Chapter 1 : Architecture - Theory of architecture | www.nxgvision.com

A Short Critical History of Architecture including; Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance and Modern (at the time of print obviously). Spine cover coming away front front cover and has been previoussly reattached to rear cover with the aid of a little sticky tape - cosmectic only, still strong and structurely sound.

Bring fact-checked results to the top of your browser search. Theory of architecture The term theory of architecture was originally simply the accepted translation of the Latin term ratiocinatio as used by Vitruvius , a Roman architect-engineer of the 1st century ce, to differentiate intellectual from practical knowledge in architectural education, but it has come to signify the total basis for judging the merits of buildings or building projects. Such reasoned judgments are an essential part of the architectural creative process. A building can be designed only by a continuous creative, intellectual dialectic between imagination and reason in the mind of each creator. A variety of interpretations has been given to the term architectural theory by those who have written or spoken on the topic in the past. Before every comprehensive treatise or published lecture course on architecture could appropriately be described as a textbook on architectural theory. But, after the changes associated with the Industrial Revolution , the amount of architectural knowledge that could be acquired only by academic study increased to the point where a complete synthesis became virtually impossible in a single volume. The historical evolution of architectural theory is assessable mainly from manuscripts and published treatises , from critical essays and commentaries, and from the surviving buildings of every epoch. It is thus in no way a type of historical study that can reflect accurately the spirit of each age and in this respect is similar to the history of philosophy itself. Some architectural treatises were intended to publicize novel concepts rather than to state widely accepted ideals. The most idiosyncratic theories could and often did exert wide and sometimes beneficial influence, but the value of these influences is not necessarily related to the extent of this acceptance. The analysis of surviving buildings provides guidance that requires great caution, since, apart from the impossibility of determining whether or not any particular group of buildings intact or in ruins constitutes a reliable sample of the era, any such analyses will usually depend on preliminary evaluations of merit and will be useless unless the extent to which the function, the structure, and the detailing envisaged by the original builders can be correctly re-established. Nevertheless, the study of the history of architectural philosophy, like that of the history of general philosophy, not only teaches what past generations thought but can help individuals decide how they themselves should act and judge. For those desirous of establishing a viable theory of architecture for their own era, it is generally agreed that great stimulus can be found in studying historical evidence and in speculating on the ideals and achievements of those who created this evidence. Distinction between the history and theory of architecture The distinction between the history and theory of architecture did not emerge until the midth century. Even then, however, the distinction was seldom scrupulously maintained by either specialist. It is impossible to discuss meaningfully the buildings of the immediate past without discussing the ideals of those who built them, just as it is impossible to discuss the ideals of bygone architects without reference to the structures they designed. Faced with the problem of discussing Athenian buildings constructed in the time of Vitruvius, he decided to discuss them twice, by treating them separately under two different headings. ErechtheumCaryatid porch of the Erechtheum, on the Acropolis at Athens. As a result of discussing constitutional law in terms of its evolution, every branch of knowledge especially the natural and social sciences was eventually seen as a historical sequence. In the philosophy of architecture, as in all other kinds of philosophy, the introduction of the historical method not only facilitated the teaching of these subjects but also militated against the elaboration of theoretical speculation. Just as those charged with the responsibility of lecturing on ethics found it very much easier to lecture on the history of ethics, rather than to discuss how a person should or should not act in specific contemporary circumstances, so those who lectured on architectural theory found it easier to recite detailed accounts of what had been done in the past, rather than to recommend practical methods of dealing with current problems. Thus, the attitudes of those scholars who, during the 19th and early 20th centuries, wished to expound a theory of architecture that was neither a philosophy of art nor a history of architecture tended to

become highly personal, if not idiosyncratic. By most theoretical writings concentrated almost exclusively on visual aspects of architecture, thereby identifying the theory of architecture with what, before , would have been regarded as simply that aspect that Vitruvius called venustas i. This approach did not necessarily invalidate the conclusions reached, but many valuable ideas then put forward as theories of architecture were only partial theories, in which it was taken for granted that theoretical concepts concerning construction and planning were dealt with in other texts. Distinction between the theory of architecture and the theory of art Before embarking on any discussion as to the nature of the philosophy of architecture, it is essential to distinguish between two mutually exclusive theories that affect the whole course of any such speculation. The first theory regards the philosophy of architecture as the application of a general philosophy of art to a particular type of art. The second, on the contrary, regards the philosophy of architecture as a separate study that, though it may well have many characteristics common to the theories of other arts, is generically distinct. The first notion i. This theory of fine art might not have been so widely adopted but for the development of aesthetics , elaborated after Thus, when academies of fine art were being established successively in Denmark, Russia, and England on the model of the French Academy in Rome, German philosophers were gradually asserting 1 that it was possible to elaborate a theory of beauty without reference to function Zweck ; 2 that any theory of beauty should be applicable to all sensory perceptions, whether visual or auditory; and 3 that the notion of beauty was only one aspect of a much larger concept of life-enhancing sensory stimuli. The alternative theory i. Hegel first popularized the philosophical discipline. Kant, in his Kritik der Urteilskraft ; Eng. He classified architecture as dependent beauty, saying that in a thing that is possible only by means of design Absicht â€"a building or even an animalâ€"the regularity consisting in symmetry must express the unity of the intuition that accompanies the concept of purpose Zweck , and this regularity belongs to cognition. This latter tendency was reinforced when the French philosopher Victor Cousin , writing in , classified the history of philosophy under three distinct headings: The ensuing acceptance of the idea that beauty was to be studied independently of truth and goodness produced a tendency not merely to regard beauty as something added to a building rather than conceptually inseparable from the truth and goodness of its structure and function but to regard beauty as limited to visual and emotional qualities. In the first half of the 20th century, philosophers grew less dogmatic about aesthetics. But its influence on theories of architecture became stronger because of the popular view that sculpture was essentially nonrepresentational.

Chapter 2 : History of architecture - Wikipedia

A History of Architecture in London, Arranged to Illustrate the Course of Architecture in England Until by Walter Hindes Godfrey A History of Architecture in Italy From the Time of Constantine to the Dawn of the Renaissance by Charles Amos Cummings.

Architecture makes the difference between the way things are and the way man wants them to be. Within this broad context, everything is fair game. Almost anything piled on something else can be included as long as that something serves some purpose. Kostof, a professor of architectural history at the University of California at Berkeley, and a former president of the Society of Architectural Historians, is as good as his word. He begins his narrative with a description of the dwellings of a Stone Age community; he then discusses the cave paintings at Lascaux, and considers the four stages of construction at Stonehenge, the most famous of Neolithic monuments. The rest of this impressive book is a chronologically ordered analysis of construction throughout the ages. All the major periods are covered with their principal monuments, most of these illustrated with photographs; in addition, the text is augmented with maps and with original drawings of general site plans and with reconstructions. Kostof not only gives the reader detailed technical descriptions, but he also examines the buildings in terms of their historical and social context, showing how they expressed the values and activities of the times in which they were first constructed and how some were transformed or modified by later ages. His approach, in this sense, is straightforward cultural history. Man is understood through his artifacts, his architecture an example of the vision of those who designed the buildings, of those who commissioned them, and of the myriad technological, economic, and philosophical developments that shaped their structure and use. Traffic and Glory, , but this general survey concentrates primarily on the Western experience. Kostof, though, frequently couples his descriptions with insights into other architectural traditions. Thus, in addition to the usual descriptions of the glories of Greece and Rome, the splendors of the Gothic cathedral, and the wonders of the Italian Renaissance city-state, he describes the stirrings of urban consciousness in Mesopotamia, the place of architecture in the empire of Muhammad, and the construction techniques of the Mayans and the Aztecs. One of his more interesting juxtapositions is medieval Florence with medieval Cairo. Both cities had their origins in Roman times and, since then, have developed by fits and starts. By the late Middle Ages, Cairo had become a hopeless jumble of all sorts of urban activity. A city with little segregated land use, it had no natural center, no town hall, and no civic square. It was a confusion of crowded and hectic bazaars burrowing their way through the urban fabricâ€"a maze of culs de sac, with no major thoroughfares. In this condition, Cairo remained a prisoner of its backwardness. As Kostof says, the military feudalism that governed the cities of Islam left little room for a municipal organization that safeguarded the public domain; the sanctity of private rights made the emergence of a self-governing city impossible. The quarters of the city were being woven together, and city officials were setting standards for the formation of balconies and porticoes to the control of street traffic and to the regulation of the composition of paving materials. Laws were passed to establish open spaces, and public-works projects were begun, culminating in the building of a new cathedral, a city hall, a communal granary, and a guild hall. Kostof believes that cities, and the architecture they contain, are the result of a constant battle between public rights and private interests. How that struggle is resolved ultimately determines the character of the urban environment and also the character of the buildings it contains. The rulers of Florence and Cairo chose different paths of developmentâ€"the consequences of that choice are plain to see. Yet Kostof is not too helpful in answering why this was so. One of the hazards of setting the parameters of an inquiry so broadly is that inevitably one is The entire section is 2, words. Unlock This Study Guide Now Start your hour free trial to unlock this 9-page A History of Architecture study guide and get instant access to the following:

Chapter 3 : Modern architecture a critical history review essay

A short critical history of architecture - Kindle edition by H.H Statham. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets. Use features like bookmarks, note taking and highlighting while reading A short critical history of architecture.

Roman aqueduct in Segovia, Spain Dome: Interior of the Pantheon in Rome Main article: Byzantine architecture The Byzantine Empire gradually emerged as a distinct artistic and cultural entity from the Roman Empire after AD , when the Roman Emperor Constantine moved the capital of the Roman Empire east from Rome to Byzantium later renamed Constantinople and now called Istanbul. The empire endured for more than a millennium, dramatically influencing Medieval and Renaissance-era architecture in Europe and, following the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in , leading directly to the architecture of the Ottoman Empire. Early Byzantine architecture was built as a continuation of Roman architecture. Stylistic drift , technological advancement , and political and territorial changes meant that a distinct style gradually emerged which imbued certain influences from the Near East and used the Greek cross plan in church architecture. Buildings increased in geometric complexity , brick and plaster were used in addition to stone in the decoration of important public structures, classical orders were used more freely, mosaics replaced carved decoration, complex domes rested upon massive piers , and windows filtered light through thin sheets of alabaster to softly illuminate interiors. Persian architecture The ruins of Persepolis , approximately years old. The pre-Islamic styles draw on thousand years of architectural development from various civilizations of the Iranian plateau. The Islamic architecture of Iran in turn, draws ideas from its pre-Islamic predecessor, and has geometrical and repetitive forms, as well as surfaces that are richly decorated with glazed tiles, carved stucco, patterned brickwork, floral motifs, and calligraphy. The Achaemenids built on a grand scale. The artists and materials they used were brought in from practically all territories of what was then the largest state in the world. Pasargadae set the standard: Pasargadae along with Susa and Persepolis expressed the authority of The King of Kings, the staircases of the latter recording in relief sculpture the vast extent of the imperial frontier. With the emergence of the Parthians and Sassanids there was an appearance of new forms. Parthian innovations fully flowered during the Sassanid period with massive barrel-vaulted chambers, solid masonry domes, and tall columns. This influence was to remain for years to come. The roundness of the city of Baghdad in the Abbasid era for example, points to its Persian precedents such as Firouzabad in Fars. The fall of the Sassanid Empire to invading Islamic forces ironically led to the creation of remarkable religious buildings in Iran. Arts such as calligraphy , stucco work, mirror work, and mosaic work, became closely tied with architecture in Iran in the new era. Archaeological excavations have provided sufficient documents in support of the impacts of Sasanian architecture on the architecture of the Islamic world. Many experts believe the period of Persian architecture from the 15th through 17th Centuries to be the most brilliant of the post-Islamic era. Various structures such as mosques, mausoleums, bazaars, bridges, and different palaces have mainly survived from this period. In the old Persian architecture, semi-circular and oval-shaped vaults were of great interest, leading Safavi architects to display their extraordinary skills in making massive domes. In the words of D. Huff, a German archaeologist, the dome is the dominant element in Persian architecture. Domes can be seen frequently in the structure of bazaars and mosques, particularly during the Safavi period in Isfahan. Iranian domes are distinguished for their height, proportion of elements, beauty of form, and roundness of the dome stem. The outer surfaces of the domes are mostly mosaic faced, and create a magical view. However, the quality of ornaments was decreased in comparison with those of the 14th and 15th centuries. The great mosques of Khorasan , Isfahan , and Tabriz each used local geometry, local materials, and local building methods to express in their own ways the order, harmony, and unity of Islamic architecture. And thus when the major monuments of Islamic Persian architecture are examined, they reveal complex geometrical relationships, a studied hierarchy of form and ornament, and great depths of symbolic meaning. Islamic architecture Due to the extent of the Islamic conquests , Islamic architecture encompasses a wide range of architectural styles from the foundation of Islam to the present day. Both the religious and secular

designs have influenced the design and construction of buildings and structures within and outside the sphere of Islamic culture. Islamic architecture is typically based on the idea of relating to the secular or the religious. Notable Islamic architectural types include the early Abbasid buildings, T-type mosques, and the central-dome mosques of Anatolia. Islam does not encourage the worship of idols; therefore the architecture tends to be decorated with Arabic calligraphy from the Quran rather than illustrations of scenes from it. Various regional styles of medieval Islamic architecture, as show in religious structures from west to east Sudano-Sahelian:

Chapter 4 : Modern Architecture: A Critical History by Kenneth Frampton

Whatever Happened to Autonomy Author: To cite this paper Hartoonian, Gevork. Whatever Happened to Autonomy. It is not the implied territorial divide that interest Frampton. At issue is how architecture could or should define the periphery in contrast to the hegemonic architecture unfolding in the centre. Since the rise of postmodernism, Frampton has constantly searched for alternative s in the work of architects who sidetrack the post-sixties turn to historical eclecticism and the drive for formal autonomy, to mention two dominant tendencies of the time. It also separates his discourse from any form of vernacular, sentimental or otherwise. To avoid other mis-readings, Frampton tried to discuss the subject in more systematic terms. Still, in a text written during , Frampton introduced two additional tropes important for his discourse on critical regionalism: On this horizon, architecture is not perceived as a single object or for that matter a sister to the fine arts, but the art of the construction of the life-world with the capacity to promote a critical relationship with the technological beyond the nostalgia implied in the German word heimat and the spectacle permeating the culture of the megalopolis. The first one concerns periodization: Frampton is well aware of the essentiality of the notion of identity for the formation of bourgeois society. Even though national identity has lost its historical relevance, particular to architecture is the identity it could evoke. What differentiates architecture from most other artwork is its capacity to be both temporal and historical. Architecture is both history and is historical. I wish to explore this aspect of the building art in terms of the culture of building, called autonomy and discussed in the last part of this essay. For now, I would like to turn to the genealogies of the idea of critical regionalism. For the third time, in a book entitled Critical Regionalism: It is important, at the outset, to note the dialogical relation permeating between the interpretation of contemporary architecture and the meaning ascribed to the word critical therein. Their essay, [vi] critical regionalism designates a group of architects whose work sought to formulate an alternative to the postmodernist simulation of historical forms. Their recent text, instead, attempts to present a critical regionalism thematic that is defined by the universalism deployed through globalization of information and western cultural values. Interestingly enough, in modernity, the discourse of regionalism was mostly understood in confrontation with one form of universalism or another. Instrumental to both the picturesque movement and Gothic revivalism unravelling in England and Germany, for example, was an understanding of national identity that, opposing modernity, sought to associate architecture with place. This subject will be discussed shortly. If the idea of critical regionalism, they write, was once sought in confrontation with a hegemonic architectural discourse â€" the international style architecture of the s; postmodernism of the late s â€" the word critical, according to the authors, should now be subdued by what is called Realism. One reason for this shift might be to avoid the issue of national identity. Realism as such suggests a postmodern paradigm where the universal dimension of technology is met outside of history. Also they tacitly adhere to the Kantian notion of autonomy. In other words, Realism designates a state of objectivity, the architectonic of which is devoid of metastatement. The issue here is political in nature, with significant consequences that for the brevity of this paper deserves passing mention. The differentiation of late capitalism and modernity is important: Those values are not innate to a place or a phenomenon, but they are sought as such when an historical condition makes them tangible, or required. One might go further and claim that their alleged linguistic diversity accomplishes one thing: In their second text Frampton is discussed favourably; more recently his position is criticised in the following authoritative words. Rather than being used critically â€" even when it was used together with that term [critical] â€" it was transported back to its obsolete, chauvinistic outlook. The case is one of ideological doubling: Their text also fails to address whether it is necessary to differentiate the project of modernity from late capitalism. Following Frampton, I wish to underscore those aspects of his argument that are useful for the critique of architecture in the present situation when commodification takes command. To this end, two imperatives suggest themselves: His argument is based on the historicity of the modernism of the 20s when the situation was foggy enough for the

subject to claim autonomy from the fetishism of the past, and thus jump into the machine of progress. In the first place, the discussion should concern the two problematic themes: In different ways both issues were central to the discourse of Romanticists and art historians. Pugin, for example, made an association between the spiritual wellbeing of a society and the quality of its artefacts. Briefly and without commencing a review of many available theorizations of the concept of place, [xix] it is enough to suggest the following: To formulate the language of modern architecture, pre-war historians had no choice but to map the implications of regionalism in two vectors central to the development of modern architecture; the spatial implications of the new building techniques, and the aesthetics of abstract painting. Rather, it is the particularity of his vision of modernity and the absence of art history traditions enabling him to write the history of modern architecture in different terms than Giedion, or other historians. Hitchcock was especially interested in H. In the s, the concept of necessity was instrumental for legitimizing modernization and the use of industrial techniques. By the time of World War II and after, the term lost its historicity and was used to urge modification needed to qualify modern architecture with regional and expressive qualities. What remains to be addressed here is the difference between Hitchcock and Mumford on issues that concern regionalism. At the time of the symposium, new directions in architecture were already questioning the linguistic monologue that haunted some sectors of modern architecture. It was not the expressionism of Mendelsohn, but the ways architecture expresses its relation to the particularities of a given program, place, and monumentality. There are two major sources of expressionism: German Expressionism, and Romanticism. In general, expressionism can be defined as the expression of inner emotions; in art it could be defined in terms of the expression of the visual aspects or the structure of the form. In this gathering Hitchcock said: Expressionistic architecture is overtly emotional, and not Sachlich. It is aimed at an emotional response. It is not subjective, but it has some subjectivity in it. Interestingly enough, Frank L. Needless to say that Wright was not an advocate of genius loci. The expressionism Hitchcock registered, on the other hand, had an operative nature. Hitchcock was seemingly unconcerned with distinguishing between organicism understood by Romanticism and organicism as a conceptâ€"the latter alluding to the dialectics of expression and technique, adheres to the Enlightenment view of natural products. As organism, a flower, for example, was seen as mechanical while expressing the laws governing its form as a work of classical art. Central to any theory of expressionism, however, is the tectonic rapport between structure and the form: Of course, Hitchcock had to revise his monologue on technique and expression in the post-war era. On the one hand, fundamental to the question of the American contribution to the formation of modern architecture is the dialectics of region and modernity. Essential to his position is a non-formalistic understanding of the autonomy of architecture. It belies the nihilism of a modernity whose operative scope remained hidden to both the advocates and critics of modernization respectively. This historicity is useful because it allows the fabrication of a discourse that begins with the extrapolation of two formative ideas from the debate running between Hitchcock and Mumford. The contradiction consists in the impossibility of finding a correct synthesis between the consequences of technical and scientific conquest and the values of tradition. In this light, then, of the present sharpening of the difference between modernity and capitalism, this essay wishes to advance the following argument. These concepts were overshadowed by the 50s preoccupation with civic architecture and monumentality, but soon returned to the main stream of architectural theory. Hal Foster recently appropriated autonomy as a strategic position critically addressing, if not resisting, the commodification permeating everyday life and design. To this end, it is necessary to recall the Kantian idea of parallax and to give a new twist to the tectonic discourse. Writing in the late s, Greenberg suggested that in order to isolate itself from the imperatives of market economy and the revolution losing its tide in the Soviet Union, the avant-garde had to navigate in a realm presumably devoid of any contradiction. Firstly, facing the mechanization of the production process, the craft based traditions of architecture were disintegrated. The drive for modernization also dematerialized the homologies that were once sustainable between the body, language and landscape. If, for Benjamin, the mechanical reproduction of the work destroys the unity that once existed between architecture and the place, for Heidegger, recollection of the thematic of that bygone unity provides a strategy to problematize the myth of progress. What makes the association between Heidegger and Benjamin interesting is the following: Even though the issues raised here are not

addressed as such, Frampton scored two significant points: Firstly, in critical regionalism he underlined some aspects of the dream of the national bourgeois concerning a democratic and just society, not fully realised for many reasons including the historical and autonomous development of capitalism, the destination of which remained inaccessible even to the bourgeois class of the s. Secondly, in the spirit of Adolf Loos, Frampton subscribed to a paradoxical position of modernity. Dwelling on the dialectics of locality and universality, Frampton is indeed indirectly reiterating the lessons one might learn from the experience of Hannes Meyer, Hans Schmidt, Mart Stam and others. Migrating to the Soviet Union in the s, these self-exiled architects attempted to synthesize the symbolic vernacular dimension of architecture with the forces of industrialization. Rationalization of construction remains endemic to the project of modernity even when it had to justify demolition. And secondly, critical regionalism is paradoxical by definition; it suggests a tendency in contemporary architecture that is innovative aesthetically and yet resilient to accept the culture of modernity in its entirety. His theory maps the subject matter of construction in fields that until then were considered peripheral. The same might be said about the art-form: In the present commodified world, where the subject, in any region, is inflicted by an everydayness that is saturated by visual images, the predicament of architecture still centres on the fact that architecture by definition is a collective and constructive art. Routledge Press, , p. Bay Press, , pp. Stanford University Press, , p. Prestel, , p. Columbia University Press, , p. University of Nebraska, The Poetics of Order, Cambridge: The MIT Press, Columbia University Press,

Chapter 5 : Architectural History MA | The Bartlett School of Architecture - UCL - London's Global Universit

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Chapter 6 : Critical Regionalism: Whatever Happened to Autonomy @ Fusion Journal

A short critical history of architecture Item Preview remove-circle Share or Embed This Item.

Chapter 7 : Full text of "A short critical history of architecture"

About this Book Catalog Record Details. A short critical history of architecture, Statham, H. Heathcote (Henry Heathcote), View full catalog record. Rights: Public Domain.

Chapter 8 : A History of Architecture Summary - www.nxgvision.com

Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.

Chapter 9 : A Short Critical History of Architecture

Buy A Short Critical History of Architecture (Classic Reprint) online at best price in India on Snapdeal. Read A Short Critical History of Architecture (Classic Reprint) reviews & author details. Get Free shipping & CoD options across India.