FOREWORD

Recalling Goethe’s theory of ur-phenomenon and considering the Eiffel Tower as a montage of various elements, Walter Benjamin presented quotation as the Geist of a theoretical break with the vulgar historical naturalism, and as a means to grasp the construction of history as such: as meaning in the structure of commentary. Benjamin was not alone in using quotation as a strategy to deconstruct historicism. We are also reminded of Karl Kraus, who used quotation not to preserve, but to purify, to tear from context, to destroy the established totality. Considered as a fragment, quotation can play a critical role in putting together the large construction (historiography) made out of smallest architectonic elements, the detail.

In general we are asking, what do you quote and to what purpose?

Recent historiographies present anachronism as a theoretical paradigm to dispense with the historicist certainties, which most often try to cement the historian’s tendency for period style, solidifying the linear progression of history. Even though quotation seems to be natural to historiography, it’s hard to find a text or manuscript that does not use quotation to re-activate the past, either to confirm a claim, or to expand the scope of the historiographical implications of another claim. In both cases quotation introduces interruption, a pause in the presumed linearity and natural extension of the narrative. But what is it that makes a sentence or an idea quotable? And why is it that throughout history both architects and historians have used citations, if only to save a place in the linear progression of history? The historian’s interest in quotation might be that it says something about an event and/or serves as a reminder of the accuracy of a fact, a recollection. Or else, citation forces the sentence to depart from its subject matter, historical facts and events in order to enter into the realm of what might be called insight, which can also mean in-cite, or in-site. Insightful observations, nevertheless, can become facts in their own right after being quoted and referred to repeatedly. Interestingly enough, Manfredo Tafuri makes a distinction between those who use quotations “to build a new reality” and those who use the same quotations “in order to cover up the disappointments of reality.” In addition to the Benjamian concept of historiographic montage, what quotation means for architectural historiography is this: that the text, an assembly of facts, processes, events, and insightful observations offers quotable fragments when it inaugurates or establishes a different historical knowledge.
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KEYNOTE:
Figures Of The Architext

Jean-Louis Cohen
New York University

Literary theorist Gérard Genette, whose book Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree is devoted to the many dimensions of quotation, has defined the “architext” as “This relationship of inclusion that relates each text to the different types of discourses in which it is inscribed.” Far from remaining valid only in territories remote from architectural concerns, the analyses of the “second hand,” as proposed by Antoine Compagnon, or the concept of intertextuality proposed by Julia Kristeva and developed by Genette with the architext, are relevant for the study of architectural and urban forms. Rather than being limited to quotation – understood as the transfer of a phrase from one design, or one building to another one, intertextual relationships correspond to a wide spectrum of figures, from literal inclusion to paraphrase, or from condensation to homology. Architectural intertextuality operates in many realms of theory and practice, and its consideration allows for better understanding of processes at work within the oeuvre of a given architect, or of the reverberation of designs from different authors on those of contemporaries, and followers. The paradigm of the intertext provides a frame within which different types of relationships can be detected, that deal in some cases with the syntactic dimension of architecture, and in others with its lexical spectrum. Among these, three distinct systems could be observed: intericonicity – that is the circulation of images from a particular design to another one; intertectonicity – that is the transfer of tectonic features from a structure to another one; and also, observing the creation and the development of cities since the Renaissance, interurbanity – that is the translation of street layouts, open space patterns, or monumental schemes from city to city. Operating at different scales, these processes complicate the reflection on quotation, or on such a dubious construct as “influence.” They will be discussed on the base of an eclectic selection of cases.

Jean-Louis Cohen holds the Sheldon H. Solow chair in the History of Architecture at New York University’s Institute of Fine Arts. He is the author of numerous books and articles about nearly every aspects of how modernization has affected the built environment. A specialist in the Russian avant-garde and the work of Le Corbusier, Cohen’s work has also focused on the multiple patterns of internationalization, from the colonial situations of Morocco and Algeria to the worldwide circulation of ideas and forms.
KEYNOTE:
‘The Rational and The Robust’:
Jennifer Taylor and the historiography of Australian architecture

Julie Willis
The University of Melbourne

The study of Australian architecture has been circumscribed by its chief authors, the most influential of which have been historians whose wider interests in the contemporary and context of Australia as place have underscored their work. These authors are also distinguished by their primary training as architects, giving them a deep interest and understanding of architecture as a process. Robin Boyd defined not only early Australian architectural historiography, but also the popular imagination of an Australian architecture. But Boyd took a fundamentally modernist approach, echoed by Max Freeland in his Architecture in Australia, and their privileging of tectonic purity and belittling of ornament characterizes the first generation of Australian architectural historians. The first generation of architectural historians was intent on demonstrating an Australian architecture that was connected to international trends that proved its pedigree. The second generation was interested in understanding what might be a particularly Australian architecture, one that was for and of its place, including historians such as David Saunders, Miles Lewis, George Tibbits and Jennifer Taylor. Of all of these, Taylor came closest to inheriting Boyd’s mantle, with her enduring interest in contemporary and architecture of the recent past. Taylor was deeply interested in the late modern and post-modern, helping to demonstrate the brutalist and regional influences inherent in Australian architecture in the 1970s and 1980s. Her work was fundamental in showing that Australian architecture was not just a reflection of ideas from elsewhere, but where place, materials and form were defining new regional approaches. This presentation examines Taylor’s legacy in documenting the rational and robust architecture of the post-WWII period that underpins understanding

Julie Willis is an architectural historian, Professor of Architecture and Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Building & Planning at the University of Melbourne. With Professor Philip Goad, she is Editor of the acclaimed Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture (Cambridge University Press, 2012), which won an AIA Bates Smart Special Award for Architecture in the Media in 2012. Her research projects focus on Australian architecture, undertaking significant work on historic and contemporary hospitals; architecture in community, education and civic identity; architecture of wartime and its impact; nationalism and identity in public buildings; and equity and diversity in the Australian architectural profession.
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An Architectural-Urban Strategy  
Re-reading Rowe and Koetter’s Collage City  

Michael Jasper  
University of Canberra  

Abstract  
This paper postulates that composition strategies propounded in Colin Rowe (1920-1999) and Fred Koetter’s (1938-2017) Collage City illustrate a form of quotation at the scale of the urban precinct and composite building. The paper demonstrates that three kinds of quotation are at work: quotation as literal citation, as replication of form generation principles, and as evocation of architectural character chiefly by means of the park as city image. The paper suggests that a close analysis of Collage City will add to our understanding of the concept and device of quotation in terms of the aesthetics of urban scale composition. The paper also postulates that certain secondary readings have misread Collage City or at best not done it full justice in claiming the book advocates the common, the permanent, and the stable. The paper suggests that closer analysis of the text, the iconographic support, and student work undertaken under Rowe’s direction in the Cornell University graduate urban design studio demonstrate an aesthetic sensibility, a mind set, and a studio practice that is all about action, change, and movement. Collage City, student work completed under Rowe at Cornell, and contemporaneous writing comprise primary source material for the research. Key secondary literature – Baird, Biraghi, Cooper, Hurtt, Middleton, Ockman, Ortelli, Secchi, Tschumi – is referenced and for select works differences in point of view and finding briefly discussed. The paper makes a contribution of scholarship on the ideas and influence of Rowe and Koetter’s thinking and Rowe’s teaching on architectural discourse revealing a generative potential largely ignored in secondary literature to date, adds to studies of twentieth-century architectural education, and addresses aspects of the 2017 SAHANZ conference theme of quotation.
Introduction

To us [Freud] is no more a person
Now but a whole climate of opinion.
W. H. Auden, “In Memory of Sigmund Freud”

If we assign Collage City to the place of Freud and extrapolate, Auden’s phrase becomes: Collage City is today no more a thing but a whole climate of opinion. And accepting this opening volley as at least provocative and consistent with the authors’ own description of their text as explorative – it was a question for Rowe and Koetter of an ‘essay’ and not a book – then giving Auden the task of providing an epigraph to this paper may begin to make sense. For treating Collage City as a ‘climate of opinion’ allows us to treat it not as closed, hard, and hermetic but rather as sponge-like in its capacity to absorb and deflect things that have gone on around it since its publication. This also to a degree mimics the specific character and underlying sensibilities of the book along with the other manifestations of Rowe’s temperament and those of his students surrounding it over those same years.

Collage City has occupied an odd place in the architectural imaginary over the more than four decades since it’s initial and highly abbreviated 1975 publication in The Architectural Review. Accepting the gambit of this year’s SAHANZ conference, an examination of Collage City from the lens of quotation, as both composition strategy and concept, seems timely and may reveal aspects of the text little considered to date.

I begin with two propositions. The first, primary proposition is that the composition strategies propounded in Collage City illustrate a kind of quotation at the scale of the urban precinct and composite building. A second proposition follows the first: that certain secondary readings have misread Collage City or at best not done it full justice in claiming the book advocates the common, the permanent, and the stable. Within the limits of this paper I will only sketch out the elements of a response to the latter, while devoting the majority of what follows to the first proposition, reading Collage City as setting out quotation strategies for architectural-urban composition.

In trying to come to grips with the devices and ideas of Collage City and their potential reach as strategies of urbanistic collage, one quickly discovers the need to equally examine student work from Rowe’s contemporaneous teaching practice. As Rowe writes when reflecting on it some twenty years later, Collage City is extensively about ‘the content of [the Cornell urban design] course’.

Under Rowe, and over a twenty-five year period (1963-1988), the graduate urban design studio at Cornell University took urban scale elements as the site of invention and of intervention. The formal development of the city was its field of investigation and an attitude of flexible responses deeply informed by knowledge of the immediate and more distant past and a certain confidence in the architect’s limits to control the future an underpinning philosophy. A founding hypothesis informed at a basic level all of the studio work, that of the integration – dynamic, antagonistic, dialectical - of the traditional city and the modern city: the city of solids and the city of voids according to Rowe. The design studio was distinguished by a series of relevant architectural-urban problems, an attitude loosely defined as contextualism, and a method of design based on a belief that a constant oscillation between, as Rowe wrote later, ‘the present and the past, between the empirical and the ideal, between the contingent and the abstract’. For Rowe this was the only valid and responsible manner to deal with the city at least within the setting of a university architecture-urban design studio.

Four Clusters: Scholarly Context

Let me return to the second proposition, and the claim that certain critical and historical interpretations of Collage City and the Cornell graduate urban design studio under Rowe and their respective architectural-urban composition theories is limited and thus worthy of re-examination. Where such
effort has been made, the point of view has been generally descriptive or anecdotal as distinguished from the analytic and thematic viewpoint of this paper. Such secondary literature can be organised chronologically in four clusters each roughly a decade apart. The first cluster appears in the decade after Collage City’s publication and is dominated by former students of Rowe. This includes essays by Stuart Cohen, Wayne W. Cooper, William Ellis, Steven Hurtt, D. B. Middleton, Thomas Schumacher, and Grahame Shane. A second period is clustered some twenty years later in the mid 1990’s as Rowe retired from teaching and a spate of essays appears in the spirit of a festschrift. This includes a full issue of ANY in 1994 and essays by George Baird (1997) and Joan Ockman (1998). In the mid 2000s, the third decade, Rowe generally and Collage City specifically are revealed as important influences on a generation of European architects in particular, accepting the acts of an international conference held in March 2008 in Venice at the Istituto universitario d’architettura di Venezia (IUAV) as dispositive. Some thirty years after Collage City, nearly half of those included in conference proceedings chose to take on the Rowe and Koetter book as their main interlocutor. Closest to us, a collection of ten essays on Rowe was published in 2015 and of these a third directly engage with the ideas and impact of Collage City. Select texts from this secondary literature are returned to in part three of this paper as a way to frame a further, larger study.

Research Material

In order to approach the paper’s primary proposition, architectural-urban composition strategies and devices propounded by Rowe’s students and by Rowe and Koetter’s Collage City will be examined across two primary sources. The first is the book itself as published in 1978, though I will also refer in certain instances to the partial 1975 publication in The Architectural Review. The second source is studio work undertaken in the Cornell graduate urban design studio under Rowe’s direction starting in the Fall semester 1963. Though Rowe continued to teach on and off until 1988, in what follows references will be limited to studio work which is clustered around the writing and publication of the book, thus from the late 1960s to the early 1980s. This limitation is partially practical and partially strategic, as a larger study would be needed to include the full spectrum of work. I also will not be examining the relation between earlier writings predating Collage City and the potential influence and transformation such ideas might have undergone as a consequence of Rowe’s teaching practice. Certainly worth interrogation, such topics will have to await staging into a larger project.

Studio materials related to student work completed at Cornell were sourced from available academic publications and are relatively comprehensive and representative of the work from the multi-decade studio. Out of some one hundred and fifty studio projects recorded under Rowe’s supervision, fifty were surveyed and, as will be seen in section two below and in the conference presentation, some dozen touching on specific kinds of quotation used in the development of this paper.

Analysis

Collage City is bracketed front and back by two approaches to urbanistic collage as quotation: David Giffin and Hans Kolhoff’s city of composite presence opens the book in a double-page spread that confronts in an imaginary city the Villa Adriana, the Strada Nuova Genoa, Palazzo Farnese, Pergamon, and the Uffizi among others; an illustrated list of ‘stimulants’, from memorable streets to precinct or city-scale gardens to be cited whole or in part provides a concluding Excursus. These two approaches can be taken as a shorthand framing of a range of quotation strategies. Within that set up, and from an analysis of Collage City and student work, three kinds of quotation can be identified: first, quotation as direct citation (a literal imposition or collage of a building or building group onto a site); second, the referencing of planning and design principles from an exemplary work into a project; third, the quotation via direct references to parks into precinct or city-scale conditions. The analysis also reveals that these kinds of quotation find resonance in the urban design studio problems at Cornell. A limited number of studio problems recur: grid and fragment studies largely explored at the scale of the street and block plan and frequently the result of grid collisions or grid extensions;
infill, connection, or completion problems, taken on at the scale of the composite building with solutions replicating or quoting planning and design strategies from the past; and overall city-wide field or mapping studies that may include open spaces of various kinds employing water, plazas, and parterres as ordering devices which reference parks from architecture’s past.

In what follows I describe and illustrate examples of each, recognizing that often Collage City and studio work blur the boundaries of these artificial categories.

Citation

A first kind of quotation is evident as a form of literal citation, where form is directly adopted or overlain. This is direct citation of a building or building group from architecture’s past, whether recent or a more distant past. It often is used in conditions of grid extension or grid collision in the studio work. Griffin and Kolhof’s city of composite presence is one example. Collage City’s Excursus provides a catalogue of some fifty ‘stimulants’ which the authors suggest can be seen as quotable exemplars or ‘possible objets trouvés in the urbanistic collage’ of an imaginary city. As additional demonstration of this quotation temperament at work, seven illustrated categories of such quotable material are provided: memorable streets, stabilizers, potentially interminable set pieces, splendid public terraces, ambiguous and composite buildings, nostalgia producing instruments, and the garden.

The provocation to literally quotexemplars can be seen at work in a number of student projects. In the studio project for 48th street on New York’s west side, for example, Steven Peterson directly cites Gunnar Asplund’s 1922 project for the Royal Chancellery, Stockholm (Figure 1). At a larger scale, Le Corbusier’s redunts are cited by Thomas Schumacher in the latter’s plan for an extension to South Amboy. Other examples of citation in the studio work include David Griffin’s 1979 project for Montreal in which he directly inserts the plan for the Palais Royal into the site; or Jerri Smith’s 1981 project for the Cincinnati Waterfront that includes elements from the Piazza Augusto Imperatore of Rome.

Form Generation Principles

A second form of quotation is evident as a replication of form generation principles. The composite building, both in Collage City and in the Cornell studio work, provides a frequent display of this kind of quotation at work. The major ambition of Collage City to a degree is about identifying urban scale planning principles and architectural-urban devices which can be cited or referenced into specific
conditions. This form of implied and explicit quotation of form-generation strategies runs throughout the text and finds its purest rendition in the composite building. The Quirinale and Manica Lunga, Rome, the Palais Royal and Louvre of the Plan Turgot for Paris, and the Hofburg, Vienna, are examples of this: buildings which both shape space and are shaped by it. Composite buildings are two-faced.

![Composite Building](image)


The composite building, in other words, is a building that attaches to the surrounding building fabric, sponsoring figural voids and solids that in turn provide and stabilise spatial energies. It serves as demonstration of an ambiguity in buildings that both occupy space and define it, ones that construct both positive figure and positive ground. In terms closer to us, they are responses that reveal traits of both event and field.  

In the Cornell studios, infill and hinge or connection conditions were recurrent problem types that benefitted from this kind of quotation. In these, Rowe and his students developed over time a move from those linear buildings so loved by the moderns to what he came to call composite buildings. These function for Rowe and Koetter as noted above to both define edges, enclose space, and at the same time evolve into objects of focus for an established or extended texture. The engagement with texture and context on the one hand and the development of city-scale elements of focus on the other reveal specific characteristics of this kind of dialectic maintained in tension.

In studio projects developed for the Providence Capital District studios, for example, one can see a full range of urban scale problems including loss of spatial definition, small to large scale, foreground to background. Two solutions for the capital complex provide an illustration of the use of this kind of quotation. Middleton deploys an exemplary mix of devices: figural void, verdure as space definer, closure, and hierarchy following the Roman Imperial fora of *Collage City* (Figure 2). This can be contrasted with Bostick’s slightly earlier project also for Providence that seems to quote from Van Eesteren’s proposal for the Unter den Linden, Berlin, and a Regent-like park figure: regular void, linear space-shaping buildings.

Fong’s thesis for Marlybone Rail Station from the same years contains similar elements and further evidence of the kind of internal quotation and self-referentiality that distinguishes the 1980 post *Collage City* studios. Fong’s solution to the Marlybone studio is a particularly elegant example of the both figure and ground aim which deployed the repetition as citation of design principles.
Park as Paradigm

Figure 3. Completion and extension of an existing city as 18th c park.
Firenze Interrotta, Studio Projects (1980): Proposed plan,
Axonometric: New Quarter Del Prato (The Cornell Journal of

The third kind of quotation at work in Collage City and in student work is that in which the park is referenced as the paradigm for formal decisions as well as evocation of urban character. Collage City is explicit about the potential of the garden model. It appears early in the text and occupies a prominent place in the Excursus: this is quotation as forming architectural character by means of the park as model and as city image. To take only the most evident, the gardens of Chantilly, Verneuil, and the Park Monceau are constants in Collage City and underlay the thinking at work.

Student projects illustrate this kind of quotation, with the garden problem at the scale of the precinct or compact city appearing with regular frequency especially in the later years. Baltimore, Berlin, Florence, London and Rome provided the material for much of the studio work in this period, and the group project was not uncommon. Infill may be the most easily legible term, but a close study of the student work on the Berlin plan (Figure 5) or the Florence plan (Figure 3), for example, reveals a now mature deployment of this approach to the city as park and the productive potential of a quotation strategy. The Cornell studio’s counter proposal to Guiseppe Poggi’s plan of 1865 for Florence exemplifies this, with the overall city view taken in order to resolve the irregular and confusing medieval texture surrounding the centre. The size and shape of the proposed blocks in the Poggi plan are replaced by other types to more consistently follow a park model.

Conclusion - Strategies
I have too briefly analysed Collage City and student work of the Cornell graduate urban design studio as an approach to the proposition that composition strategies propounded in the book illustrate a kind of quotation at the scale of the urban precinct and composite building. Three kinds of quotation have been identified, each displaying a range of architectural-urban composition strategies. The first is a kind of literal quotation where works are inserted into a project site. A second form is quotation as citing a composition device or design principle from one of the many paradigms that circulated around Collage City and in Rowe’s Cornell studio. Key projects mined for their design principles include Le Corbusier’s redents in the master plan for Antwerp, the Villa Adriana, and the Vienna Hofburg. A third kind of quotation is seen in Rowe and Koetter’s approach to restore or retain utopian poetics through aesthetic fragments organised most frequently in versions of the city as 18th c park. In As I was Saying, Rowe illustrates other student projects from Rome in the same years that also deploy this kind of quotation.
The differences across the kinds of quotation are both evident and subtle. The scale of investigation is the most visible. Citation tends to be at the scale of the individual building or public space. Replication of planning and design principles appears in studios or conditions calling for the group plan or composite building. The park paradigm is quoted at precinct or citywide problems. An attitude toward context varies, as does the underlying assumption about autonomy. At a different scale and in a different realm, Rowe and Koetter’s deployment of figure/field relationships passes through a filter or is indexed against cubistic composition devices not only in plan but spatially, which endeavour to realize an ‘and-and’ (as different from an either or) condition. Collage City’s field of inquiry can be seen to be simultaneously context based – whether Baltimore and London, or Rome and Manhattan – and deeply engaged with architecture’s future by a parallel confrontation with architecture’s past and an openness to the potential in concepts and ideas from other realms.

A range of composition strategies as variations on urbanistic collage is at work in Collage City, thus providing some demonstration of the validity of the first proposition. The lens of quotation, along with a working taxonomy of citation, application of planning and design principles, and city as park provide a grill of terms for organising a reading of the various city manifestations in Rowe and Koetter’s book. The question across city-ideas discussed in Collage City is open: the city of composite presence that opens the text is certainly one synthetic image of urbanistic collage: collision city and collage city seem interchangeable at least from this survey. Perhaps museum city deserves a temporary consideration as too little examined and one to be returned to in the closing notes below.

Second Proposition, Secondary Literatures
In the introduction it was suggested that secondary literature around Collage City can be organised chronologically in four clusters each roughly a decade apart. I also proposed that certain secondary readings have not do full justice to the text, its internal ambiguities, and its more loose as opposed to more static and fixed aesthetic preferences. In what follows a single text from each decade-long cluster is taken to stand for the period as an opening approach to the claim of too restricted an interpretation. A future study will be needed to expand on and test these preliminary comments.

Former students of Rowe mark the first cluster in the decade after Collage City’s publication. Hurtt’s 1983 essay can stand as one example, and certainly one of the most subtle. Still close to the Cornell lessons, Hurtt is rare in evoking a complex provenance and destiny for the studio ideas. If perhaps too enamoured with the synthetic cubism analogy, he does find in the end ‘a beauty less stable, less perfect, more dynamic, more irresolute’ in the Rowe and Koetter position worth further exploring.

In ANY Magazine’s 1994 thematic issue Form Work: Colin Rowe, a number of the articles reference Collage City. Stan Allen’s nimble take on the Rowe sensibility suggests perhaps that the city ideas remain at the plane of the connoisseur and that the building ideas contain all the sophistication. A longer engagement would no doubt reveal more nuanced potential while recognising the strength the differences can add.

Architecture as text and Colin Rowe as figure: thus implies the title of a collection of papers originating from a March 2008 conference held in Venice. Some thirty years after Collage City a surprising number as noted above take on Rowe and Koetter’s Collage City as protagonist. Looking at only one essay as an example, Ortelli notes the book’s deep reliance on dialectical pairs that Ortelli suggests removes Rowe and Koetter from a more cinematic point of view. This dialectics reliance might prove worth further scrutiny as shaping the Collage City message.

Bernard Tschumi’s contribution to a collection of essays published in 2015 provides a final example. Rowe and Koetter’s collage I believe is much more slippery, more fluid then certain readings have allowed and a close reading may reveal greater capacity in the quotation strategy of urbanistic
collage. This is perhaps especially evident as related to the question of the accommodation of change over time. Tschumi’s comments differ markedly from this and though he qualifies his comments he finds the book on the side of the conservative:

‘It is my contention that if Rowe and Koetter so carefully avoided any mention of the cinema and resorted instead to a painterly analogy, it is because their argument is based upon a deeply embedded belief that architecture and the city are the embodiment of permanence and stasis. Collage, in the mind of Rowe, is about space. Montage [following Eisenstein], as conceived in film, is about space and time’.  

Back to Rowe and Koetter: at the end of the chapter Collage City and the Reconquest of Time they advocate a different interpretation of collage as incorporating time in addition to space and structure, a position that challenges Tschumi’s interpretation. They can thus stand in defence of their position in a retrospective response.

because collage is a method deriving its virtue from its irony, because it seems to be a technique for using things and simultaneously disbelieving in them, it is also a strategy which can allow utopia to be dealt with as image, to be dealt with in fragments without our having to accept it in toto, which is further to suggest that collage could even be a strategy which, by supporting the utopian illusion of changelessness and finality, might even fuel a reality of change, motion, action and history.

If we give Rowe and Koetter the last word, they do provide a counter argument to the claim of static thinking further rendered in the text and perhaps in the iconographic support and certainly in the published studio work that came out of Rowe’s Cornell studio. This is further demonstration of the need for, and potential, in additional research around these themes and the debates and ideas contained in the secondary literature.

Notes on Museum City
The notion of the city as museum is introduced in the final chapter of Collage City. It emerges without fanfare and little elaboration as another manifestation of the city idea alongside but different from the city of composite presence, collision city, and collage city. It suggests for Rowe and Koetter, I would argue, a potential model that provides capacity for both fabric and object, the open and the critical in a state which privileges neither the new city of the moderns nor the traditional city. From such an interpretation, maybe museum city designates a physical configuration and a mental state better approximating the Rowe-Koetter ideal if you will, one beyond or at least different from collage city. If not used as a title for the book, it is perhaps because the authors realized how unpalatable such a title would be. In any case it can certainly serve to lead into a provisional conclusion for this paper.

One can see the attraction of the museum as city model, the term allowing the introduction of a series of couples that find resolution in tension and constructive ambiguity not opposition. These terms, all somehow rendering Rowe and Koetter’s city, include scaffold and exhibition, necessity and freedom, structure and event, museum fabric and museum content, field and object.

At the end of the chapter Crisis of the Object: Predicament of Texture, Rowe and Koetter provide a useful synthesis of composition strategies that characterize the city of immanent presence as the place of sustained debate between the new city and it’s object fixation as exemplified by Le Corbusier’s St Dié, and the old city and it’s space fixation as rendered in Parma. These strategies include cross-breeding, assimilation, distortion, challenge/response, imposition, superposition, and conciliation. These all reference the city as museum and the imperative to acknowledge movement and time in urban scale planning. A general temperament in favour of action and change was certainly in the air at the time of Collage City’s publication if we accept the comments that preface The
Architecture Review publication. The anonymous author to that preface cautions against too unreflective a deployment of the collision strategy foregrounded in the article the reader is to confront. Above all, the author recommends in terms of the aesthetic problems of city planning that one embrace the pleasure of the incomplete, the partial, and the kind of collision which preserves as opposed to destroys, the mutually colliding parts adopting a practice of ‘fruitful collisions’, perhaps another kind of quotation.30

From the above notes, a conclusion in the form of two final questions for subsequent investigation can be posed: Does Collage City herald as Rowe and Koetter suggest in the book’s last chapter a return to modern utopian poetics without the utopian politics where the latter is understood as conservative and static? Might a close reading from the lens of quotation contribute to establishing the conditions of possibility for projecting other urban futures, or even the return of that promised modern eclectic sensibility of the city as museum Rowe and Koetter allude to? Only time will tell.
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Abstract
This paper postulates that composition strategies propounded in Colin Rowe (1920-1999) and Fred Koetter’s (1938-2017) Collage City illustrate a form of quotation at the scale of the urban precinct and composite building. The paper demonstrates that three kinds of quotation are at work: quotation as literal citation, as replication of form generation principles, and as evocation of architectural character chiefly by means of the park as city image. The paper suggests that a close analysis of Collage City will add to our understanding of the concept and device of quotation in terms of the aesthetics of urban scale composition. The paper also postulates that certain secondary readings have misread Collage City or at best not done it full justice in claiming the book advocates the common, the permanent, and the stable. The paper suggests that closer analysis of the text, the iconographic support, and student work undertaken under Rowe’s direction in the Cornell University graduate urban design studio demonstrate an aesthetic sensibility, a mind set, and a studio practice that is all about action, change, and movement. Collage City, student work completed under Rowe at Cornell, and contemporaneous writing comprise primary source material for the research. Key secondary literature – Baird, Biraghi, Cooper, Hurtt, Middleton, Ockman, Ortelli, Secchi, Tschumi – is referenced and for select works differences in point of view and finding briefly discussed. The paper makes a contribution of scholarship on the ideas and influence of Rowe and Koetter’s thinking and Rowe’s teaching on architectural discourse revealing a generative potential largely ignored in secondary literature to date, adds to studies of twentieth-century architectural education, and addresses aspects of the 2017 SAHANZ conference theme of quotation.
Introduction

To us [Freud] is no more a person
Now but a whole climate of opinion.
W. H. Auden, “In Memory of Sigmund Freud”

If we assign *Collage City* to the place of Freud and extrapolate, Auden’s phrase becomes: *Collage City* is today no more a thing but a whole climate of opinion. And accepting this opening volley as at least provocative and consistent with the authors’ own description of their text as explorative – it was a question for Rowe and Koetter of an ‘essay’ and not a book² - then giving Auden the task of providing an epigraph to this paper may begin to make sense. For treating *Collage City* as a ‘climate of opinion’ allows us to treat it not as closed, hard, and hermetic but rather as sponge-like in its capacity to absorb and deflect things that have gone on around it since its publication. This also to a degree mimics the specific character and underlying sensibilities of the book along with the other manifestations of Rowe’s temperament and those of his students surrounding it over those same years.

*Collage City* has occupied an odd place in the architectural imaginary over the more than four decades since it’s initial and highly abbreviated 1975 publication in *The Architectural Review*.³ Accepting the gambit of this year’s SAHANZ conference, an examination of *Collage City* from the lens of quotation, as both composition strategy and concept, seems timely and may reveal aspects of the text little considered to date.

I begin with two propositions. The first, primary proposition is that the composition strategies propounded in *Collage City* illustrate a kind of quotation at the scale of the urban precinct and composite building. A second proposition follows the first: that certain secondary readings have misread *Collage City* or at best not done it full justice in claiming the book advocates the common, the permanent, and the stable. Within the limits of this paper I will only sketch out the elements of a response to the latter, while devoting the majority of what follows to the first proposition, reading *Collage City* as setting out quotation strategies for architectural-urban composition.

In trying to come to grips with the devices and ideas of *Collage City* and their potential reach as strategies of urbanistic collage, one quickly discovers the need to equally examine student work from Rowe’s contemporaneous teaching practice. As Rowe writes when reflecting on it some twenty years later, *Collage City* is extensively about ‘the content of [the Cornell urban design] course’.⁴

Under Rowe, and over a twenty-five year period (1963-1988), the graduate urban design studio at Cornell University took urban scale elements as the site of invention and of intervention. The formal development of the city was its field of investigation and an attitude of flexible responses deeply informed by knowledge of the immediate and more distant past and a certain confidence in the architect’s limits to control the future an underpinning philosophy. A founding hypothesis informed at a basic level all of the studio work, that of the integration – dynamic, antagonistic, dialectical - of the traditional city and the modern city: the city of solids and the city of voids according to Rowe. The design studio was distinguished by a series of relevant architectural-urban problems, an attitude loosely defined as contextualism, and a method of design based on a belief that a constant oscillation between, as Rowe wrote later, ‘the present and the past, between the empirical and the ideal, between the contingent and the abstract’.⁵ For Rowe this was the only valid and responsible manner to deal with the city at least within the setting of a university architecture-urban design studio.

Four Clusters: Scholarly Context

Let me return to the second proposition, and the claim that certain critical and historical interpretations of *Collage City* and the Cornell graduate urban design studio under Rowe and their respective architectural-urban composition theories is limited and thus worthy of re-examination. Where such
effort has been made, the point of view has been generally descriptive or anecdotal as distinguished from the analytic and thematic viewpoint of this paper. Such secondary literature can be organised chronologically in four clusters each roughly a decade apart. The first cluster appears in the decade after Collage City’s publication and is dominated by former students of Rowe. This includes essays by Stuart Cohen, Wayne W. Cooper, William Ellis, Steven Hurtt, D. B. Middleton, Thomas Schumacher, and Grahaem Shane. A second period is clustered some twenty years later in the mid 1990’s as Rowe retired from teaching and a spate of essays appears in the spirit of a festschrift. This includes a full issue of ANY in 1994 and essays by George Baird (1997) and Joan Ockman (1998). In the mid 2000s, the third decade, Rowe generally and Collage City specifically are revealed as important influences on a generation of European architects in particular, accepting the acts of an international conference held in March 2008 in Venice at the Istituto universitario d’architettura di Venezia (IUAV) as dispositive. Some thirty years after Collage City, nearly half of those included in conference proceedings chose to take on the Rowe and Koetter book as their main interlocutor. Closest to us, a collection of ten essays on Rowe was published in 2015 and of these a third directly engage with the ideas and impact of Collage City. Select texts from this secondary literature are returned to in part three of this paper as a way to frame a further, larger study.

Research Material

In order to approach the paper’s primary proposition, architectural-urban composition strategies and devices propounded by Rowe’s students and by Rowe and Koetter’s Collage City will be examined across two primary sources. The first is the book itself as published in 1978, though I will also refer in certain instances to the partial 1975 publication in The Architectural Review. The second source is studio work undertaken in the Cornell graduate urban design studio under Rowe’s direction starting in the Fall semester 1963. Though Rowe continued to teach on and off until 1988, in what follows references will be limited to studio work which is clustered around the writing and publication of the book, thus from the late 1960s to the early 1980s. This limitation is partially practical and partially strategic, as a larger study would be needed to include the full spectrum of work. I also will not be examining the relation between earlier writings predating Collage City and the potential influence and transformation such ideas might have undergone as a consequence of Rowe’s teaching practice. Certainly worth interrogation, such topics will have to await staging into a larger project.

Studio materials related to student work completed at Cornell were sourced from available academic publications and are relatively comprehensive and representative of the work from the multi-decade studio. Out of some one hundred and fifty studio projects recorded under Rowe’s supervision, fifty were surveyed and, as will be seen in section two below and in the conference presentation, some dozen touching on specific kinds of quotation used in the development of this paper.

Analysis

Collage City is bracketed front and back by two approaches to urbanistic collage as quotation: David Giffin and Hans Kolhoff’s city of composite presence opens the book in a double-page spread that confronts in an imaginary city the Villa Adriana, the Strada Nuova Genoa, Palazzo Farnese, Pergamon, and the Uffizi among others; an illustrated list of ‘stimulants’, from memorable streets to precinct or city-scale gardens to be cited whole or in part provides a concluding Excursus. These two approaches can be taken as a shorthand framing of a range of quotation strategies. Within that set up, and from an analysis of Collage City and student work, three kinds of quotation can be identified: first, quotation as direct citation (a literal imposition or collage of a building or building group onto a site); second, the referencing of planning and design principles from an exemplary work into a project; third, the quotation via direct references to parks into precinct or city-scale conditions. The analysis also reveals that these kinds of quotation find resonance in the urban design studio problems at Cornell. A limited number of studio problems recur: grid and fragment studies largely explored at the scale of the street and block plan and frequently the result of grid collisions or grid extensions;
infill, connection, or completion problems, taken on at the scale of the composite building with solutions replicating or quoting planning and design strategies from the past; and overall city-wide field or mapping studies that may include open spaces of various kinds employing water, plazas, and parterres as ordering devices which reference parks from architecture’s past.

In what follows I describe and illustrate examples of each, recognizing that often *Collage City* and studio work blur the boundaries of these artificial categories.

**Citation**

**Figure 1.** Citing Asplund: Steven. Peterson, 48th Street, Westside Manhattan, 1969 (Cornell Journal of Architecture, 2 (1983), 102).

A first kind of quotation is evident as a form of literal citation, where form is directly adopted or overlain. This is direct citation of a building or building group from architecture’s past, whether recent or a more distant past. It often is used in conditions of grid extension or grid collision in the studio work. Griffin and Kolhof’s city of composite presence is one example. *Collage City*’s Excursus provides a catalogue of some fifty ‘stimulants’ which the authors suggest can be seen as quotable exemplars or ‘possible *objets trouvés* in the urbanistic collage’ of an imaginary city. As additional demonstration of this quotation temperament at work, seven illustrated categories of such quotable material are provided: memorable streets, stabilizers, potentially interminable set pieces, splendid public terraces, ambiguous and composite buildings, nostalgia producing instruments, and the garden.

The provocation to literally quote such exemplars can be seen at work in a number of student projects. In the studio project for 48th street on New York’s west side, for example, Steven Peterson directly cites Gunnar Asplund’s 1922 project for the Royal Chancellery, Stockholm (Figure 1). At a larger scale, Le Corbusier’s *redents* are cited by Thomas Schumacher in the latter’s plan for an extension to South Amboy. Other examples of citation in the studio work include David Griffin’s 1979 project for Montreal in which he directly inserts the plan for the Palais Royal into the site; or Jerri Smith’s 1981 project for the Cincinnati Waterfront that includes elements from the Piazza Augusto Imperatore of Rome.

**Form Generation Principles**

A second form of quotation is evident as a replication of form generation principles. The composite building, both in *Collage City* and in the Cornell studio work, provides a frequent display of this kind of quotation at work. The major ambition of *Collage City* to a degree is about identifying urban scale planning principles and architectural-urban devices which can be cited or referenced into specific
conditions. This form of implied and explicit quotation of form-generation strategies runs throughout the text and finds its purest rendition in the composite building. The Quirinale and Manica Lunga, Rome, the Palais Royal and Louvre of the Plan Turgot for Paris, and the Hofburg, Vienna, are examples of this: buildings which both shape space and are shaped by it. Composite buildings are two-faced.


The composite building, in other words, is a building that attaches to the surrounding building fabric, sponsoring figural voids and solids that in turn provide and stabilise spatial energies. It serves as demonstration of an ambiguity in buildings that both occupy space and define it, ones that construct both positive figure and positive ground. In terms closer to us, they are responses that reveal traits of both event and field. ¹⁷

In the Cornell studios, infill and hinge or connection conditions were recurrent problem types that benefitted from this kind of quotation. In these, Rowe and his students developed over time a move from those linear buildings so loved by the moderns to what he came to call composite buildings. These function for Rowe and Koetter as noted above to both define edges, enclose space, and at the same time evolve into objects of focus for an established or extended texture. The engagement with texture and context on the one hand and the development of city-scale elements of focus on the other reveal specific characteristics of this kind of dialectic maintained in tension.

In studio projects developed for the Providence Capital District studios, for example, one can see a full range of urban scale problems including loss of spatial definition, small to large scale, foreground to background. Two solutions for the capital complex provide an illustration of the use of this kind of quotation. Middleton deploys an exemplary mix of devices: figural void, verdure as space definer, closure, and hierarchy following the Roman Imperial fora of *Collage City* (Figure 2). This can be contrasted with Bostick’s slightly earlier project also for Providence that seems to quote from Van Eesteren’s proposal for the Unter den Linden, Berlin, and a Regent-like park figure: regular void, linear space-shaping buildings.

Fong’s thesis for Marlybone Rail Station from the same years contains similar elements and further evidence of the kind of internal quotation and self-referentiality that distinguishes the 1980 post *Collage City* studios. Fong’s solution to the Marlybone studio is a particularly elegant example of the both figure and ground aim which deployed the repetition as citation of design principles. ¹⁸
Park as Paradigm

![Figure 3. Completion and extension of an existing city as 18th c park. Firenze Interrotta, Studio Projects (1980): Proposed plan, Axonometric: New Quarter Del Prato (The Cornell Journal of Architecture, 2 (1983), 133).]

The third kind of quotation at work in Collage City and in student work is that in which the park is referenced as the paradigm for formal decisions as well as evocation of urban character. Collage City is explicit about the potential of the garden model. It appears early in the text and occupies a prominent place in the Excursus: this is quotation as forming architectural character by means of the park as model and as city image. To take only the most evident, the gardens of Chantilly, Verneuil, and the Park Monceau are constants in Collage City and underlay the thinking at work.

Student projects illustrate this kind of quotation, with the garden problem at the scale of the precinct or compact city appearing with regular frequency especially in the later years. Baltimore, Berlin, Florence, London and Rome provided the material for much of the studio work in this period, and the group project was not uncommon. Infill may be the most easily legible term, but a close study of the student work on the Berlin plan (Figure 5) or the Florence plan (Figure 3), for example, reveals a now mature deployment of this approach to the city as park and the productive potential of a quotation strategy. The Cornell studio’s counter proposal to Guiseppe Poggi’s plan of 1865 for Florence exemplifies this, with the overall city view taken in order to resolve the irregular and confusing medieval texture surrounding the centre. The size and shape of the proposed blocks in the Poggi plan are replaced by other types to more consistently follow a park model.

Conclusion - Strategies

I have too briefly analysed Collage City and student work of the Cornell graduate urban design studio as an approach to the proposition that composition strategies propounded in the book illustrate a kind of quotation at the scale of the urban precinct and composite building. Three kinds of quotation have been identified, each displaying a range of architectural-urban composition strategies. The first is a kind of literal quotation where works are inserted into a project site. A second form is quotation as citing a composition device or design principle from one of the many paradigms that circulated around Collage City and in Rowe’s Cornell studio. Key projects mined for their design principles include Le Corbusier’s redents in the master plan for Antwerp, the Villa Adriana, and the Vienna Hofburg. A third kind of quotation is seen in Rowe and Koetter’s approach to restore or retain utopian poetics through aesthetic fragments organised most frequently in versions of the city as 18th c park. In As I was Saying, Rowe illustrates other student projects from Rome in the same years that also deploy this kind of quotation.
The differences across the kinds of quotation are both evident and subtle. The scale of investigation is the most visible. Citation tends to be at the scale of the individual building or public space. Replication of planning and design principles appears in studios or conditions calling for the group plan or composite building. The park paradigm is quoted at precinct or citywide problems. An attitude toward context varies, as does the underlying assumption about autonomy. At a different scale and in a different realm, Rowe and Koetter’s deployment of figure/field relationships passes through a filter or is indexed against cubistic composition devices not only in plan but spatially, which endeavour to realize an ‘and-and’ (as different from an either or) condition. Collage City’s field of inquiry can be seen to be simultaneously context based – whether Baltimore and London, or Rome and Manhattan – and deeply engaged with architecture’s future by a parallel confrontation with architecture’s past and an openness to the potential in concepts and ideas from other realms.

A range of composition strategies as variations on urbanistic collage is at work in Collage City, thus providing some demonstration of the validity of the first proposition. The lens of quotation, along with a working taxonomy of citation, application of planning and design principles, and city as park provide a grill of terms for organising a reading of the various city manifestations in Rowe and Koetter’s book. The question across city-ideas discussed in Collage City is open: the city of composite presence that opens the text is certainly one synthetic image of urbanistic collage: collision city and collage city seem interchangeable at least from this survey. Perhaps museum city deserves a temporary consideration as too little examined and one to be returned to in the closing notes below.

Second Proposition, Secondary Literatures
In the introduction it was suggested that secondary literature around Collage City can be organised chronologically in four clusters each roughly a decade apart. I also proposed that certain secondary readings have not done full justice to the text, its internal ambiguities, and its more loose as opposed to more static and fixed aesthetic preferences. In what follows a single text from each decade-long cluster is taken to stand for the period as an opening approach to the claim of too restricted an interpretation. A future study will be needed to expand on and test these preliminary comments.

Former students of Rowe mark the first cluster in the decade after Collage City’s publication. Hurtt’s 1983 essay can stand as one example, and certainly one of the most subtle. Still close to the Cornell lessons, Hurtt is rare in evoking a complex provenance and destiny for the studio ideas. If perhaps too enamoured with the synthetic cubism analogy, he does find in the end ‘a beauty less stable, less perfect, more dynamic, more irresolute’ in the Rowe and Koetter position worth further exploring.

In ANY Magazine’s 1994 thematic issue Form Work: Colin Rowe, a number of the articles reference Collage City. Stan Allen’s nimble take on the Rowe sensibility suggests perhaps that the city ideas remain at the plane of the connoisseur and that the building ideas contain all the sophistication. A longer engagement would no doubt reveal more nuanced potential while recognising the strength the differences can add.

Architecture as text and Colin Rowe as figure: thus implies the title of a collection of papers originating from a March 2008 conference held in Venice. Some thirty years after Collage City a surprising number as noted above take on Rowe and Koetter’s Collage City as protagonist. Looking at only one essay as an example, Ortelli notes the book’s deep reliance on dialectical pairs that Ortelli suggests removes Rowe and Koetter from a more cinematic point of view. This dialectics reliance might prove worth further scrutiny as shaping the Collage City message.

Bernard Tschumi’s contribution to a collection of essays published in 2015 provides a final example. Rowe and Koetter’s collage I believe is much more slippery, more fluid then certain readings have allowed and a close reading may reveal greater capacity in the quotation strategy of urbanistic
collage. This is perhaps especially evident as related to the question of the accommodation of change over time. Tschumi’s comments differ markedly from this and though he qualifies his comments he finds the book on the side of the conservative:

‘It is my contention that if Rowe and Koetter so carefully avoided any mention of the cinema and resorted instead to a painterly analogy, it is because their argument is based upon a deeply embedded belief that architecture and the city are the embodiment of permanence and stasis. Collage, in the mind of Rowe, is about space. Montage [following Eisenstein], as conceived in film, is about space and time’.  

Back to Rowe and Koetter: at the end of the chapter Collage City and the Reconquest of Time they advocate a different interpretation of collage as incorporating time in addition to space and structure, a position that challenges Tschumi’s interpretation. They can thus stand in defence of their position in a retrospective response.

because collage is a method deriving its virtue from its irony, because it seems to be a technique for using things and simultaneously disbelieving in them, it is also a strategy which can allow utopia to be dealt with as image, to be dealt with in fragments without our having to accept it in toto, which is further to suggest that collage could even be a strategy which, by supporting the utopian illusion of changelessness and finality, might even fuel a reality of change, motion, action and history.

If we give Rowe and Koetter the last word, they do provide a counter argument to the claim of static thinking further rendered in the text and perhaps in the iconographic support and certainly in the published studio work that came out of Rowe’s Cornell studio. This is further demonstration of the need for, and potential, in additional research around these themes and the debates and ideas contained in the secondary literature.

Notes on Museum City
The notion of the city as museum is introduced in the final chapter of Collage City. It emerges without fanfare and little elaboration as another manifestation of the city idea alongside but different from the city of composite presence, collision city, and collage city. It suggests for Rowe and Koetter, I would argue, a potential model that provides capacity for both fabric and object, the open and the critical in a state which privileges neither the new city of the moderns nor the traditional city. From such an interpretation, maybe museum city designates a physical configuration and a mental state better approximating the Rowe-Koetter ideal if you will, one beyond or at least different from collage city. If not used as a title for the book, it is perhaps because the authors realized how unpalatable such a title would be. In any case it can certainly serve to lead into a provisional conclusion for this paper.

One can see the attraction of the museum as city model, the term allowing the introduction of a series of couples that find resolution in tension and constructive ambiguity not opposition. These terms, all somehow rendering Rowe and Koetter’s city, include scaffold and exhibition, necessity and freedom, structure and event, museum fabric and museum content, field and object.

At the end of the chapter Crisis of the Object: Predicament of Texture, Rowe and Koetter provide a useful synthesis of composition strategies that characterize the city of immanent presence as the place of sustained debate between the new city and it’s object fixation as exemplified by Le Corbusier’s St Dié, and the old city and it’s space fixation as rendered in Parma. These strategies include cross-breeding, assimilation, distortion, challenge/response, imposition, superposition, and conciliation. These all reference the city as museum and the imperative to acknowledge movement and time in urban scale planning. A general temperament in favour of action and change was certainly in the air at the time of Collage City’s publication if we accept the comments that preface The
Architecture Review publication. The anonymous author to that preface cautions against too unreflective a deployment of the collision strategy foregrounded in the article the reader is to confront. Above all, the author recommends in terms of the aesthetic problems of city planning that one embrace the pleasure of the incomplete, the partial, and the kind of collision which preserves as opposed to destroys, the mutually colliding parts adopting a practice of ‘fruitful collisions’, perhaps another kind of quotation.30

From the above notes, a conclusion in the form of two final questions for subsequent investigation can be posed: Does Collage City herald as Rowe and Koetter suggest in the book’s last chapter a return to modern utopian poetics without the utopian politics where the latter is understood as conservative and static? Might a close reading from the lens of quotation contribute to establishing the conditions of possibility for projecting other urban futures, or even the return of that promised modern eclectic sensibility of the city as museum Rowe and Koetter allude to? Only time will tell.
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