Borromini, Piranesi, Tafuri
Historical memory and programmatic uncertainty

Andrew Leach
Wellington Institute of Technology & Ghent University

This paper considers Manfredo Tafuri's writing on two important Baroque *progettisti*: Borromini (1599-1667) and Piranesi (1720-1778). Both architects figure prominently in Tafuri's bibliography; essays on Borromini dominate his early historical scholarship. Within the numerous possible readings of their critical relationship, the paper is concerned with how Tafuri understands their respective positions toward 'evidence' of the past. In *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968), Tafuri retraces an 'eclipse of history' extending from the introduction of an abstract representation of classical culture in the Florentine *quattrocento* to the contemporary historicism and 'new objectivity' of his own moment. Therein, both Borromini and Piranesi acquire status as figures whose practice resists abstractions upholding the reconstructed classical tradition. Borromini's wild formal digressions into Rome's antique and medieval past constitute a challenge to the classical language as one proper to Christendom. Likewise, Piranesi's archaeologically informed vision of a fragmented and resistant past celebrates the magnificence of 'Ancient Rome' as a contradictory canvas spanning five centuries. Tafuri's analyses of projects by these two architects belie a great deal of his own concerns about architecture's capacity to operate critically with respect of historical abstractions translated into architectural theory. Tafuri's readings of Borromini and Piranesi, the paper demonstrates, reflect his appropriation of Walter Benjamin's mimetic and operative figures from *Das Kunstwerk* (1936) to the ends of a discourse on architecture's confrontation with the 'equipment' of history. It shows how Borromini and Piranesi, for Tafuri, embody a programmatic uncertainty towards the past and ambivalence towards the future that corresponds with those twentieth century figures Tafuri would call the undecided: neither avant-garde nor blindly bound by tradition, but who feel the difficulty of their historicity. This, Tafuri positions as an historical stance, turning away from the future, but bound by a condition of representation.

- -

This paper describes the theoretical framework for a detailed consideration of Manfredo Tafuri's critico-historical relationships with Francesco Borromini (1599-1667) and Giovan Battista Piranesi (1720-1778). Tafuri accords these two subjects sustained attention over distinct moments of his academic life, utilising the commemorative *anno borrominiano* of 1967 and the *anno piranesiano* of 1978 as foci, and both inform his thinking on the nature of historical memory and on the status of historical knowledge in architectural culture.[1] Set within an investigation into Tafuri's thought on the confrontation of the past with its representation as history and about the historian's role in architectural culture that his readings of Borromini and Piranesi acquire importance above other individuals whom he treats at length.[2] A theme common to his reading of both *progettisti* is their confrontation with the disciplinary perspectives that Tafuri assigns architects (operativity) and historians (criticality). What does an historian learn, Tafuri asks of Borromini and Piranesi, from an architect who looks towards the past without seeking its activation in the future? In one sense, this question implicates Tafuri's argument for the historian's place in architectural culture, one largely reflective of his own entry into history from a form of architectural practice concerned principally with the city. However, in broader terms it introduces two historical examples of architects whose 'projects' might be regarded as historical rather than architectural, and who thus might better equip us for considering what Vittorio Gregotti's *Casabella* once called 'il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri.'[3]

In Tafuri's account of history's 'eclipse' in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968), the architect's artistic emancipation follows the rise of architectural theory, which justifies architectural production in terms circumscribed by historical representation.[4] Accepting that architects assume individual stances towards the 'equipment' of the past, Tafuri borrows two abstract figures from Benjamin: 'magician' and 'operator'.[5] Where Benjamin writes of either mimetic or operative approaches towards the 'equipment' of modernity, Tafuri adapts their basic attributes in articulating two strategies open to architects in their approach towards the past as 'equipment'. Tafuri distinguishes between the past *per se* and its mediation as 'history'; history, he argues, is abstractly available to architectural practice as architectural theory, thus 'projected' into the future. Tafuri introduces *Teorie e storia* by showing the classical tradition as a burdensome historical reconstruction, indexing antiquity without recourse to rigour or experience. As it extends from the *quattrocento* through subsequent centuries, Tafuri observes the emulation, elaboration or subversion of a

'classical' architectural knowledge. Such 'mannerists' as Romano, Sansovino and Palladio remind architecture of its extra-traditional past, engaging with the mechanisms of historical representation. While they demonstrate the capacity of architects to move beyond the prescribed bounds of tradition to test the validity of those same limits, they stop short of transgressing disciplinary boundaries by conducting an historical, rather than architectural, practice. Borromini and Piranesi, by contrast, show how historical knowledge might surpass its theoretical constraints; on this basis, they provoke Tafuri to reflect upon his own practice as an historian.

Borromini and Piranesi thus introduce a disciplinary conundrum. They are architects; their outlook, utopian (a disciplinary idea bound up in the 'project'). How, then, do they conceive of the past when confronting the theoretical structures that translate their historical knowledge into utopian constructions? Tafuri again questions Borromini and Piranesi: how can an architect understand the past as an historian, rejecting utopian tendencies while maintaining the disciplinary media that necessitates architects mediated treatment of history? He presents a third way between operative and mimetic practices: '*gli indecisi*' ('the undecided'), torn by knowing the past as historians, but compelled to pursue the representational strategies of the architect.[6] This observation appears off-hand in the pages of *Teorie e storia*, one sentence within a complicated theoretical case. Yet his introduction of 'indecision' as a potential stance relative to historical 'equipment', neither 'operativity' nor 'mimesis', raises the question of its broader function. If the 'project' is a site for 'seeing' the future from the present, and if Borromini and Piranesi eschew the utopian dimensions of architectural practice by exposing and negating the functions of architectural theory, then their examples offer Tafuri important insights into the tools and tasks of the architectural historian. Tafuri never declares as much, but Borromini and Piranesi are archetypically 'undecided': they understand the fragile nature of historical representation while insisting upon an architectural practice that upholds the utopian conditions of representation. In so doing, they confront the tendency of theoretical devices towards the homogenisation of historical knowledge with the means of their own disturbance.

Borromini, history and historians

Borromini figures prominently in Tafuri's early historiographical bibliography, his critical writings on this architect coinciding with what he later characterised as a turn towards history, away from architecture.[7] Even putting the nature of that 'decision' to one side, his published papers in the middle 1960s, anticipating and then marking the tercentenary of Borromini's death, are clearly written in an attempt to claim some place in the Italian field of (then) contemporary architectural historiography. His first scientific article, on Borromini's drawings for the Palazzo Carpagna, appears in the *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura* (1967).[8] This is the first of Tafuri's writings

on Borromini that do not bear a clear secondary agenda implicating either historiographical practice (at the level of theory, rather than practice), or Tafuri's relationship with other contemporary historians. Instead, a series of short critical articles restate the concerns evident in *Teorie e storia* with specific reference to Borromini: two essays in the Roman journal *Palatino* (1966, 1967); two essay-length contributions to the published symposium *Studi sul Borromini* at the Accademia nazionale di San Luca; and an article in *Comunità*, 'Borromini e il problema della storia' (1965).[9] Tafuri returns to Borromini, and many of these articles, in his 1978-1979 seminar course at IUAV. He commences the seminar with a new text, 'Francesco Borromini e la crisi dell'universo umanistico' (1978), which makes an implicit claim upon his research and writing on Borromini as an advancement of the themes of *Teorie e storia*, wherein the disciplinary distinction between history and architecture is fundamental.[10]

Portoghesi provides Tafuri an early opportunity to cement his disciplinary claim upon architectural history. His 'Borromini e il problema della storia' begins with an analysis of Portoghesi's edition of the 1725 *Opus Architectonicum* and *Borromini nella cultura europa* (1964).[11] Tafuri had already vilified Portoghesi and Zevi for the 'historical deformations' pervading their exhibition 'Michelangelo architetto' (1964).[12] Portoghesi, he argues, extends this 'operative' criticism to Borromini, namely that his 'mannered' approach to the classical tradition justifies the more playful possibilities open to modern architecture. Tafuri acknowledges that no other architect has understood so well as Borromini the 'lessons' of Buonarroti, but writes that Portoghesi offers no new conclusions to the 'problema borrominiano', simply identifying those elements of Borromini's 'poetical world' and of his 'commitment' that justifies his construction of the tormented 'modern architect'.[13] Tafuri's disagreements with Portoghesi echo quibbles with Frey, Garroni and Argan; they, too, frame Borromini as a foreground to the present.[14] However, while Portoghesi follows several of Argan's cues, establishing a tension between freedom and order in Borromini expressed in symbols and in "*fantasmi di passioni*", Tafuri suggests that he programmatises Borrominian poetics within a substantially more problematic historiography.[15] Tafuri subjects each of the figures dominating Borromini's tercentenary to a disciplinary 'temple-clearing', principally Portoghesi, Argan and (more tangentially) Zevi.[16] He targets less the historical arguments than the historians who make them, whose 'corrupt' presence dominate a field he now patently regards as his own. Importantly, the lessons Tafuri identifies in Borromini's practice pertain to the historian, not the architect.

Borromini predicates his 'break' with tradition upon a rigorous exploration of the past referenced in the codified classical tradition.[17] Tafuri frames as 'experience' Borromini's 'unmediated' engagement with knowledge, the past, mathematics, symbols, etc., in order to undertake "a fascinating voyage of memory."[18] He argues that Borromini posits a clear distinction between tradition

and its equipment in terms corresponding to Benjamin's; Borromini's architectural practice thus constitutes an 'experience of history'. Thus the 'historical fragments' of the villa Pamphili; medieval and humanist sepulchral monuments in S. Giovanni Laterano; 'Albertian' memories in the interior of S. Carlino; gothic motifs in the fabric of the Oratorio dei Filipini; 'repressed memories' of Imperial Rome in the superficial interplay of concavity and convexity in S. Carlino and S. Andrea delle Fratte. For Tafuri, Borromini regards "architecture as continual and polyphonic narration, concrete in its complex compositions of autonomous and correlating parts."[19] He exchanges a 'religione della trascendenza' over a 'religione dell'umano', paying careful attention to the "history of man, of nature, of things," in which 'facts' divest themselves of meaning to become 'profound mundanities'.[20] Borromini's historiographical value to Tafuri lies in his broader reception of antiquity and in the terms of his activation of antiquity in the present. At stake is the antecedence of the ancient world; Borromini confronts both this claim and the terms of its pursuit by accessing that world through the indexical capacity of archaeological fragments from a complex past. The difference between narrative tradition and 'fragment' is that between 'myth' and 'knowledge': for Tafuri, the domain of historical practice.

History as image, past as disturbance

Central to Tafuri's writing on Piranesi over the course of the 1970s is an essay only slightly modified during this decade. It first appeared in Angelus Novus (1971), then L'architecture d'aujourd'hui (1974) and finally as '«L'architetto scellerato»,' the opening chapter of La sfera e il labirinto (1980).[21] La sfera e il labirinto also 'recovers' and problematises Eisenstein's claim upon Piranesi's legacy for avant-garde visuality, exposing its difficulties as an historiographic abstraction and activating it as an agent for the historicisation of the avant-garde.[22] Piranesi appears, too, in Teorie e storia as Borromini's inheritor; as well, in Progetto e utopia (1969, 1973), Tafuri introduces the Campo Marzio in demonstration of the tension between the plan and its 'realities', one of the central themes of this text.[23] For the anno piranesiano of 1978, marking the bicentenary of Piranesi's death, Tafuri contributed the paper 'Borromini e Piranesi' to Piranesi tra Venezia e l'Europa (Venice, 1978), included in his 1978-1979 Borromini seminar at IUAV.[24] This timing is interesting. Tafuri's 'Storia dell'architettura IIa' seminar treated Borromini in 1978-1979, then Piranesi in 1979-1980, during a time when Tafuri was returning to a series of texts concerned with the relation of language, myth, ideology and theory, on one side, to evidence of reality as a represented condition on the other. He introduces this reflection with 'Il «progetto» storico', presenting the historian's media and material as poles within a dialectical condition concerned at once with 'utopia' and its negative. Borromini, but Piranesi more so, demonstrates the strained architectural claim made by the architect upon historical knowledge.

We can point towards three of Piranesi's architectural 'projects' that Tafuri absorbs as precedents to his own attempt to frame history as a 'project'. They are his archaeological study, Il Campo Marzio dell'Antica Roma (1762, begun in the mid-1750s); the fictional dialogue between Protopiro and Didascalo, the Parere su l'architettura (1765); and his altar for S. Maria del Priorato (1764-1766). These projects, drawn from a small span of years in the 1760s, hardly represent the entirety of Piranesi's complex and intriguing œuvre, from which other complementary examples arise. A fundamental theme in Tafuri's treatment of Piranesi works is the tension between the documentation of the past as image and the tendency of all images to index values that inflect, in turn, the nature of what they represent. This is at once a critical observation and a metaphor for the deeper 'problem' of the representation as history of the past, rendered serviceable to architectural theory as historical evidence in support of images projected forwards into the future. However, Tafuri disagrees with Eisenstein that Piranesi 'sees the future'; he projects nothing forwards, while accepting image as a medium for representing the past.

In Campo Marzio, Piranesi makes this manifest in a tension between the presentation of artefact and Rome's reconstruction through the superimposition of fragments that together describe a homogeneous Roma antichità by piling up disparate fragments describing several hundred years' worth of accumulated and conflicting past. Piranesi's Rome is a self-defeating image, archaeology at once unlocking the past and subverting its knowledge as representation: an 'epic battle' "waged by architecture against itself."[25] Tafuri regards the monuments of the Campo Marzio as fragments without order, parole senza linguaggio; conversely, they resist that which 'acts upon the world' in order to bring it to order. Piranesi reduces those known sites of the Campo to "minor, almost unrecognisable incidents … inserted into a continuum of fragments."[26] Deprived of both autonomy and status, Piranesi challenges the 'reader' of his work to contemplate "just how vast [is] the field of these exceptions." The logical extension of this principle is the reduction of all monuments, which by definition index value, to fragments, thus rendering them equally meaningless. Piranesi thus argues against the privileged place of architecture in the city, of building as differentiated from context, and critiques the "breathless pursuit of exceptional structures."[27] Tafuri shows that Campo Marzio is simultaneously projective and denunciatory, "a disenchanted documentation".[28]

If the Rome of Campo Marzio is a site of disenchantment, Piranesi's dismissal of the ultimate precedence of Greece in the Parere su l'architettura extends that disenchantment to all historical abstractions.[29] The fictional Didascalo justifies Piranesi's 'caprice' to his older counterpart, Protopiro, who locates architecture's origins in 'nature' and who rigorously calls for the omission of all ornament and frivolousness superfluities relative to an original Architecture. Roman baroque offends the legacy of Greece the closest approximation to architecture's

origins. M. Mariette, and Protopiro in turn, characterise 'contemporary' architecture as the final consequences of fantasy run amok. Piranesi exposes the fallacies of this rigorist view, demonstrating that the full implications of this position results in the deconstruction of historical images. Protopiro, as a protagonist seeking change in the present, enters Piranesi's debate with programmatic intentions. Didascalo, while demonstrating the necessity of freedom of design, destroys the notion of truth applied to historical 'fact' while eschewing the temptation to propose his own image of the future.

This 'agonising dialectic', Tafuri suggests, is shared by the altar at Santa Maria del Priorato: "narrative, didactic and caustically late-Baroque—facing the public; abstract, anti-descriptive, and of haunting Illuminist symbolism—at the back, where a naked sphere is embraced by a geometrical solid figure, in a sort of allegory of the already achieved *eclipse of the sacred*."[30] The altar's basic structure consists of two parallel sarcophagi, upon which rests a third. Above the third is a sphere, atop which is a sculptural depiction of the *Apotheosis of Saint Basil*, sculpted by Tommaso Righi. Piranesi reveals the duplicity of his composition on the sculpture's rear face: it describes the impossibility of recovering the past or of representing it except in the most arbitrary manner. And yet, Piranesi is at once compelled to represent the past and to know the impossibility of such a task. For this reason, he does not 'herald' the future: "When Ledoux, Boullée, Sobre, and Vaudoyer point out Piranesi's geometric silence, they will feel obligated to substitute for the ancient symbolism of transcendence a symbolism of man made sacred to himself."[31] The sphere upon which Piranesi depicts Saint Basil's apotheosis is immutable, precisely because it forms the lynchpin of a dialectical expression of the necessity for the past and the impossible distance of its knowledge. Yet the altar structure itself clearly shows that this 'truth' resides upon the repositories of the dead, upon the accumulation of the vast totality of past human experience. The sphere, instead of signifying this totality, comprises an inversion: it is the negation of everything, enveloped in platonic form. The sphere forms a highly charged symbol of the past as an irrecoverable burden, known in the present only in mediated terms. He nonetheless attempts its representation; Tafuri shares Piranesi's 'agonising dialectic'.

Indecision and historical practice

To return to 'indecision' as a principle of historical consciousness in architectural practice, Tafuri's identification of Piranesi's 'agonies' and Borromini's 'experience of history' constitute a dual lesson for his historical practice. To reiterate, the three examples Tafuri points towards, without elaboration, in reference to Benjamin's analogy of the painter and the operator in *Das Kunstwerk* (Bonatz, Fahrenkamp, Tessenow), are drawn from the uniform background of modern architects caught up in the uses made by the classical tradition by Nazi rhetoric. Further, the analogy has the specific function of identifying strategies by architects towards the 'equipment'

of the past. Restating this analogy for historical practice, we are now in a position to impose upon Tafuri a different scheme. On the one side, then, are the 'painters', those who mimetically repeat lessons from the past as operating principles for the present, reinvigorating history with a new life. These are Tafuri's operative critics, a tradition that (as we have written elsewhere) extends from the programmatic writings of Bellori to the devout advocacy that imbues the historical judgements of Zevi, Portoghesi and Giedion.[32] On the other, the operators, those who set aside the false consciousness of history and seek a direct engagement with the past. Archetypical of these is Tafuri himself. In the middle, we find those undecided, neither given over to the strategic representation of tradition in the present, nor sufficiently 'courageous' to set aside representation completely.

Piranesi and Borromini stand as good examples here, though they are not necessarily alone, for drawing Tafuri's attention as historical cases. They are architects (and thus fundamentally operative), but they turn aside from 'operative' modes for seeing the past. Their media remain central to architecture as a discipline: drawing, building, etching and the written treatise. Yet common to their work is a simultaneous fascination for the fragment and rejection of the tendency towards its rationalisation within historically recoverable systems. Within such rejection, it follows, lies the tendency to turn away from the future. For in exchanging for the classical tradition a vast accumulation of pasts, from which one can draw no sustainable rational logic except in theoretical discourse pertaining to architectural production, the future is neither obvious nor shaped by their work. Piranesi's sphere, as we have seen, is a declaration of the irrecoverability of the past; it sits in stark contrast alongside the declarations of rational (revolutionary) man's supremacy found in architecture within mere decades. Borromini's fragments, his exorcision of the medieval ghost, confrontation of the classical with antiquity, the elaboration of theoretical systems to their extreme ends: each looks both to the past and its representation. He predicates his experience of the former with the destruction of the latter. And yet both, through insight into the difficulty of representing the past remain 'operators'; they practice architecture as a basic disciplinary alignment. This tension, that of the 'undecided', is shared by Tafuri.

The historian, he acknowledges, knows the past as a fragmented construction, an accumulation of evidence from an ultimately irrecoverable milieu. However, the medium of historical practice implicates the construction of images, judgements, conclusions; this underpins the historians' writing of books and essays, curatorship of exhibitions. Tafuri identifies with Borromini and Piranesi in that they both, using rather different strategies, view representation in the mode of 'disenchanted documentation' (as he observes of Piranesi). He finds in their example a precedent for his resistance of the image, of rational historiographical structures and ultimately of history's utility to architectural theory and the future.

NOTES

1 This paper documents doctoral research at Ghent University, supervised by Professor Bart Verschaffel. A lengthier study (forthcoming, 2006) attends more closely to Tafuri's writing on Borromini and Piranesi.—Cf. Leach, 'Manfredo Tafuri and the Era of Historical Representation', *Architectural Theory Review*, 12, 1 (2005): 1-18; 'Choosing History: Tafuri, Criticality and the Limits of Architecture', *Journal of Architecture*, 10, 3 (2005): 235-244. This research is supported by the Flemish Funds for Scientific Research and the Belgian Historical Institute at Rome.

2 This list includes Leon Battista Alberti, Jacopo Sansovino, Giulio Romano, Francesco di Giorgio Martini, Vittorio Gregotti, Aldo Rossi, Carlo Scarpa, Peter Eisenman and Le Corbusier, among others. Omitting full references for brevity's sake, cf. Anna Bedon, Guido Beltramini and Pierre-Alain Croset, 'Una prima bibliografia / An initial bibliography', *Casabella*, 619-620 (1995): 170-175; Víctor Pérez Escolano, 'Manfredo Tafuri (1935-1994): Un ensayo de bibliographía', *Arquitectura*, 300 (1994): 90-94.

3 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' [special issue], *Casabella*, 619-620 (1995). Gregotti references Tafuri's 'Il "progetto" storico', *Casabella*, 429 (1977): 11-18, though he undermines the irony of Tafuri's use by removing the inverted commas around 'progetto'.

4 Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, Bari: Laterza, 1968, pp. 19-94.

5 Cf. Walter Benjamin, 'Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit', *Zeitschrift für Sozialfurschung*, V, 1 (1936); published in English as 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn, 1968, New York: Pimlico, 1970; Tafuri, *Teorie e storia*, pp. 46-49.

6 Tafuri, *Teorie e storia*, p. 49. He writes: "In mezzo sono gli indecisi, coloro che registrano le difficoltà insite in tale coraggiosi e radicale realismo."

7 Tafuri, 'History as Project: An interview [by Luisa Passerini] with Manfredo Tafuri [Rome, February-March 1992]', trans. Denise L. Bratton, et al., in I. De Sola-Morales (ed.), 'Being Manfredo Tafuri', *Architecture New York*, 25-26 (1999), p. 31.

8 Tafuri, 'Borromini in Palazzo Carpegna: Documenti inediti e ipotesi critiche', *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, XIV, 79-84 (1967): 85-107.

9 Tafuri, 'La poetica borrominiana: Mito, simbolo e ragione', *Palatino: Rivista romano di cultura*, X, 3-4 (1966): 184-193; Tafuri, 'Inediti borromiani', *Palatino*, XI, 3 (1967): 255-262; Tafuri, et al. (round-table discussion), 'Il metodo di progettazione del Borromini', in G. De Angelis d'Ossat (ed.), *Studi sul Borromini: Atti del convegno promosso dall'Accademia Nazionale di San Luca*, vol. 2, Rome: De Luca, 1967, pp. 5-34; Tafuri, et al. (roundtable discussion), 'Il rapporto tra Borromini e la tradizione', in De Angelis d'Ossat (ed.), *Studi sul Borromini*, vol. 2, pp. 35-70; Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia', *Comunità: Giornale mensile di politica e cultura*, 129 (1965), reprinted as 'Borromini e l'esperiza della storia', in Tafuri, 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIA', Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia, Istitutto universitario di architettura di Venezia, 1978, pp. 9-30.

10 Tafuri, 'Francesco Borromini e la crisi dell'universo umanistico', in 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIA' (1978).

11 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia', *Comunità* 129 (1965), reprinted in Tafuri, 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIa' (Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia, IUAV, 1978), p. 10; Paolo Portoghesi, *Borromini nella cultura europea* (Rome: Officina, 1964); Francesco Borromini, *Opus architectonicum*, edited by P. Portoghesi (1725, Rome: Elefante, 1964).

12 Paolo Portoghesi & Bruno Zevi, *Michelangelo architetto*, Turin: Einaudi, 1964.

13 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia', pp. 9-11.

14 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' p. 13.

15 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' p. 14.

16 Later, he adds several other historians to his list, scathingly dismissing the 'approfondimenti linguistici' of Portoghesi, the 'veementi "attualizzazione"' of Zevi, the 'letteratura iconologica' of Battisti, the 'structuralista' of Brandi and the "ricerche sugli echi borrominiani in Boemia' of Norberg-Shulz.—Tafuri, 'Inediti borrominiani,' p. 256.

17 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' p. 24.

18 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' p. 25 (my trans.).

19 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' pp. 25-26 (my trans.).

20 Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' p. 27 (my trans.).

21 Tafuri, 'G. B. Piranesi: L'architettura come «utopia negativa»', *Angelus Novus: Trimestrale di estetica e critica*, 20 (1971): 89-127; Tafuri, 'Giovan Battista Piranesi: L'utopie négative dans l'architecture', *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, 184 (March-April 1974): 93-108; Tafuri, '«L'architetto scellerato»', in *La sfera e il labirinto: Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70*, Turin: Einaudi, 1980, pp. 33-75.

22 We refer to Sergei Eisenstein, 'Piranesi, ili tekuꞷesꞷ form' (1946-1947), which appeared in *La sfera e il labirinto* as 'Piranesi o la fluidità delle forme', trans. Maria Fabris, pp. 89-110. Tafuri entitled his critical response 'Storicità dell'avanguardia: Piranesi e Ejzenštein' (pp. 7-88); it earlier appeared as 'The Dialectics of the Avant-Garde: Piranesi and Eisenstein', trans. Marlene Barsoum, *Oppositions*, 11 (Winter 1977): 72-80. This version appears rather different to the English version in *La sfera e il labirinto*, which we might attribute to two different translations of the same text,. Note that the latter essay includes a new opening paragraph and a more contextually conscious conclusion.—Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-gardes from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Barbara Luigi la Penta, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987. While these two smaller texts, Eisenstein's and Tafuri's response to Eisenstein, draw us away from the subject at hand, they raise important issues regarding Piranesi's capacity to project the future, though in less specific terms than other of Tafuri's writings.

23 Tafuri, *Progetto e utopia: Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico*, Bari: Laterza, 1973, pp. 16-20.

24 Tafuri, 'Borromini e Piranesi: La Città come «ordine infratto»,' in Alessandro Bettagno (ed.), *Piranesi tra Venexia e l'Europa: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio promossi dall'Istituto di storia dell'arte della Fondazione Giorgio Cini per il secondo centenario della morte di Gian Batista Piranesi, Venice, 13-15 October 1978*, Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1983, pp. 89-101; published under the same title in Tafuri, 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIa', Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia, IUAV, 1979, pp. 143-147. The two texts are virtually identical, with the rectification of some minor typographical errors distinguishing the 1979 publication from the 1983.

25 Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology', trans. Stephen Sartarelli [from 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica', *Contropiano* 2 (1969): 31-79], in K. Michael Hays (ed.), *Architecture Theory since 1968*, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998, p. 11.

26 Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 35.

27 Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 35.

28 Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 38.

29 Giovanni Battista Piranesi, *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Mariette; with Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Ancient Europe in Ancient Times*, trans. Caroline Beamish and David Britt [from *Osservazione sopra la lettre de M Mariette aux auteurs de la Gazette littérature de l'Europe, inserita nel supplemento dell'istessa gazzetta stampata dimanche 4, novembre MDCCLIV; e Parere su l'architettura, con una prefazione ad un nuovo trattato della introduzione e del progresso delle belle arte in Europa ne' tempi antichi*, Rome, 1765], Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2002.

30 Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 49.

31 Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 49.

32 Cf. Leach, 'Inoperative Criticism: Tafuri and the discipline of history', *Architectural Theory Review*, 8, 2 (2003): 85-93.