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Grete Schütte-Lihotzky, Dwelling for a professional woman at the exhibition ‘Heim und Technik’ (Appartment 16), 1928.
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The call for this themed issue formulates an interesting proposition, one that is a common conception – that people's behaviour and, accordingly, the use of buildings is changing – and that this leads to the emergence of new building typologies. More specifically, it claims that ‘the reality of what is happening inside buildings nowadays is much more complex, diverse and multi-layered than a single word can describe.’ This paper intends to challenge the word ‘nowadays’, which places this situation as something historically unique and special. It will do this in order to conclude with a discussion of theory of analysing architecture.

The first question to be examined is historical. While it may be true that building use is currently changing rapidly, it is equally true that this has happened before. Some of the most common ‘types’ are in fact under constant change, and this will be illustrated through the ‘shop’ and the ‘home’, concluded by a discussion on the perception of rapid change and historical stability as such. It will be suggested that this is partially embedded in a typological process. The second question is theoretical. It will be argued that the very idea of changing and more flexible use is tied to an idea of architecture with its roots in modernity, where ‘use’ became a central question to plan for, along with the development of a specific notion of function that was intimately connected to the notion of type. Many earlier ‘types’ were not as much use-adapted as ‘appropriate types’ for a range of reasons, sometimes even contrary to ‘use’. This discussion will explore the interdependency between conceptions of type and perceptions of the theoretical, disciplinary, and practical bases of architecture.

Following this, the paper will conclude by drawing the strands together to discuss architectural analysis and the risks and potentials of typology as an analytical operation.

‘Detective Del Spooner: You got that right... Is there something you want say to me?

Dr. Alfred Lanning: I'm sorry. My responses are limited. You must ask the right questions.

Detective Del Spooner: Why would you kill yourself?

Dr. Alfred Lanning: That, detective, is the right question. Program terminated.’
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The call for this theme issue frames its topic through an outline of a historical evolution from clear building typologies with clear uses, readily decoded by an undefined ‘everyone’, to a rapidly changing situation where the functions as well as the typologies are in constant flux. This is arguably a conception widespread in architectural discourse in the way practice communicates itself to the public and in professional media. Offices like OMA, MDRDV, BIG, Stan Allen and Rafi Segal, and others often use a radically changing society requiring a radically changed architecture to communicate the raison d’être of their proposals. To an extent, one can relate this to how John McMurrough comments in ‘Ru(m)inations: The Haunts of Contemporary Architecture’, that ‘Whether in relation to capital, capacity, structure, or symbolism, architecture’s history and legacy – maybe its very meaning – is to be found in the creation of reasonable explanations for its existence, its raison d’être made in the midst of a series of preservative justifications, in leaps of faith and defensive postures’ (McMurrough, 2008, p.164). Whilst not always explicitly referring to type, works such as the Seattle Public Library, the Scala Tower, the Eight House, Block/Tower, and others are presented as new types of buildings for a new type of society. In parallel, there is a growing tendency for urban design to operate with ‘typological mix’ to achieve both social, economical and aesthetic ends, often based on specific interpretations of Jacob’s (1961) work and variations of uses and building ages (e.g. Talen, 2008; Gehl, 2010; Tarbatt, 2012 – c.f. Ellin, 2006; Lee and Jacoby, 2011a; McMurrough, 2001a).

There are reasons to examine these ideas. Even the re-emergence of a typological discussion, found not only in this call but in recent publications such as the works of Philip Steadman (2014), K. Michael Hays (2010) and in the 2011 issue of AD (Architectural Design, Lee and Jacoby 2011b) titled ‘Typological Urbanism’ is of interest. That is to say, if we indeed were already ‘after type’, as we supposedly were in the early 20th century (Madge, 2007), and then again in the early 21st century (Braham, 2000), then the very question of changing typologies would be irrelevant. However, the conception of having left ‘type’ rests in both cases on particular understandings thereof. The first stems largely from the Beaux-arts and Antoine-Chrysostome Quatremere de Quincy’s (1977) work, and the second from the perceived failure of the reclaiming of type in early postmodernism to revive ‘meaning’ in architecture through typologies of the past (Braham, 2000). More or less simultaneously to this historicist push, Vidler (1978) made his case for a ‘third typology’, replacing ‘typologies of nature’ and ‘typologies of technique’ with ‘typologies of signification’ – a semiotic of types no longer drawn from other origins but defined relatively by their positions in the city.

From another point of view, architecture never quite left type – it just ceased to be a central part of discourse and argument for proposals (Braham, 2000). In practice there have existed a number of modernistic ‘types’: the high-rise office, point-block housing, open-hall library, amongst other examples (c.f. Pevsner 1976; Lathouri, 2011; Steadman, 2014). The basis for these were quite different from the typological tradition of Quatremere de Quincy or the early modern types discussed by Marcus (1993); however they were, supposedly, rationally developed for the function which they were to house, and these functions were equally rationally derived from what society needed and how people would live functional, efficient lives (e.g. Lathouri, 2011). They were, so to speak, constructed ‘ground up’ from ‘user needs’, said with all the caveats that need to accompany such a description (e.g. Wigley, 1995). In this they differ radically from both pre-modern and early modern types, and dispensing with the burden of ‘type’ was a reasonable step in introducing a function and use-based architecture. Still, typologies of function and typologies of form, as Braham labels them, seem to some extent to have ‘always’ existed.

Notes:
2. Vidler (1978) defines the first typology as imitative of the order of nature, and the second as a dialectic of means and ends joined by criteria of economy, and thereby architecture can be seen as a matter of technique. The third typology, comparatively, is based on the city where rather than an external referent, the city creates the frame of reference in which typologies become meaningful; i.e. they are mutually creators of one another. To claim that types have always existed is problematic and needs to be expressed carefully. While one could argue that there are certain ranges of solutions that have existed and developed, one must also be careful not to ascribe this to them having been perceived or deliberately employed: the possibility to retroactively understand something as typological development simply does not mean there is a conscious or deliberate process behind it, or that there are direct links between them. This makes type as a historical or anthropological question quite different from type as an architectural theory question, depending, furthermore, to which ideology of architectural theory one subscribes.
and changes in-between them have, if we believe Braham, been the rule rather than the exception; the appropriation of the basilica by the church, and the appropriation of the atrium – given origin in ‘western architecture’ in Roman domestic architecture by Madge (2007) – by the office building, and so on (c.f. Markus, 1993; Steadman, 2014), to the more recent ‘commercidences’ of Tokyo (Tsukamoto and Fujimura, 2008).

The coming investigation aims to address theory and method of architectural analysis. An important part of the problem I aim to address lies in the kind of narrative that lies behind the call to this issue but seems to proliferate in contemporary discourse, implying firstly a kind of pre-existing simpler and more authentic world – doing so by an undefined reference backwards that avoids questioning and makes universal claims at the same time by its very lack of specificity (c.f. Baudrillard, 1996). A second issue regards notions of changing building typologies based on recent technological or habitual changes.

This discussion will first address the claim of a simpler, more easily defined typology in the past. In this I will allow myself to extrapolate, and discuss historical changes and conditions of certain select types. Secondly, it will address the link between use and form. In doing so, I will by necessity address questions of the formal basis of architecture, its purpose and how we evaluate its worth. In conclusion, I aim to discuss the analysis of ‘buildings’ and the potential and risk of typology, and what the interrogations throughout the paper mean for the why, what, and how of such analysis.

It used to be simple, or, the Doppler Effect in the rear-view mirror

One curious part of many arguments of a radically changing society is the recurrent use of ‘now’, ‘today’, and other words suggesting this is a state that is (often radically) different from before – that is, implying that what was before was a much more stable state now left behind in wake of rapid change (c.f. Rosa, 2008). While there are arguments to be made for this being the case (c.f. Lee and Jacoby, 2011a; Kärrholm, 2013), there are also some issues with this image in how it operates in relation to history that, to an extent, relates to the modus operandi of ‘type’. Since it is beyond the scope of one paper to provide a thorough overview of the richness which I attempt to address (see e.g. Girouard, 1985; Markus, 1993; Hanson, 1998), I will for now limit myself to two ‘types’ where this may seem to have the most deceptive character – homes and stores. I do this partially because they are thoroughly researched, allowing me to draw from many sources, and because they are suitable for the purpose of illustrating two points in relation to a notion of sudden rapture from pre-existing stability. This concerns both whether they have been stable or not, and whether new forms and hybrid typologies are as radical as sometimes stated. The arguments and examples are chosen to highlight these issues and therefore at times point to exceptions rather than general trends, but I will strive to point out when this is the case.

Point of purchase – Commercial Space as Sites of Cultural Negotiation

When Denise in Emile Zola’s novel The Ladies’ Paradise (1995) moves to Paris, she moves in with her uncle Baudu and his family not far from the new, grand department store – a social and cultural monstrosity, according to Baudu. Baudu’s shop, as it were, is not only a ‘shop’ in today’s simplest sense, but also a home as well as something of a factory where family members contribute to most aspects of business. While there are boundaries between family and shop parts, these are fleeting and repeatedly breached in both directions. Baudu and his customers also regularly enter into (or already have) other kinds of social and cultural bonds, where the
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Exchange forms only one part of a long-term, mutual commitment. A recurring theme is how Baudu as well as his customers are convinced that Mouret’s invention – the Ladies’ Paradise – will be the end of civilisation, and that whomever goes or works there must be considered a traitor not only commercially, but to culture and society. As Denise begins working at the Paradise, she too becomes a traitor forced to move in with the other employees living on the upper floors of the Paradise. As both Michael Miller (1981) and William Lancaster (1995) show, this was a regular practice, and a common reason to discredit the department stores: surely, young girls living together, without proper supervision and in such a seductive environment like this, would succumb to loose life and in the long run prostitution.

Zola captures some of the radical changes to commercial life taking place in large parts of Europe during that period from the late 19th to early 20th century, where what a shop was, whose it was, and the nature of both shopping and working in a shop was extensively studied in, for example, Nava and O’Shea (1996), Shields (1992), and Jackson, Brooks and Crewe (2000). Changing means of production and a growing bourgeois gradually led to shopping becoming a pastime, dependent on both the proliferation of affordable goods, and an increasing amount of spare time for certain classes of society. In the wake of this change, the kind of shop characterised by Baudu’s with only fleeting difference between home and shop, social ties and commercial exchange, began to give way to stores with what might today be more recognised as a seller-customer relationship. The effect of this transformation on public culture is found further in Sennet’s discussion in The Fall of Public Man (1977), lamenting the loss of shops as cultural and social institutions. In 19th century Europe, entering a shop carried a social contract with wide socio-cultural implications.

Notes:
4 As Lancaster notes, there is very little actual evidence that girls working and living at department stores fell into prostitution; on the contrary, any empirical evidence suggests they did not, but the notion is abundantly present in the discourse of the time (Lancaster, 1995).
It is important to note, however, that it was not only the relation between seller and customer that changed, but the internal social configuration of shops, increasingly dominated by an employee culture as compared to a more family-based enterprise. A process that contributes to what Castells (2004) notes as a change in personal identification from ‘role’ – what you do and your place in society – to ‘identity’ – your tastes, preferences, and memberships of networks based on interest.

One distinct difference between late 19th and early 20th century shops such as the ones in Figure 1 and many shops today is remarkably unremarkable at first sight: the price tag. A price tag allows customers to understand the price without asking, reducing the social contract and cultural reproduction side of negotiation that Sennet describes. This ostensibly minor difference affords radically different behaviour in stores, and consequently renegotiates the relation between customer and staff dramatically. Together with an increase in the practice of browsing, partially allowed by the price tag, the supposed expertise was transferred from retailer to customer. It was no longer the shop owner who would tell you what was best for you, and the customer would no longer be victim to their social and cultural knowledge (or, cultural capital, if referring to Bourdieu, 1984). As the expertise shifted, the choice to shop, but not buy became less that of a social pariah (Bergman, 2003; c.f. Miller, 1998).

Part of this transition into ‘shopping’ as it is known today must be seen as interlinked with (not caused by or causing) the development of cultures of display (Nava and O’Shea, 1996; Muscau, 2008; Figure 2) – the introduction of glazed shop windows, mannequins, and similar ways of displaying goods not only enabled shoppers to see what there was to shop even without entering the store (c.f. Iarocci, Notes: 3 See March and Steadman (1971) and Steadman (1983) for an extensive body of research on this subject.

Figure 2:
Early cultures of display were established through glazed shop fronts, where the goods could be put on display, a technique that developed over time from this early, simple type into a design profession of its own.

In the transformation of the practice of shopping and of street culture in general, such technological innovations must not be neglected, and further contributed to the transformation of what a ‘shop’ was, especially if one looks at the shop as an interface between private and public.

(Eugène Atget, shops on Boulevard de Strasbourg, left Chemiserie, c. 1900 (MoMA), right corset shop, 1922, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Public domain by age).
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Notes:
5 ‘High-end’ here is not distinct as a price range, but arguably applies to the sub-cultural as well as mainstream elites, even if those who know how differ, and this sometimes is misconstrued as one being casual and the other requiring knowledge, whereas it requires knowledge on how to be casual to be casual (c.f. Bennett, 1995; Zukin, 1995). Even within singular department stores radical differences can be found, from high-end cosmetics requiring customers to ask personnel to even touch any of the goods, to regular grab-and-buy boxes of underwear (Koch, 2012).

2008), but also provided a means for the owners to reassert control over the impressions and characters of the goods for sale (Osborne, 2008).

Subsequently, the practice of shopping has become a diverse field of activities, as noted for instance by Miller (1998), where economic, social, and cultural norms and practices are negotiated. Choices of where, what and how to shop contribute to the social and cultural structuring of individuals and society. What a ‘shop’ was, what social and cultural practices a visit entailed, as well as how it formulated social bonds and relations internally and externally, at this point had gone through changes making it from many points of view problematic to equalise the before and after as the same type of space or function, despite a consistent partial purpose being shared in the form of economic transactions.

However, this difference between shops, here described as a historical evolution related to industrialism and the rise of an affluent middle class, can be recontextualised and redescribed in a more synchronic sense: there are, as Miller et al. (1998) clearly show, radically different activities taking place in shopping practices, also present in contemporary retail, where different stores operate in different ways and cater to different forms of socio-cultural relationships. While the bundle home-shop may have largely disappeared in large parts of the ‘western world’, ‘shops’ are a highly differentiated category that socially and culturally perform very different acts; where, for instance, the more pragmatic role of a supermarket is distinctly different from that of high-end fashion stores (c.f. Chua, 1992; Potvin, 2008).5

Coming home – a formation of the modern family
As foreshadowed by the example of Baudu’s shop in Zola’s novel, the most recent centuries have also seen drastic changes to what a home is. Domesticity itself, today often linked to the idea of a ‘home’, does not have a timeless existence. Madge (2007) argues, for instance, that a central difference between ancient Greece and ancient Rome was that in the former, the ‘domestic sphere’ was simply an aside, a dirty other or heterotopia (c.f. Foucault, 1997), with focus lying on public spaces for the interaction and practices of free men; whilst in the latter, the home held a central role in culture. This focus on the home or the domestic was quite different from today’s conception of ‘home’ in many cultures; the home had a central societal role where many business, social, and governmental negotiations and meetings took place, rather than in an office, public space, or other types of buildings. Politics and business was very palpably part of the ‘home’.

‘Western European’ domesticity, or what in many places is referred to as ‘home’ today if one is to believe Witold Rybczynski (2011), rather emerged in the Netherlands in the 16th century - curiously as a result of socio-cultural conditions, economic development, and bad building techniques. A culture of self-sufficiency blended with weak isolation, few fireplaces, and small apartments created a situation where the ‘core’ family gathered in one room and acted as ‘a family’. However, while the transition to the concurrent or ‘modern’ notion of a home is a complex and rich history with many interacting strands and directions and many different historical roots (c.f. Giroaurd, 1985), this was largely agreed to be an effect of industrialisation, relying on the one hand on the emerging lifestyles of the growing bourgeois, and on the other, on the separation between working life and other life both physically, socially, and in terms of power that grew out of this for the working class. Home and workplace, or work and spare time, became two distinct entities - whereas the boundaries in-between for large portions of the population before had been fleeting or even non-existent.

Studies of homes also clearly point to cultural and social differences as key to understanding not
only the internal configuration of homes, but also what a home is (c.f. Hanson, 1998; Whitehand and Carr, 2001; Steadman, 2014). Hanson, for instance, points to how

‘Contemporary literary and sociological studies of people’s homes were unearthing a wealth of evidence that space configuration featured in British society in surprising, and often unexpected ways, as a means of social and cultural identification. The manifest variety of ordinary people’s lifestyles seemed to point away from behavioural universals and basic human needs towards a view that, if space had a purpose, this was to encode and transmit cultural information.’

(Hanson, 1998, p. 109)

Steadman (2014) here offers an interesting example in the development of London flats in the 19th century and why the French type of block of flats could not be established in London: the French tradition of several apartments in a single building with a single entrance to a shared staircase was unacceptable to the British, who considered it problematic to risk meeting strangers on the staircase, as well as being unable to hermetically close their houses if one were to leave, for instance, for a longer trip. British apartment buildings, in comparison, tended to consist of one building or at least one entrance per apartment. Whitehand and Carr (2001) note similar differences, but offer a parallel argument – namely, that in Britain the main seats of nobles had for a long time been their countryside estates, whereas on the continent (France, Italy) these had been the city palaces. This, they argue, led to a culture that prioritised the self-owned building with one’s own entrance and, preferably, plot of land in Britain, against a culture that prioritised central location and access to the city on the continent. They suggest this further offers a part explanation for how suburbs in 20th century Britain came to be dominated by row houses and semi-detached houses, as opposed to being dominated in France and Italy by large modernist buildings of blocks of flats – although differences in planning processes, political power distribution and economics must also be taken into account.

Another difference noted by Steadman is how the British homes had comparatively large kitchens and dining rooms, in keeping with the tradition of having supper and other meals at home, whereas the French tradition largely was to go out and dine at restaurants. This difference can be understood in two ways: either, a ‘home’ and ‘being at home’ did not include dining in France but clearly did in Britain, as it happened within the confines of the ‘physical home’ in the latter but not in the former; or, the home in France included a larger portion of public space than it did in Britain. That is to say, the practice of ‘homing’ also took place in public space much more in one case than the other.

However, it is worth noting that in both traditions as presented by Steadman, and as can be seen in many plans from the early modern era if not before, the ‘home’ often included servants, distinctly separated to various degrees from the ‘main’ inhabitants. A ‘home’, simply, was more than the contemporary single-family apartment, implying significant problems in discussing them as the same ‘type’ as late 20th century homes, except for specific purposes of understanding changes in ‘home’ types. That this housing of servants inside homes and apartments was widespread practice can be illustrated by the introduction to an article in the ‘Arkitektur’ (The Swedish Review of Architecture) in 1961:

‘The perspectives have totally changed during the 40 years I have been a master builder involved in housing production. Far down into the lower middle class it was earlier considered necessary that the housewife must have a certain degree of domestic help at their disposal. And this aid was to live at the working place. For this reason, housing was produced with ‘maid alcoves’ – an appendix to the kitchen, which according to national regu-
Notes:

6 Engqvist here uses more old-fashioned language with clearer class markings. It is possible that it would have been a better translation, for instance, to use ‘petty bourgeoisie’ rather than ‘lower middle class’. The regulations referred to also have a specific name, ‘bygnadsgodningen’, which is a type of regulation that is not quite law and therefore changed more easily.

Engqvist, writing in 1961, goes on to elaborate how by this time these alcoves had commonly become places for kitchen tables, while kitchen stairs and secondary staff entrances had been gone since the 1930s.

As demonstrated by Legeby (2013) and Henderson (2009), this reduction in household size continued throughout the 20th century in many places, both through shrinking family sizes and other reductions in who shared a household within the functionally planned modernist areas. As an illustration, in 1905 the most common household number in Sweden was six, whereas by 1975 this had fallen to one, and the average number of inhabitants per housing units had shifted from 5.1 to 1.8, then to 1.9 in 2012 (Legeby, 2013, p.178; Figure 3). While Sweden might be an extreme case, this trend has arguably followed similar lines in ‘the western world’.

In addition, as Penny Sparke (1995) comments, the 20th century ‘home’ has transformed in other ways such as whose concern it is, and who spends their time in it. Sparke notes how, as the Second World War drew towards a close, women had to a large extent taken over work in factories, offices, stores and other places – and once the soldiers returned, did not happily cease their activities and return home. Rather, they stayed in working life which on the one hand led to a slew of propaganda for the virtues of life as a housewife, but on the other more or less brought a new social structure into permanence. These processes together have led to the same apartments in some cases today housing less than half the population, who spend almost double the percentage of their time elsewhere, working, than when originally produced. On the other hand, the level to which homes have been transformed through the introduction of radio, TV, and the personal home computer should not be underestimated, mediating the world into the home and vice-versa (Virilio, 2000). These technologies, together with raised housing standards, arguably further allowed for spare time spent inside the home, with drastic changes for the conditions and practices of public life (c.f. Person, 2001).

Much of these ‘home’ transformations, it is worth noting, took place in the same physical structures - at times remodelled, at times simply put to other uses than the intended, partially as a result of higher living standards. To an extent, therefore, it can be said that we live in the same homes, yet they are radically different in whom they include, what purposes they serve, and what activities they contain. This is a key observation for the coming discussion, but before continuing this it is worth addressing an additional factor affecting the development of homes during the 20th century.

An ideology of function

The functionalist studies of homes often took place under the guise of a rational, neutral standpoint in order to find better solutions for the societal function of housing. However, as Whitehand and Carr (2001), Legeby (2013) and Person (2001) note, this was additionally a political project that not only sought to raise living standards for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and housing units</th>
<th>population</th>
<th>housing units</th>
<th>people/unit</th>
<th>annual incr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>93,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>144,974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>300,523</td>
<td>58,373</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>442,528</td>
<td>114,339</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>744,562</td>
<td>270,417</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>665,202</td>
<td>365,222</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>750,348</td>
<td>404,988</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>847,073</td>
<td>443,647</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Legeby, 2013, p.178). As the table shows, between the beginning of the 20th century and 1975, the average population per apartment has more than halved to below two people. This shows a dramatic shift in what constitutes a regular household, with implications for the perceptions and identities of both ‘family’ and ‘home’.
poor or the working class in many countries, but also to transform society through redefining what a home was. In the same issue of *Oppositions* in which Moneo writes on Typology, Sima Ingberman (1978) explores this aspect in her study of housing development in Vienna between 1919 and 1934, the ‘Vienna Superblocks’. Here Ingberman contrasts the development of superblocks in Germany, introduced as revolutionary and redefining what a home was, with the development in Vienna. According to Ingberman, the latter – even though somewhat delayed – rather took an evolutionary route of adapting and evolving the existing apartment types for new production instead of imposing a new order and removing such traditional urban references as the street and the square in favour of rows of family housing. They are labelled ‘The Normative Solution’ and ‘The Evolutionary Alternative’ in the article, but it is reasonable to consider both as normative even if they respond to different norms – perhaps to different people’s norms (the governments or the populace, transformative or conservative).

Perhaps an even more pointed example is present in Susan Henderson’s (2009) studies of the early 20th century debates in Germany regarding single women. While it was clear at the time that a lot of single women were looking for homes, and that being housed into the homes of others was problematic for them, the very idea of producing housing for single women raised moral alarm both regarding the if and the how of such a scheme.

It was argued that single women living alone would destabilise society: it was a route to low-life and prostitution, it spoiled women who ought rather to be looking for a husband to raise a family, and that it would be good for young, single women to live in households to learn how to do housework. Therefore it was argued that the apartments, if they were to be produced at all, must be small and of low standard – not comfortable enough to become permanent. On the contrary, they must be made to encourage single women to find themselves a husband and family. Further, it was argued, these apartments should be designed so that all aspects of living in them focused on preparing the girls for the household duties of proper married life. These apartments, worked out in various iterations by Grete Schütte Lihotzky and others, almost exclusively took on these characteristics, including clearly striving for space-use efficiency as seen in the ‘Heim und Technik’ exhibition published in *Der Baumeister*, 1928 (c.f. Figure 4).

7 When looking at the plan it should be acknowledged that the exhibition ‘Heim und Technik’ focused on small and efficient apartments, but it is notable in such an exhibition that the single women apartments could appear. It is also worth noting that of the 21 apartments exhibited at the exhibition (Baumeister, 1928), the apartment is the smallest, together with Wolfgang Vogl’s elderly homes (Altersheimes; Apartment 13, p.226), although the latter were connected to common spaces (Gemeinschaftsräume), with shared kitchen and washing room facilities, and thus as such not ‘whole’ apartments.
It is perhaps even more remarkable to note that this debate regarding whether single women should even have homes ran in parallel to the presentation of ‘A House for a Bachelor’ by Mies van der Rohe in the Berlin exhibition of 1931 (Figure 5) (Baumeister, 1931; Tegethoff, 1985). While Mies’s building was made for an exhibition with an altogether different ideology, which needs to be taken into account when making comparisons, the way the building formulates the life and space of a ‘home’ is quite different. This house shows little sign of preparing anyone for married life, or being sparse or limited in scope. Rather it is a house as much for social life as for anything else, and the bachelor seems likely to be the one on the receiving end of domestic help.

While keeping firmly in mind the differences between exhibition pieces from exhibitions of different years, intents, and curatorships, it is clear how such a simple thing as housing unmarried people was heavily invested with values, yet considered in radically differently ways for different people - in this case dependent on gender. To further complicate the picture, the above takes place in the same time period as Loos designed his house for Josephine Baker (e.g. Colomina, 1996), illustrating how this is both a class and gender issue, including the matter of who makes the proposal and for whom.

The normative force of early modernism and especially early modernist housing projects is further noted by Peponis in his contribution to *Ekistics* 334, where he argues that one of the reasons for the doubts regarding any relation between architecture and the use to which it is put stems from how, ‘architectural ideals such as those of early modernism, which were proposed as part of programs of radical social reform, could be adopted and assimilated so as to reinforce the reproduction of the existing social order’ (Peponis, 1989, p.106).

This small excursion has been intended to show two things. Firstly, that what a home or a store is, as a socio-cultural site and architectural interface (c.f. Hillier & Hanson 1984, Markus 1993, Koch 2013), has changed quite radically over time and space for at least the last two hundred years, regarding both what constitutes a home or a store, and what personal, social, cultural, and societal purposes they fill – including who constitutes a home, and who is allowed to have a home. At the same time, the practices of ‘homing’ and ‘shopping’ have gone through radical changes, to the point where some argue that ‘shopping’ as we consider it today did not exist before the 19th century. Secondly, that this has been paralleled by architectural changes, sometimes where architecture adapts to changing

Notes:

8 It is worth noting that while there are several accounts of the house being for a single man/bachelor (and maid), it is published in Baumeister under the heading ‘Neue Linie’ (1931b) in free-standing single-family housing (‘Alleinstehenden Einfamilienhaus’). This article mainly concerns Haus Tugendhat, however, which makes it unclear whether this definition relates to the Berlin Exhibition building as well.

9 It has often been argued that Loos’ project was rather for his own benefit than Baker’s, and there is little evidence suggesting she ever commissioned the project. While this is important to keep in mind, it is also important to remember that Loos’ house for Josephine Baker never was a house for Baker only – it had an entire floor dedicated to servants, making sure the household was more than a single woman.
conditions as discussed by Steadman (2014), sometimes by architecture driving change as in much modernist development as discussed by Ingberman and Peponis, and sometimes by changing practices within existing stock such as when household sizes and practices change within existing apartments to a point where they can no longer be considered as the ‘same’, despite having been little altered physically (c.f. Markus, 1993; Kärrholm, 2013). The purpose has been to highlight the complex situation of continuity and change characterising both ‘types’, indirectly questioning whether what we see today is historically remarkable or a part of a greater continuity of continuously changing habits, practices and, in as far as they are relevant, typologies.

Changing Societies, Speed, and the Doppler Effect

In *Notes on the Doppler Effect and Other Modes of Modernism*, Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting (2002) note the tendency to perceive ideas as more convincing the faster they come towards us. While this of course cannot be considered an immediate truth, it is of interest to raise their point in relation to the simple speed with which offices like BIG, OMA, and others communicate their work, as well as in relation to a society perceived to be changing faster and, characterised more rapidly by a constant flow of information and news - almost whether one wishes to partake of it or not. On the one hand, if Somol and Whiting are right and society is changing faster, these changes risk being accepted and adapted to with little critical resistance simply due to the apparent speed with which they take place. On the other hand, there is a risk that the proliferation of information itself produces a perception of change that may be less fundamental than the change itself actually is.

Along these lines, Hartmut Rosa (2013) argues that we are so busy living in a changing world that we forget to consider what is changing from what and to what. Rosa argues that on the one hand there is a constantly repeated notion of the changing now, without distinct past or future, enabling the perception of its own state – all that is said is that it is changing, not from what or to what. On the other hand, a growing life span allows for more exposure to living accounts of a different world than when the regular lifespan was shorter, as well as enabling individuals to live through more changes personally. Both of these conditions contribute to a greater ‘socially perceived’ change. Conversely, in an almost reverse of ‘the Doppler Effect’, it appears that the further back in time one looks, the simpler and more stable things appear to be. This also tends to encourage the development of an increasing aura of authenticity with distance in time or space (Baudrillard, 1996).

The notion of type here plays an interesting role, especially if one were to follow the argument by Aldo Rossi (1982) that part of the potential of typology is the way it makes use of history for its own ends. Rossi is well aware, as Hays (2010) also notes, that the historical references inscribed into much of the postmodern historicising of architecture and typological thinking have been largely lost to memory. What the typological approach can offer, rather, is the impression of memory and history that gradually, through processes of reification and quiet reaffirmation, grows into perceived ‘actual’ memories. Or, that the memories of the recent or concurrent can be inscribed into the historical types retroactively, even if knowledge of how these types emerged or were lived in is sparse at best.

The risk, or the potential offset here, is for the notion to grow that as we live in the ‘same home’ now as we did before, we would therefore live in it the same way. Such a process, thoroughly investigated for real cases in *The Architecture of Experience* (Arnold and Ballantyne 2004), noting how quickly historical use can get replaced by current in ‘concurrenct memory’ (see esp. Weiner, 2004), would lead to continuous changes in the way we imagine previous

Notes:
10 ‘Critical resistance’ here should not be mistaken for conservatism, but rather considered a reflective and critical examination of ideals and values of that which is coming at us with great speed in relation to alternative proposals, changes, or evolutions. Somol and Whiting are careful to note that the Doppler Effect is a mode of operation caused by speed, not by the particular content of ideas in themselves (Somol and Whiting, 2002).
Notes:

11 Tafuri (1980, p.158) argues Rossi’s work is critical due to how it grounds its research in the vast mass of existing material, typological because it insists on formally invariant phenomena, and operative due to the contemporary nature of its planning choices.

12 It is interesting to note some similarities to early space syntax work (Hillier et al., 1976), and the discussion on morphic languages further developed in The Social Logic of Space (Hillier and Hanson, 1984), which also have clear relations to a structuralist discourse – while also noting some central differences including the foci on formal elements and spatial relations respectively.

Changing uses changing types, or, the formal basis of architecture

‘To raise the question of typology in architecture’, states Moneo (1978, p.23) in his article in Oppositions 13, ‘is to raise a question of the nature of the architectural work itself.’ The article continues to discuss what a type is, also proposing what type is, or should be, for his concurrent generation. In Moneo’s argument, the question of type is about architecture as such, where the question is as important as the types or typologies themselves. He continues: ‘To respond to it means, for each generation, a redefinition of the essence of architecture and an explanation of all its attendant problems.’ (ibid., 23).

For Moneo, type can be understood as a concept that describes a group of objects characterised by the same formal structure. The question then becomes what this formal structure is, and much of that generation’s discussion of type tends to focus on formal elements that they consider to carry meaning, or as K. Michael Hays (2010, p.2) puts it, ‘The expanded decade of the 1970s […] saw a search for the most basic units of architecture and their combinatory logics’, units which were irreducible and ‘could not be translated into other modes of experience or knowledge.’ For Moneo, Argan, Rossi and others, this took the form of units of architectural meaning which, as Hays continues, could not be seen as symbols, but as more akin to phonemes which through their combination formulated meanings (ibid., p.26). It was on this abstracted, analytical level of formal structures and relations that typology operated, placing it in the structuralist tradition of architectural discourse of that time. However, the typological discussion was not only analytical, indeed, as Moneo notes this is not quite possible, but served as a vehicle for architectural thinking both directly through types, and indirectly through how typological thinking required responses regarding the nature of architecture.

The focus here lies on how typology raises questions about the nature of the architectural object by forcing decisions to be made through grouping architectural objects into types: what properties or characteristics need to be considered in such typological divisions and their relative order of priority? That is to say, typologies, as drawn from the specific built or designed architecture that never exists as the types in themselves, can only be abstracted by decisions on which elements, properties, and configurations participate in constructing a type, which is not an innocent operation (Foucault, 2003). To a certain extent, this means that a discussion
on typology includes a discussion on the formal basis of architecture both in its becoming and in its existence as built form. As such, it is perhaps not a surprise that the discussion of typology re-emerged at the same time as Tafuri’s (1968) work (amongst others) was breaking down the established conventions for the raison d’être of architectural form, clearly revealing the ideological components of the ostensibly rational modernism.

It is timely to elaborate at this point on modernity. For this discussion, I prefer to make use of Thomas A. Markus’ (1993) interpretation of the established separation between typologies of form and use, labelling them typologies of form and typologies of function, rather than Steadman’s formal types and activity types. The reason for this is how, according to Markus, the idea of ‘function’ in modernity and especially early modernism, comes not from how it can at times be interpreted today as a pragmatic question of use patterns or usability, but from the biological analogy between architecture and biology, or between society and a body translated to architecture (Markus, 1993), largely based on sociological works such as that of Durkheim. That is to say, like organs in a body, society had a number of essential functions that were necessary for it to operate, and these could be deduced, clarified, and built for. Accordingly, part of early modern and functionalist work did not focus on everyday use based on empirical grounds, but on theorising and deducing the necessary components of a city, formulating ‘function-types’ of architecture (a city’s organs – library, court, school, homes, etc.), and consequently, the functions of each function type (the building’s organs – bedroom, living room, kitchen, etc.).

Regardless of any theoretical validity as a model of society or life, the requirement for this life’s realisation in modern architectural solutions is that it can be made real and given shape in its model form. This is due in part to the correspondence thinking between social and spatial entities – that is, that one can translate a (functional) activity to a corresponding space, in a similar vein to how one was thought to be able to transfer social units (communities) to spatial units (housing areas), which as Hanson and Hillier (1987) show is a faulty assumption. It is also due to the rationale that seeks to make architectural solutions tailored and specifically efficient to this correspondence-based idea of life. That is to say, life consists of compartmentalised activities in that sense, which can be housed in rooms tailored to each particular activity. The particular reduction of the relation between form and use behind modernism is thus threefold; it rests on a distillation of society and life into distinct units that can be compartmentalised; it rests on the formulation of architectural purpose to housing these units; and it rests on the notion of correspondence in that these units can be designed for directly by corresponding spatial units.

When Robin Evans (1978) or Macarthur and Mouls (2005), amongst others, point out that the architectural plan and its components was something other before modernism, and that functional planning and labelling of rooms did not quite exist, it must be considered in the context of this background. It is clearly the case that some rooms were given labels and also purpose earlier than modernism. The point is that the plan was not solved and given form around the basis of a pre-existing programme rationally derived from the functions essentially required for the purpose of the building, which equally had its function motivated rationally from how society operated (and had to operate). Macarthur and Mouls (2005) note that before modernity, a plan was to do something entirely different, and symmetry and geometry had a completely different meaning than we would ascribe it today (c.f. Figure 6). In other periods, architectural rationale came in response to or as expressions of perceived cosmic orders, as for instance argued...
Changing building typologies
Koch, D.

Figure 6:
Palazzo Antonini in Udine by Andrea Palladio from the mid 16th Century (top right) and the Red House, by Philip Webb in Bexleyheath, London, mid 19th Century (bottom right).

Robin Evans uses these buildings amongst others to demonstrate the difference in architectural plan principles; Palazzo Antonini is arranged symmetrically after a geometrical order, with all rooms being thoroughfares, and the Red House is designed with rooms arranged and designed in size and connection after specific function written into them. It furthermore shows different 'homing' cultures – in one, thoroughfare was a quality, in the other, a good quality room was to have only one entrance – the latter further with the logical conclusion into corridor solutions. Palazzo Antonini, drawing from the original project in Palladio, Quattro Libri dell’Architettura, 1570 (available through Wikimedia Commons).

The Red House, plans; copyright © Heritage Images.
by Hegel (Wallenstein, 2008). Consequently, if the plan did not emerge as a response to ‘functional’ needs, neither would it have to change if there was a change in use (within reasonable boundaries). It is thus not necessarily their intent to state that there was no interrelation between form and inhabitance, or that architectural works did not incorporate notions of how they were to be used, but that this took a different form and had a different priority to how it is often considered today.

Consequently, as these ‘functions’ were identified and internalised into architectural thought, they could on the one hand be used as entities to be composed into a good, purposeful and functional architectural solution (c.f. Macarthur and Moulis, 2005; Emmons, 2006); and on the other, it can be argued that once this is part of how buildings are conceived of and perceived, that functional efficiency and the search for correct use measures can begin. Architecture began in a multitude of ways to define and restrict; not only by designing specific functions for specific rooms, but through geometry, configuration, size, fenestration, and other properties that all started to become more adapted to the function as derived rationally for the best measures for the performance of that function. Amongst many others, Wigley (1995; c.f. Hillier, 1996) shows that while functionalism tried to communicate and aestheticise function rather than ‘do’ function, the reframing of the idea of architecture in terms of solving the problem of ‘function’ seems to survive to this day. That is, regardless of the degree to which it is ‘true’ that modernism and functionalism ‘solved the problem of function’ in the way we would consider the problem today, it is first with the modern era planning that distinct and explicit connections of that kind can be readily made on the level of general architectural thought.

This suggests that to a high extent the perceived failure of functionalism is embedded in functionalism itself and that the claim of its failure largely remains lodged in its own paradigm: for functional failure to exist, the purpose must be function. The more precise the description of function, the more adaption to this precision, the more sensitive to mistakes, simplification, or changes an object will be. In this sense, the lack of functional specificity of early or pre-modern architecture can potentially be a reason for its escape from notions of failure by never quite attempting to be tailored specifically to use to begin with.

It is interesting in this context to draw a parallel to Baudrillard’s discussion of the Gadget (1996), where he states that the purpose of the gadget is its failure. He does not mean that this is a deliberate and expressed purpose, but that it is part of gadget ideology that there must be a point where it fails us, where we are reassured that no matter how fantastic a piece of technology it is, we are superior. Another point of this failure, Baudrillard argues, is how it in itself drives the ideology of development, allowing the propagation of new and ‘better’ solutions to constantly replace the old, as well as the idea that such development is necessary because of the (intrinsic) failure of what is. It is then tempting to raise the question whether a purpose of functionalism, or use-adapted architecture overall, is its own failure, reassuring us on one hand that we are free wills and indeed individuals that cannot be controlled or anticipated, and on the other, that the world is indeed changing and that yesterday’s solutions no longer suffice, furthermore assuring us that we are much more complex than architecture allows us to be.13 While it would be problematic to claim such a purpose, one can observe that what is established is a situation where it takes rather small ‘failures’ for this perception to reaffirm itself once one has put the focus on architecture to be a smoothly responding means to whatever ends one might come up with for it to serve; arguably, it sets up impossible goals that can only lead to continuous failure and need for new ideas and new solutions due to the ‘nature

Notes:
13 Arguably, the early modern and functionalist movement believed they could find a permanent solution, a ‘best fit’ for e.g. an apartment (c.f. Lathouri, 2011). Ever since the argued failure of modernism, however, and in a situation where we assume that we live in constant change, this can no longer be assumed to be the case. Rather, streamlining and perfecting architecture for a specific use must be seen as either highly ideological-conservative, or possibly progressive if it challenges current ways, but also reasonably doomed to become outdated. A third option is a belief in something universal and permanent, where the failure of functionalism is the solution that was come up with – not the problem which they set out to solve or the concepts through which they worked to solve them.
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This depends on activities being understood as very specific and comparatively static in their relation to the environment. They are further required to be specifically ‘functional’; i.e. that they are conditioned by their ‘internal’ properties and how these condition the environmental dependencies rather than their ‘external’, their ‘functional’ rather than their ‘social’, or, borrowing from Koch, Steen and Öhlén (2012), their ‘primary’ rather than their ‘secondary’ conditions. To illustrate, I will expand on a simple argument about reading by Bart Verschaffel:

‘[...] it is crucial that reading as an activity remains intensely related to its environment. Reading is absorption and concentration with the eyes on the page, but also seeing and feeling and hearing the paper of the page and the book, and letting the eyes wander and rest on the table, on the walls, and, through the windows, stare at the landscape and the sky – all while staying ‘in’ the reading. Because reading is a situation that ‘takes place’, it is important to investigate in detail how the experience of space becomes part of the activity of reading.’ (Verschaffel, 2010, p.89)

Verschaffel presents this specific way of reading as a larger argument positing that reading is a differentiated, contextual activity not limited to the specific act of following letters and words on a page or screen, and in extension, that different contextualised reading activities could rather be considered as more akin to other activities than other forms of reading. Not only does this differentiate between reading activities, but it differentiates between the socio-spatial conditions of these both locally – the immediate context – and configuratively – close to or far away from what it is reasonable to do. Such a view of activity allows on the one hand for a more nuanced differentiation of analysis of use, relating to works such as that of De Certau (1984) or Augoyard (2007; c.f. Choi, 2013). On the other, it allows an otherwise rational and more or less ‘a-social’ view of activity (i.e. it concerns only the individual and his or her actions in the environment) to integrate with social and cultural factors, such that it is not clear cut whether reading together with one’s family is reading first, and then socially contextualised, or if it is social first, and then taking the specific form of reading. It is not my intention here to argue one way or the other, but rather to argue that either could be true, varying from instance to instance, and that it is likely that to certain degrees, both kinds of aims are effectively present in most forms of activities, together with other aims, in an interactive process (c.f. Giddens, 1984).

Once more returning to Hanson’s (1998) studies, one can argue that her findings on homes and their dependency on cultural rather than functional factors for their diversity support such an argument – it is quite clear that her analysis supports an even wider view incorporating cultural norms, ideals, relations and processes in a variety of ways. When it comes to analyses of ‘buildings’, it is in studies that investigate more complex socio-cultural and spatial relations where the discussions gain traction, be it in Hanson’s or Markus’ work, or in the studies of curatorial strategies in museums or department stores by Zamani and Peponis (2007), Tzortzi (2011), or Koch (2012), the studies of narratives and conceived space by Psarra (2009), or recent shifts in the analysis of offices from movement patterns and locations of interactions to other types of questions like social networking (Sailer and McCulloh, 2012).

The point of this excursion is not, however, to validate or question research into use patterns but to establish a framework in which to discuss to what extent changing use patterns can be directly related to changing building typologies or not, how such a discussion fits into a historical and theoretical context, and in what architectural ideology such a discussion places itself. A second point is the way in which the introduction of the idea of a functional basis of architecture transformed the idea of life of the problem’ (c.f. Rittel and Webber, 1973).
and activity (Emmons, 2006). This changed view not only operates on the formal level of architecture, but on the levels of activity and psychology; a functionalist plan requires a functionalist life with clear and distinct activities that could be related to rooms, and with clear and distinct individuals who operate on and in, rather than through and with their environment. It thus requires not only a particular view of architecture, but also of the always-elusive ‘use’.

The argument here is not whether function based change has taken place or not – both Markus (1993) and Steadman (2014) quite clearly show there has been. The point is that the perception of the strength of this link is dependent on the understanding of architecture. That is to say, the question is framed under a paradigm that includes not only architecture, but also the social as pragmatics of use patterns over and above myths, meanings, cultural communication, and social structuring, all the while definitively having purchase on all of these. Not only directly, but indirectly through the why of architecture, the how of architecture, what the basis for socio-spatial differentiation is, who is to be differentiated, in what parts, and on what grounds, and so forth. In a similar vein, although potentially less explicit, a notion of changing building typologies as an effect of technological developments rests on other views of architecture and potentially the use of technology, depending on whether the developments in consideration are in construction methods, materials, design tools, modelling technology, or interactive technological devices affecting behaviour and the degree of direct purchase of such, to name a few – none of which can be considered historically or geographically universal.

**In conclusion, some notes on strategic abstractions**

It seems that most authors on type agree on one point: there are certain types of buildings connected to modernity that produced a fairly clear set of typologies, valid for a certain period of time. These include schools, prisons, department stores, libraries, hospitals, and museums (c.f. Markus, 1993; Steadman, 2014). To a certain extent, homes, or perhaps more specifically housing, could be included (c.f. Whitehand and Carr, 2001; Steadman, 2014). These are also clearly formulated as function-types, and only to a certain extent form morphological types. The ‘function’ of function types, furthermore, is on a distinct societal level and not on a specific use level, although there are clear indicators of also operating on a more detailed scale as in the patterns of control and power of schools and prisons (Hillier and Hanson, 1984; Markus, 1993), the separations of movement in courthouses (Hanson, 1996), and the entry and exit as well as surveillance conditions of museums and public libraries.

To a certain extent, these modern function types, and even more so later functionalism, rested on very specific notions of function and use, and their relation to built form as distinct and specific. Under such a point of view a relation between changing habits and changing typology is immediate. If one changes, so does the other. The more one pushes the habit or use towards specificity, the more sensitive the perception of change or instability becomes.

Arguably, one of the things space syntax has shown is that it is rather on a social and contextual level that relations between form and use in architecture operate (c.f. Hillier and Hanson, 1984; Peponis, 1989; Hanson, 1998), which sometimes takes the form of reoccurring patterns measurable through correlations.

This is also when consistent findings tend to appear, be it in social networks instead of specific interactions, in the distribution of fashion in relation to configuration-use instead of specific points of purchase, or in the hierarchical distributions of power, control, or surveillance rather than specific locations of interactions. A key question in such analysis becomes what parts of ‘the social’ have been embedded and invested in spatial
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configuration, and what relations have been left to be ‘transpatial’, fully recognising that ‘the social’ is always too saturated, complex, and contradictory to allow complete correspondence, and that what has been embedded changes over time and space (Markus, 1993; Koch, 2013). This extends further to generic discussions of series trees and networks (c.f. Hillier and Hanson, 1984; Foucault, 1997) that can be discussed in relation to ideas rather than uses, or points, lines and fields, as discussed by McMurrough (2001b) and Allen (1997); i.e. early museums of history being series, and early libraries being trees, as reflecting ideas of history (series of events or eras) and knowledge (a tree of infinitely finer branches of knowledge), where the changes of the ideas have been followed by changing types (Markus, 1993).

These observations aside, the main discussion of this paper has concerned typology in relation to questions of architecture – what kinds of questions it raises, and what kinds of implications it holds. Partially illustrated through examples of homes and shops, it has been discussed how one can make the case for continuous change rather than historical stability – and it has further been argued that, as pointed out by Rossi (1982) and developed by Arnold and Ballantyne (2004) as well as Hays (2013), architectural typology has the potential and risk of disguising this continuous change as stability. In part, this can be related to Markus’ (1993) discussion of types, suggesting there is often a fair tolerance in discrepancies between the ‘ideal’ and the ‘real’ as architecture is made use of, but that there are limits where continuous change leads to ostensibly sudden ruptures, moves, adaptations, or rebuildings.

The reason for this potential and risk, arguably, lies in the kind of operations intrinsic to the construction of types and typology: the need to extract a set of abstracted categories, from a mass of specific buildings, into which the mass can be organised. This abstraction, in a typology, is grounded in certain logics or principles – a discourse or theory – with a certain priority between the range of choices involved in the process. By default, this means a prioritisation of architectural properties and their importance for classification and thereby our understanding of the objects in question as well as of ‘architecture’. Other properties are thereby set into the background to the point where they risk being disregarded – here illustrated by the risks involved in treating ‘homes’ and ‘shops’ as categories extending through history and how this may disguise their continuously changing characters.

On the one hand, in as far as this takes place, it is part of the process of interpretation of the abstracted type, consciously or subconsciously made ‘real’ by giving it specificity through the addition of information lost in the very process of abstraction. This re-specification (prothesis) of the types, however much based on real cases, then risk being applied to the whole range of objects in a type even though ‘true’ only for some of them (c.f. Châtelet, 2000). This is another way of understanding Rossi’s discussion of the way types act on history, but also with purchase on any typological operation.

On the other hand, this means the more that types, regardless of their basis, are treated as essential or factual (‘real’) categorisations, the more typologisation becomes a proposition for architectural universals. This is both a potential and a risk, in that typologisation could be a research topic in itself regarding whether such universals exist. On the other hand, such proposals can be made exploratively, in order to examine what can be learnt from different ways of typologising architecture. If, in extension, typologisation is re-applied to architectural design work, it could then be used for generative exploration of ‘types’ (c.f. Bos and van Berkel, 2011).

In both cases, the abstractions made and the internal order and priority they are given become strategic choices, where the common division into
'typologies of form' and 'typologies of function' only give a cursory description of the differences between existing approaches, helpful as a rule of thumb but also hiding a range of differences internally and 'hybrids' in-between, and not quite allowing other, if less established, ways of discussing type to be considered (e.g. Vidler, 1978; Kärrholm, 2013).

Through this paper, the point has been to both illustrate and discuss the notion of type itself, and what kind of operation a typological discussion is, which can be related to Moneo’s (1978) statement on how it brings the very idea of what constitutes architecture into play. This has less to do with whether there is a true typology or not, or whether it is a fruitful way of looking at architecture. Madge’s point that whether discussed or not, there seems to be a sort of typological production or reproduction occurring appears to be highly relevant in terms of the production of buildings – in part through the way architectural design rests on references and knowledge drawn from precedents, in part through the way in which, as Steadman (2014) shows, there are limits to architectural form given certain geometrical and material conditions. However, regardless of the validity of type as an idea, the basis on which typology is organised and how types are separated entails a stance not only in relation to the properties of architecture that should be considered important and those that should not, but also on the formal basis of architecture. This means that the construction of typologies and what is allowed to be included becomes a strategic question in relation to one’s view of architecture on the one hand, and the purpose of the typological abstraction on the other. It becomes a site not only for exploring what architecture is, as Moneo proposes, but what it potentially could be.
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