and the claims for its greater appropriateness to the land, climate, and mores of northern Europe. Later it became plausible to see these concerns as providing the root stock for the new, free architecture, especially of the English house, in the latter part of the nineteenth

century. All this made a mark on the Architectural Association of London (founded 1847); still, architectural education in England, too, especially again at the beginning of the twentieth century, was strongly marked by classicism.[4]

In Germany, too, the challenge to classicism was deep and pervasive. The *Rundbogenstil*, simultaneously medievalizing and tectonically elemental, offered a compelling alternative. Increasingly marked was the reliance on an eclectic range of medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque forms—increasingly based on northern precedents.[5] The classicism of Karl Friedrich Schinkel and his time maintained its prestige, but the northern alternatives increasingly dominated and marked the schools and their historical inquiries as well. Schinkel and Friedrich Gilly themselves—and Goethe, too—provided the example for close and motivated inquiry into great medieval works.[6]

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Hermann Muthesius attacked recent eclecticism and the current *Jugendstil*, embracing all that was Nordic but especially the English free architecture, which he was in the process of documenting so well from his position as cultural attaché at the German embassy in London. He examined the British phenomenon lovingly and in detail, yet his proposition was that Germany had not to copy the English works, but rather to follow a parallel course from Germanic sources to a rooted Modernism.[7]

In the same years, the young artist Peter Behrens, newly made Director of the School of Arts and Crafts *(Kunstgewerbeschule)* in Düsseldorf (1903), ambitiously continued his own self-instruction as an architect while seeking to establish an innovative architectural program in his school. In the present context, the important matter is the example he set for history within the school. He did not hire an architect with one or another form of commitment to history but rather a young art historian, Wilhelm Niemeyer, trained by August Schmarsow in Dresden. Schmarsow was noted for an innovative approach that sought to identify what was elemental to each artistic medium.[8] The proposition that sculpture was essentially the occupation of space while architecture was the art of the creation of space fundamentally cut away conventional stylistic discourse. Whether in historical inquiry or creative design, the mind was freed and simultaneously given a fulcrum on which to shift the load of tradition. Niemeyer also taught Behrens to appreciate the thought of Alois Riegl, and especially the concept of the *Kunstwollen*. From these two sources Behrens could derive both a fresh formal program and a conviction of historical mission.[9]

I emphasize this European and relatively little-known example of Behrens's Düsseldorf school for three reasons: it may be the first example of a highly trained, academic art historian playing a programmatic role in an innovative architectural program; it shows the telling influence in architectural education of the abstractions of "scientific" art history *(Kunstwissenschaft)* rather than received stylistic or even architectural commitments; and, finally, the two leading modernists to direct schools of architecture in the United States, Walter Gropius and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, knew this example from their immediately ensuing years in the atelier of Behrens.

Walter Gropius was invited to Harvard by Dean Joseph Hudnut in 1937 and became chairman of the Department of Architecture a year later. The new architecture espoused by Gropius had to make its way in confrontation with ingrained conventional practice—a consequence of which was the tendency to distance the new from historical roots and thus to inhibit the study of architectural history by impressionable young student architects. The dismissal of history from the program of the Graduate School of Design, emphatically claimed by Klaus Herdeg, is an argument that may need to be tempered.[10] Still, I can witness that, as the bright young graduates of Harvard and other East Coast schools of architecture in the 1950s took leading roles in the change of architectural education in schools across the country, history was largely treated as bunk. The use of the library, even the perusal of current journals, was a clear and present danger to the student's creativity.

In 1938 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe became director of the architectural school of the Armour Institute in Chicago, predecessor of the Illinois Institute of Technology. In his 1939 description of the school, Mies began and ended with the need for cultural and historical education. He closed with:

> The buildings of the past are studied so that the student will acquire from their significance and greatness a sense for genuine architectural values, and because their dependence upon a specific historical situation must awaken in him an understanding for the necessity of his own architectural achievement.[11]

Yet the pervasive and long-lasting control of Miesian form giving over the student architects of IIT (still debated today) should assure us that Mies's opening to history was to convey a Zeitgeist endorsed by him, with the consequence that the student's architectural achievement would emerge within the form world of Mies.[12]

As late as 1967, the widespread dismissal of history was noted by Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, with characteristic wit:

> An inquiry into a methodology of teaching architectural history to students of architecture boils down to three decisive points:

why to teach a discipline which is generally rejected by practitioners; whom to select for such an unpopular task; and how to implement the ordeal of four credit units of glazed eyes, chronic absenteeism, and interfaculty condescension.[13]

Given the intelligence and charm of Sibyl, one assumes she spoke more of a general situation than of her own experience, though one must also assume her experience was similarly tinged. Another common model, usually accompanied by the same doubts, involved borrowing history courses from the department of history of art. In all these cases, as Spiro Kostof pointed out, the teachers were trained in schools of the history of art that treated architecture as one, but usually the lesser, of the visual arts. Their discipline was little affected by the practice of architecture or architectural education. Little if any consideration was given to the differing audiences of liberal arts students versus professional architectural students.[14] Indeed, Moholy-Nagy specifically inveighed against teachers drawn from "the art-historical product of our Fine Arts Institutes."[15] Nonetheless, there are notable historians who performed well within such circumstances. James Ackerman did not see many glazed eyes as he taught architecture students at Berkeley in the late 1950s. By reputation, this must have been true for Vincent Scully at Yale (and Ackerman again, after his appointment at Harvard). The success of these teachers in reaching architectural students does not, however, imply shared programs; Kostof offers witness to the effect of Scully's enthusiasms.[16]

Indeed, by 1967 the situation was not wholly as Sibyl Moholy-Nagy painted it. One of the indicators of change was the organization by Henry Millon (MIT) of the annual Cranbrook Seminar of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture in 1964 under the title "The History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture." Bruno Zevi's advocacy of an operative architectural history and the virtual takeover of schools by historians did not precisely carry the day. But a roster of notables (including Reyner Banham, Serge Chermayeff, Peter Collins, Millon, Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, and Colin Rowe) as well as some younger people gave evidence that history was in the process of winning a more prominent place in schools of architecture.[17]

With a prehistory at the University of Texas at Austin, Colin Rowe took a professorship at Cornell University in 1962, where he launched an urban design program. That program embraced operative historical studies much as schools before the advent of the Modern Movement had done, but Rowe represented much more—brilliant historical analyses (extending to Modernism) and critical polemics that persuasively influenced students and faculty beyond his urban-design program.[18] In 1966 Robert Venturi published *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, the manifesto of an architectural theory with assertedly extensive historical roots.[19] As with Rowe's urban-design program, Venturi's broad impact in architecture was just that, advocacy of an architecture more historically informed but not addressed to history per se.

From about 1960 another change in architectural history within professional schools of architecture was taking place: increasing numbers and broadening roles of architect/historians within the schools, and the related emergence of an unprecedented activity—the organized education of architectural historians within schools of architecture.[20] It is this phenomenon I wish to emphasize by surveying the earlier and noted competing programs. In the survey, the diversity of the programs will appear, complicating any attempt to offer a collective interpretation of their motivations and methodologies. Nonetheless I will risk some comments.

Typically, the introduction of advanced education in history was intended simultaneously to improve professional education in architecture. Only the University of Virginia, successively building degree programs in the history of architecture from the baccalaureate through the master's and doctoral levels in an independent division of its School of Architecture, implicitly endorsed a certain autonomy of historical studies. For the rest, immediate advantage was seen in attracting and holding well-trained, intellectually ambitious historians within the professional school. The long-term advantage was the training of more such scholars who would enhance historical teaching also in professional schools that did not develop programs of advanced historical studies.

Some of these new historians came from traditional art history graduate programs, while others held no such advanced degrees. What most of them had in common was prior training as architects. Such training provided a degree of technical competence that was advantageous to the study of architecture, but perhaps more importantly it provided a mentality more open to speculation. Whether holding advanced history degrees or not, these new historians shared certain criticisms of art history, as then constituted, and opened new areas of inquiry.

The practice of art history was perceived as remarkably closed to historiographic or theoretical discussion even, or perhaps particularly, as it was implicit in its own practices. Colin Rowe and I came independently to the epistemological analyses and alternatives offered by the thought of Karl Popper and, later, Imre Lakatos.[21] Often the range of issues considered by art historians appeared too narrow. If the autonomy of the art object and studies based on connois-

seurship were already yielding to the more contextual studies of iconology and iconography, at least two areas of inquiry were still neglected. The more proximate set of concerns, and perhaps especially important for architecture as against the other arts, involved the physicality of the object, its production, and its material and social context. To address these issues required not only a greater openness to them but also, as noted, competence that professional architectural education facilitated.[22] The second, less evident, area to be opened was the recognition of theoretical and critical issues, including those contemporary issues that could appear anachronistic yet yielded reciprocal benefits for theory and history—for the understanding of temporally or culturally distant artifacts. Critical studies of the arts and of architecture addressed not only earlier periods innocent or repressive of these issues (or at least so it seemed by their absence from the standard historical literature) but also contemporary production and society. Both theory and criticism assumed ascendant roles, invoking a new pantheon of thinkers—most notably Michel Foucault.[23] If the critique of art-historical practices in the early 1960s was justified, by the 1980s the situation had changed radically in matters of theory and historiography. Even the traditional schools of art history had adopted new critical studies with a vengeance.

One should also note that what I have called the "new historians" were not monolithic; they held significant debates with one another. My first public lecture and publication was a defense of a Popperian concept of tradition against the technological determinism of Reyner Banham.[24] Bruno Zevi and Manfredo Tafuri were antagonists on the issue of operative criticism.[25] The advocacy of "critical regionalism" received much acclaim but also alternative interpretations and criticism.[26] Within the department at Berkeley, Spiro Kostof and Dell Upton competed on the front of canonic versus vernacular works.[27] With the emerging prominence of critical theory, the ground had shifted. For example, the MIT program that began with a will to bring theory and criticism into historical studies became increasingly concerned to maintain a historical sea anchor for theory and criticism. Nevertheless, what has remained constant is the persuasion that history, theory, and criticism must address one another.

I turn to a survey of some of the schools in the United States that have played a role in these debates and especially in producing the emerging voices in history of architecture. The criteria for inclusion are that the programs be in schools of architecture, offer the Ph.D. degree, are of some duration, and/or have faculty that have notably contributed to the debates. Other candidate schools that I have failed to include, and to whom I offer my apologies, are Georgia Institute of Technology, University of California Los Angeles, University of Colorado Denver, University of Illinois Urbana, and University of Texas Austin.

Cornell

Stephen W. Jacobs, who had taught history in the Department of Architecture at Berkeley, came to Cornell in 1960. By the end of 1961 the faculty had approved a master's/Ph.D. program in history to train, in Jacobs's words, "qualified, creative, and productive architectural historians able to make a contribution of high scholarly caliber to the local educational scene" in professional schools.[28] However, the program was developed and approved only in the late 1960s. Christian F. Otto joined the Cornell faculty in 1970 and has directed the program through most of its course. Colin Rowe served as chair of some committees. Preservation was added to the program in the late 1970s, but was moved to Planning in the mid 1980s. The first doctorates were granted in 1973/74. To date there have been thirty-four doctoral graduates.

MIT

Henry A. Millon, after a brief period as a lecturer earlier, returned from the American Academy in Rome to take a position as an assistant professor of history of architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1960. I joined Millon in 1963; together we represented MIT's commitment to historians with professional training in both architecture and history. In 1964, with the appointment of the art historian Wayne V. Andersen, joined by Rosalind Krauss in 1967, the MIT program assumed a character that remains unique: art-historical instruction at this institution is joined with history of architecture within the Department of Architecture. While these professors were all graduates of programs of history of art at Harvard or Columbia, they shared interests in historiographical inquiry and issues of theory and criticism of art and architecture, which they felt were inadequately represented in the traditional doctoral programs. Each of these and succeeding professors in the program contributed to the repositioning of the intellectual frameworks of their disciplines. The art historians, working from an unusual base within a department of architecture, conduct their research and writing much as they would from another base, perhaps tempered by a necessity within their teaching to construct lectures and seminars that entertain a wider and sometimes professionally defined set of student concerns.

Additionally, Millon and Anderson argued that architecture, when subsumed within history of art (whether in liberal arts or professional architectural programs, at undergraduate or graduate levels), was treated without due attention to conceptual, physical, technical, social, urban, and environmental factors. It was conceived that a doctoral program in history within a department of architecture might address these issues more fully while also bringing credentialed, and hopefully respected, historians and architect/historians into the orbit of architectural education.

About 1970 these MIT professors joined in advocating a doctoral-degree-granting privilege for the whole of their department. Finding no shared interest for such a program in colleagues from other disciplines, the proposal was submitted solely for the fields of art and architectural history (History, Theory, and Criticism of Art, Architecture, and Environmental Form—HTC). After rigorous external examination of the historians' proposal, a general departmental Ph.D. program was authorized in 1974. In that same year, Millon took leave for three years as Director of the American Academy in Rome and in 1980 resigned his professorship to serve as Dean of the Center for Advanced Study of the Visual Arts (CASVA) at the National Gallery in Washington. He has sustained a role as a visiting professor at MIT to the present. Shortly after the formation of the program, Krauss accepted an appointment in art history at Princeton; from 1977 Wayne Andersen shifted his attention to external activities and then left MIT in 1986. A distinct advantage of the program is MIT/Harvard cross-registration. The Harvard affiliation serves in many ways, but one may note especially the Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture at Harvard and MIT.[29]

The first student risked enrolling in 1974, prior to authorization of the program. The first art history graduate was in 1979 under Andersen; the first in architecture in 1980 under Anderson. To date there are forty-one doctoral graduates, the large majority of whom also hold professional architecture degrees. Graduates in the United States are dominantly academics, while those from abroad may also be involved at high governmental levels. At the start of the program, it was assumed that graduates in history of architecture would be accepted only by departments of architecture, extending the proposition that history be taught by people with dual educational backgrounds. While this is still the most common career path of HTC graduates (Columbia, Harvard, MIT, and numerous universities internationally), liberalizing interests in the renowned departments of art history resulted in MIT doctoral graduates also on these faculties at Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and elsewhere.[30]

Pennsylvania

The Ph.D. program of the School of Architecture of the University of Pennsylvania was formed in 1964 by Dean Holmes Perkins, who chaired it for eighteen years. The degree is authorized by the university rather than by the School of Architecture; it is, however, offered only to those who hold a professional degree in architecture or landscape architecture. From the beginning, the Pennsylvania program cast a wide net in topics, faculty advisers (including faculty from other institutions), and number of students. At the outset, history/theory was one of four subjects required of all doctoral students; the others were structures, the mechanical plant, and design. In 1967 the preliminary examination was reduced from these four areas to "history and theories of architecture" regardless of the candidate's field. Despite this emphasis and the presence of notable faculty concerned with history, there has never been a history program per se. Peter McCleary, an engineer with profound architectural and historical interests who came to Penn in 1977, chaired the program from 1982 to 1988, encouraging work at the intersections of his interests. From 1988 to 1995 Joseph Rykwert headed the program and focused the studies more concertedly on history, with a phenomenological orientation. David Leatherbarrow is now director of the program.[31] Of 140 graduates since 1968, about half are recognized as emphasizing history and theory.

University of California Berkeley

As already noted, in the mid to late fifties, James Ackerman (joint appointment Art History and Architecture) and Stephen Jacobs taught the introductory subject in history of architecture for the professional program at Berkeley. This early collaboration of the two departments had, according to Dell Upton, an early falling out, and contact remains minimal to this day.

In the mid-sixties the history faculty of the Department of Architecture of the new College of Environmental Design took shape: Norma Evenson was appointed shortly before the arrival of Spiro Kostof in 1965. Stephen Tobriner joined a few years later as the departmental Ph.D. program was formed. In 1983 Dell Upton joined to teach American and vernacular architecture. At the end of the eighties Nezar AlSayyad formed a program of Environmental Design in Developing Countries.[32] Working within a general departmental Ph.D. program, the "history faculty" itself has been dominantly nonarchitects and includes people with doctorates in geography and American studies as well as art historians specializing in architecture.

From the time of his appointment Kostof held the

emblematic role of the Berkeley program, assured both by his own brilliance and his commitment to bringing the history of architecture to a broad audience through lectures and books. Fundamental intellectual differences between Kostof and Upton, in orientation and subject matter, led to what Upton has termed the enduring "right and left wings" of the program—noting the irony that, in his view, the modernists were on the right. Since the death of Kostof in 1991, it is Upton's position that most strongly colors the program.[33]

The first two Ph.D. students in history were admitted in 1970 and graduated in 1974 with dissertations advised by Evenson. Among 123 departmental doctorates to date, there have been thirty-six in history.

Princeton

Princeton's School of Architecture opened in 1919 as a "section" of the Department of Art and Archaeology—unique in being headed by a historian and archaeologist, Howard Crosby Butler. Doctoral degrees were offered at the Princeton School of Architecture prior to the development of a doctoral program in history—a notable instance is that of Charles Moore with a dissertation titled "Water and Architecture" under Jean Labatut and Donald Drew Egbert (1957). Under Dean Robert Geddes, and with the arrival of Anthony Vidler in 1965, Princeton offered a joint doctoral program in architecture and urban planning, with about equal numbers of students in each. In the early 1970s, the planning program of the school was shifted to the Wilson School. The architecture doctoral program, chaired by Vidler from 1973, was recognized in three areas: History/Theory (Vidler); Social Studies (Robert Gutman); and Historical Studies in Technology (Robert Mark and David Billington). From 1989 Vidler shared the chairmanship with Georges Teyssot, who then served alone from September 1994, after the departure of Vidler for UCLA. Alan Colquhoun has been a continuing fundamental participant. Including the earlier presence of Kenneth Frampton on the Princeton faculty, its architectural history program may be seen to have had little direct engagement with the discipline of art history: Frampton, Vidler, Robert Maxwell, Colquhoun, and Teyssot are British and European architects who became adepts in history and theory independent of doctoral programs. There is, however, a relation to Princeton's noted Department of Art and Archaeology.[34]

Vidler characterizes the program as "very individually based," indicating the self-definition of topics by students and their use of faculty across the university as appropriate. Viewed from the exterior, however, one would certainly recognize a strong and distinctive character in the "Vidler era." Vidler may have conceded as much in saying "any consistency would have been due to admissions." There have been approximately twenty history graduates, the first in 1978 under Vidler.

Virginia

The architecture program at the University of Virginia dates from 1919, headed by the architect and historian Fiske Kimball. A positive orientation toward history continued under his successors; with the creation of the School of Architecture in the 1950s, a separate "division" (later department) of architectural history was recognized with bachelor's and master's programs begun in 1958 and 1964, respectively. Richard Guy Wilson arrived in 1976, Dora Wiebenson in 1977, and William Carroll Westfall in 1982 (now at Notre Dame). All three served as chair, with Wilson serving a second term since 1987. All three also participated in a lengthy process that finally recognized a doctoral program in 1989 (with a first graduate in 1990, thanks to a start in the Department of Art History).

With seven full-time faculty, the department includes historic preservation; while in historical studies, it attends to vernacular architecture and material culture as well as the canonic works of Western and Far Eastern architecture. Only the professor teaching Far Eastern architecture was trained as an architect. About thirty students are in residence in the two-year Master of Architectural History program; the Ph.D. program, with fourteen graduates to date, is offered through the Graduate College of Arts and Sciences.[35]

Harvard

Ph.D. studies in Harvard's Graduate School of Design are granted by the university through the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Occasional doctoral degrees have been earned over the years, as in the case of Christopher Alexander in 1963.[36] There was then a hiatus until 1987. Today the umbrella term at the GSD is the doctoral program in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Urban Planning. There is no "history program" per se, but history and theory emerged as the dominant area when Howard Burns and K. Michael Hays began to serve on the Ph.D. committee in 1988. Since 1995, with the departure of Burns to Venice, Hays is the program director, with increased focus on theory.[37] For Harvard students there is also the Harvard-MIT reciprocity. Thus, research from medieval through modern is available, with two-thirds of the doctoral students involved in twentieth-century studies—dominantly post–World War II.

Following the structural interdisciplinarity of the program, students have two advisers, one at the GSD and one from elsewhere. These two areas define the student's major and minor areas, with course work equally divided. Despite this extensive study and research outside the GSD, the perception is that the Ph.D. students at Harvard are more integrated to the professional studio program of the GSD than is the case at MIT and Princeton (at all three schools most of the Ph.D. students have prior professional degrees).

According to Hays, if the program has a single style of thought, then it is "a version of Marxian critical theory rewritten from a contemporary perspective. Two principles always hold: always historicize; use close formal readings to open up a problem but always search for the historical conditions of possibility for thinking and making that particular form; and use freely and rigorously categories and concepts from other fields to open up possible interpretations but always search for the specific, irreducible architectural representation of an idea."

The first history student admitted graduated in 1995 with a dissertation under Eduard Sekler, but the first graduate was in 1994 under Burns. Five Ph.D. degrees in history have been earned to date, with seven nearing completion.

Columbia

Despite its unrivaled Avery Architectural Library and a long-established program in historic preservation, the school of architecture at Columbia University came late to doctoral education in the history of architecture. Perhaps this is partially explained by the sustained, atypically strong devotion to architectural history by the neighboring and distinguished Department of Art History and Archaeology. In 1982 the Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture was founded. In 1994 this enviable set of resources became the context for a doctoral program solely in modern architecture led by noted historians within the School of Architecture, Planning, and Historic Preservation: Kenneth Frampton, Mary McLeod, and Gwendolyn Wright, as well as several architects who also teach history. The program has a strong and diverse faculty with a close relation to the studio programs, but it also has reciprocity in courses and advising with the Department of Art History and Archaeology.[38] Two students are admitted per year; there is not yet a graduate.

It will have been noted that each of these programs is marked by accidents of the history and the structure of its home institution and the proclivities of its key faculty members. The core faculty may be architects without formal history degrees, or architects with art history doctorates, or art historians who specialize in architecture. History of art may be held apart, a cooperative neighboring discipline, or integral to the program. Vernacular architecture and material culture are pursued in some programs. Certain non-Western cultural areas may be significant subprograms. In all cases, these faculties have responsibility for the history requirements of professional architectural education, but their association with the studio culture varies. The enduring questions of the proper relation of history to the teaching and practice of architecture remain matters of debate. Programs such as those surveyed here, however, are more informed and engaged in these debates and in the substance of their historical inquiries than was possible before their development. Even in those schools where the historians are engaged with the studio, their historical work is directed to their peers in history elsewhere in the academy. The teaching of history is now rarely a service conducted by professors who are not contributive to the discipline they are asked to teach. These observations stem from the schools surveyed here. Furthermore, that these schools now produce numbers of doctoral graduates, often with prior architectural training, means that this same sense of responsibility to both disciplines, history and architecture, is increasingly extended also to those professional schools of architecture that do not choose to establish graduate programs in history.

Notes

1. To cite only the German example: David Watkin and Tilman Mellinghoff, *German Architecture and the Classical Ideal* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).
2. Richard Chafee, "The Teaching of Architecture at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts," in Arthur Drexler, ed., *The Architecture of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts* (New York, 1977), 61–109.
3. Gwendolyn Wright, "History for Architects," in G. Wright and Janet Parks, eds., *The History of History in American Schools of Architecture 1865–1975*, Buell Center Books in American Architectural History, no. 1 (New York, 1990), 13–52. Caroline Shillaber, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology School of Architecture and Planning 1861–1961* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963); J. A. Chewning, "William Robert Ware and the Beginning of Architectural Education in the United States 1861–1881," Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1986; and "William Robert Ware at MIT and Columbia," *Journal of Architectural Education* 33 (November 1979), 25–29. Richard Plunz, "Reflections on Ware, Hamlin, McKim and the Politics of History on the Cusp of Historicism," in Wright and Parks, eds., *History of History*, 53–72.
4. David Watkin, *The Rise of Architectural History* (Chicago, 1980).
5. Heinrich Hübsch et al., *In What Style Should We Build?* [1828], introduction and translation by Wolfgang Herrmann (Santa Monica, 1992). Characteristic works from throughout the nineteenth century may be followed in Manfred Klinkott, *Die Backsteinbaukunst der Berliner Schule: Von K. F. Schinkel bis zum Ausgang des Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1988).
6. Klinkott, *Backsteinbaukunst*, chap. 1. For theoretical and historiographical discussion, see Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries* (Princeton, N.J., 1960), Secs. III, IV.
7. Hermann Muthesius, *Das englische Haus*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1904/5); abbreviated edition, *The English House* (New York, 1987); idem., *Style-Architecture and Building Art: Transformation of Architecture in the Nineteenth Century and Its Present Condition* [1902], introduction and translation by Stanford Anderson (Santa Monica, 1994).
8. August Schmarsow, "The Essence of Architectural Creation [1893]," in *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics 1873–1893*, introduction and translation by H. F. Mallgrave and E. Ikonomou (Santa Monica, 1994).
9. Stanford Anderson, "Peter Behrens and the New Architecture of Germany 1900–1914," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1968 [*Peter Behrens and a New Architecture for the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999), chap. 4]; Gisela Moeller, *Peter Behrens in Düsseldorf: Die Jahre 1903 bis 1907* (Weinheim, 1991).
10. Klaus Herdeg, *The Decorated Diagram: Harvard Architecture and the Failure of the Bauhaus Legacy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985). See also Kenneth Frampton and Alessandra Latour, "Notes on American Architectural Education from the End of the Nineteenth Century until the 1970s," *Lotus* 27 (1980), 9–15, and Winfried Nerdinger, "From Bauhaus to Harvard: Walter Gropius and the Use of History," in Wright and Parks, eds., *History of History*, 89–98.
11. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe in *The Octagon*, special number, "Philosophies Underlying the Teaching in Our Schools of Architecture" (February 1941): 7. Reprinted in Werner Blaser, *After Mies* (New York, 1977), 31–32, where it is taken from the Armour Institute Bulletin for 1939–1940.
12. Frampton and Latour, "Notes on American Architectural Education," 15–23; Blaser, *After Mies*, offers other insights into Mies's pedagogy, including historical instruction through the drawing of canonic works (pp. 105–111).
13. Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, "Architectural History and the Student Architect—A Symposium," *JSAH* 26 (October 1967): 178.
14. Spiro Kostof, "The Shape of Time at Yale, Circa 1960," in Wright and Parks, eds., *History of History*, 124.
15. Moholy-Nagy, "Architectural History," 180.
16. Kostof, "Shape of Time," 132–134.
17. Marcus Whiffen, ed., *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), records the lectures of Peter Collins, Bruno Zevi, Serge Chermayeff, Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, Stephen Jacobs, Stanford Anderson, and Reyner Banham.
18. Frampton and Latour, "Notes on American Architectural Education," 27–31.
19. Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (New York, 1966). Within the literature pertinent to the current essay, see Peter Collins's critique of Venturi in "Architectural History and the Student Architect—A Symposium," *JSAH* 26 (October 1967): 198.
20. The desideratum of a teacher of history as an architect also trained as a historian had been idealistically presented by Carroll L. V. Meeks, "The Teacher of Architectural History in the Professional School—His Training and Technique," *Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians* 2 (April 1942): 14–23. He did not, however, envision this historical training occurring in schools of architecture.
21. Karl Raimund Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (London, 1959), and *Conjectures and Refutations* (London, 1963). Imre Lakatos, "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes," in Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, eds., *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge, 1970), 91. Stanford Anderson, see n. 17 above and "Architectural Design as a System of Research Programmes," *Design Studies* 5 (July 1984): 146–150.
22. This concern was not new, and positive examples are not wholly absent, but it remained problematic. See Carroll L. V. Meeks, "The New History of Architecture," *Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians* 2 (January 1942): 3–6, who saw Mumford, Hamlin, and Giedion as already addressing this issue.
23. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* (1966; reprint, London, 1970), and *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1969; reprint, London, 1972). Of the many other candidates for mention here, I will note only Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973), and Edward Said, *Beginnings: Intention and Method* (Baltimore, 1975) and *Orientalism* (New York, 1978).
24. S. Anderson, "Architecture and Tradition," in Whiffen, ed., *History, Theory*, 71–89.
25. Bruno Zevi, *Architettura e storiografia* (Milan, 1951); Manfredo Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture* (New York, 1980).
26. The term *critical regionalism* was introduced by Alex Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre in "The Grid and the Pathway," *Architecture in Greece* 5 (1981), and given extended currency by Kenneth Frampton in "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance," in Hal Foster, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Port Townsend, Wash., 1983), 16–30, and in other writings. See Alan Colquhoun, "Osservazioni sul concetto di regionalismo," *Casabella* 592 (July–August 1992): 52–55, and Spyros Amourgis, ed., *Critical Regionalism: The Pomona Meeting* (Pomona, Calif., 1991).
27. See discussion below.
28. Christian F. Otto, "Orientation and Invention: History of Architecture at Cornell," in Wright and Parks, eds., *History of History*, 114–115. See also S. Jacobs, "History: Orientation for the Architect," in Whiffen, *History, Theory and Criticism*, 47–69. I am indebted to Professors Otto and Mary Woods for personal communications on the Cornell program. Other core faculty have been W. Wilson Cummer, Martin Kubelik, and Mark Jarzombek (the latter two were trained as architects).
29. Among the other noted contributors to the MIT program are Benjamin Buchloh, Kurt Forster, Royston Landau, Ákos Moravánszky, Francesco Passanti, Anne Wagner, and, today, Sibel Bozdogan, David Friedman, Mark Jarzombek, Leila Kinney, Michael Leja, and Nasser Rabbat, as well as Leo

Marx and others in the program of Science, Technology and Society, and the two notable holders of the Aga Khan Professorship at Harvard, Oleg Grabar and Gulru Necipoglu.

30. On the MIT program, see Martha Pollak, ed., *The Education of the Architect: Historiography, Urbanism, and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997); Mark Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity: Architecture, Art and History* (New York, forthcoming), postscript.

31. Other core faculty have been David Brownlee, Marco Frascari, David De Long, and John Dixon Hunt. Throughout the history of the program, Renata Holod of the Department of Art History guided many dissertations in Islamic architecture. For the University of Pennsylvania, I rely on personal experience and communications with David Leatherbarrow.

32. Other core faculty have been Kathleen James and Paul Groth who transferred from the Department of Landscape Architecture. For information on Berkeley, I rely especially on personal communications from Dell Upton.

33. Both Kostof and Upton characterized their approaches to history in introducing the survey books they authored—respectively, *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* (New York, 1985), 2–19, and *Architecture in the United States* (New York, 1998), 10–14.

34. Other important faculty include Christine Boyer, Beatriz Colomina, Alessandra Ponte, and Mark Wigley, and from Art History Hal Foster, John Pinto, and Esther da Costa Meyer. For Princeton, I rely on a personal communication with Anthony Vidler and information supplied by Georges Teyssot and the staff of the School of Architecture.

35. Other important faculty are Daniel Bluestone and Yunsheng Huang. For Virginia, I rely on a personal communication from Richard Guy Wilson.

36. Christopher Alexander's dissertation, under Arthur Maass, Serge Chermayeff, and Jerome S. Bruner, resulted in the book *Notes on the Synthesis of Form* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

37. Other members of the faculty include Christine Smith, Sarah Ksiaszek, Mirka Beneš from Landscape Architecture, and Alice Jarrard and Neil Levine from the Department of the History of Art and Architecture. For Harvard GSD I rely on personal communications with Michael Hays.

38. Other noted faculty participants are Barry Bergdoll, Robin Middleton, and Joan Ockman. For Columbia, I rely on personal communications from Kenneth Frampton and Mary McLeod. On the history of the Columbia department, see Plunz in n. 3 above and Richard Oliver, *The Making of an Architect 1881–1981: Columbia University in the City of New York* (New York, 1981).