The Architectural Typology Of Antoine Chrysostome Quatremère De Quincy (1755-1849)

Jonathan Noble

BArch, MArch. This paper is based upon research done for my MArch dissertation, "Writing Type: The Scepter of Quatremère de Quincy in Architectural Theory Since 1960." University of the Witwatersrand. Jonathan Noble is a lecturer in design and theory at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Abstract

It is commonly accepted that Quatremère was the first to define the idea of an architectural type and it is predominantly his influence which lies behind at least one consistent strand of contemporary typological debate. Quatremère's writings are not readily available since they reside in French archives.[1] Thus his important contribution to contemporary architectural theory is not well understood. This essay touches upon aspects of Quatremère's thought which are relevant to contemporary theory. Decisive in this respect is Quatremère's definition of type and model, translated by Vidler (1977), the only passage widely quoted in contemporary texts. Quatremère's idea of type presented here proceeds with a synchronic (rather than diachronic) interpretation which finally folds onto the inherent logic of Quatremère's Neo-Platonic definition of type and model.[2] In doing this we are demonstrating how a broader understanding of Quatremère's thought can be located within his celebrated ideas of model and type.

Introduction

Quatremère's work gravitates around issues of sociological circumstance, of geographic locality, climate and human economy and the kind of aesthetic mediation that reflects upon these particularities. His ideas lend themselves to an interrogation of architecture's cultural and symbolic identity. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that his notion of type was introduced to contemporary architectural discourse in Italy during the sixties by 'left-wing' architects who were critical of the 'universalist' and 'progressive' assumptions

of contemporary architectural production. The architects and academics of the so called Casabella group (Colquhoun, 1989: 248) embraced typological enquiry as a method to re-evaluate both design practice and urban theory in a way which resisted the dominance of an intrumentalisedand politically defunct Modern Movement.

The 'Post-Modern' movements, which have saturated architectural theory and practice since the demise of orthodox architectural Modernism, have each made theoretical capital from criticism of Modernism's 'universalised functionalism'. Yet universalising pragmatism remains very much part of contemporary architectural production. As the ever expanding globalization of world markets continue to support dominant capital interests so the latest Post-Modern, Neo-Classical development in down-town Johannesburg looks identical to those in glossy, international architectural magazines. An inability to think through issues of local identity continues to plague contemporary practice.

Quatremère's idea of type links categories of the 'particular' to the socio-economic 'life world' and, in so doing, makes a contribution to a social discourse of architecture that, if correctly understood, could escape both the nostalgic evocations of Post-Modernism and the progressive mythology of the new Avant Garde. This essay investigates a series of dialectics which operate within Quatremère's thought: *nature-culture* (the cave versus the hut), *primitive-modern* (the hut versus the temple), *direct imitation-ideal imitation* (arts of the senses versus the arts of reason), and *the general-the particular* (universal language versus a national tongue). These dialectics can each, in part, be shown to be duplications of Quatremère's Platonic dualism - categories of the actual versus the ideal. The Neo-Platonic frame of Quatremère's thought is truly awkward for contemporary concerns. It will be argued that these rich and useful oppositions may be materially grounded within his theory of typological imitation and it is within this domain of imitation that Quatremère's Platonic ideals can be replaced by a more modern idea of aesthetic construction. An examination of Quatremère's oppositional concerns demonstrates the richness of his thought and his relevance for contemporary theory.

Quatremère's Theory Of Typological Origin

Quatremère's historical investigations led him to formulate his theory of typological origins around three kinds of early societies and of their respective types of shelter. This kind of theorising about the distant origins of architecture and society clearly requires a degree of conjecture, and as Quatremère acknowledged, "[we] lack, without doubt, the actual means to carry out similar research with exactitude..." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 27). Despite

uncertainty, Quatremère felt it safe to rest his argument upon differences of climate, location and economic production available to these early civilizations. Hence he argues that:

> According to the various regions where the first societies found themselves, men submissive in those primitive times to the hand of nature, ... remain, according to their differing positions, hunters, shepherds, or farmers. The first dwellings that were associated with these three kinds of occupations could but reflect their requirements and bear very different characteristics.

(Hinchcliffe, 1985: 28)

With each of these three societies, namely societies composed of hunters, shepherds or farmers, Quatremère associated the respective architectural types of the cave, tent and hut which he in turn saw to be represented by the civilizations of Egypt, China and Greece. The hunters, who were required to travel long distances in search of prey, could have little need to build houses and, hence, "...they found it more convenient to hollow out dwellings in the rocks or ... in caverns." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 28). Quatremère criticizes this way of life for its lack of industry and for the natural laziness which "...must urge them to prefer the dwellings of nature to those of art." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 28). As for the nomadic shepherds who inhabit the plains there could have been no recourse to the natural abode of rocks and caves nor would their wandering have allowed for the building of stationary dwellings. The shepherd, therefore, relies for his shelter upon a tent. The agricultural society, of which Quatremère thought the Greeks to be the prime example, developed a higher degree of stability and planning and this stability and industriousness was thus represented in the primitive form of their first shelter - the hut.

Quatremère's historical investigations are far reaching making bold claims for the authenticity of the Classical tradition. But what truth do these speculations contain? That Classical architecture developed from an imitation of the primitive hut is an interpretation, which does not fit well with modern archaeology. In the eighteenth century, however, the lack of historical evidence concerning the dawn of western civilization allowed Quatremère's theory to be plausible coinciding as it did with such Enlightenment interest in the ethnography of natural man and the etymology of natural language.[3] It is not surprising then that Quatremère shows great certainty as to the significance of his historical interpretations:

> It is impossible that these three ways of life have not created in architecture some perceptible differences and the truly remarkable variety of styles... One cannot deny the simplicity of this theory..."

(Hinchcliffe, 1985: 28).

As, later on in this same essay, Quatremère expresses doubt concerning the

origin of the primitive hut it would seem that whether or not the hut was in fact the first form of Classical architecture was of less importance to Quatremère than the theory of typical imitation which he had derived from these historical speculations:

> If these maxims are incontestable, what is the difference whether the real or imaginary existence of the cabin is true or false? It is no less the axiom, the theorem of all truths...

(Hinchcliffe, 1985: 31)

The significance Quatremère ascribed to the type was not contingent upon the accuracy of his historical interpretation alone but, rather, it led the way towards his metaphysical inquiry into the nature of architectural imitation.

The Hut And The Cave

In distinguishing his three architectural types Quatremère appears to be introducing a pluralist conception of historical development. Yet he is also, and perhaps more importantly, presenting a binary opposition between the hut and the cave - the architectures of Greece and Egypt. The difference between the hut and the cave is a difference between a free standing structure and a natural or semi-natural enclosure; a shelter of man's construction and one of nature's provision; an architectural device which has resulted from man's 'industrious' labour as opposed to a 'lazy' adaptation of the natural. This binary of hut - cave is, therefore, also one of *culture* versus *nature*.[4]

Quatremère found support for this interpretation in his study of Greek and Egyptian architecture. These views were presented in his competition essay of 1785, for the Prix Caylus, on Egyptian architecture and society. At the time the orthodox view held by the historians of the French academies was that the architecture of Egypt had influenced the Greeks in a continuous historical development.[5] Quatremère's award winning essay challenged these assumptions for, in his reading, the fundamental difference between the architectures of these two cultures is reflected in a difference that existed between their political and social order. Quatremère uses this difference in his polemic support for Enlightenment Classicism ascribing to the Greeks the twin developments of democracy and Classical art. In contrast he ascribes to the Egyptian culture the creation of totalitarian politics and an architecture that was "...cold, monotonous and insipid..." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 30).

Quatremère's identification of classicism, as the necessary reference for Enlightenment architecture, is contingent upon his privileging of the cultural against the natural. This privileging may be elaborated through a discussion of Quatremère's innovative re-interpretation of Laugier. Laugier's mythical account of architecture's origin in the 'little rustic hut' entails a direct naturalism. For Laugier architecture is an art formed through imitation of nature and, consequently, is an art whose principles can be derived from nature: "...architecture...; its principles are founded on simple nature, and nature's process clearly indicates its rules." (Laugier, 1977: 11). Nature is posited as the single and true referent of artistic endeavour and more importantly the course of simple nature is itself sufficient for an understanding of artistic progress: "Such is the course of simple nature; by imitating the natural process, art was born." (Laugier, 1977: 12). In Laugier's account nature is presented as both the model and the cause of architecture's progress. Art imitates 'natural processes'. An imitation whose cause is tied to the 'course' of nature - a course determined by 'natural instinct'. The progress of culture is thus merely a reflection upon and duplication of the progress of nature. In tying architecture directly to nature Laugier's narrative points towards a functionalist theory of architecture.

Quatremère's repeated reference to the 'rustic hut' reveals his support for Laugier's celebrated theory. However, Quatremère reformulated these ideas through an avoidance of Laugier's strict naturalism: attributing to the theory of the rustic hut a more abstract conception of human culture. Laugher's idea of natural cause is replaced by a human impression of nature, an impression both primitive and true (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 30).

Quatremère contrasts the natural with the human act of formation by elaborating upon the essential nature of carpentry. The timber hut type is constructed from discreet elements and it is this 'constructedness' which speaks of the enlightened reason of man.

> Carpentry...everywhere gives occasion for projections, for elevations, the distribution of parts in relation to each other, projecting or recessed bodies which offer a varied field to the eye. The art finds itself subjugated there to a reasoned use of objects and parts...

(Hinchcliffe, 1985: 29)

In Quatremère's view the inherent nature of timber construction forced the first hut builders to materialise the ideas which are necessary for the creation of a reasoned art of architecture. The hut, in this regard, represents less a natural origin for architecture (as it did for Laugier) than the emergence of an artistic principle, or *type*, of building. In arguing this he pulls apart the *culture - nature* relation which was neatly unified by Laugier's thought. Laugier's naturalism is replaced by a view which points towards the particular social constituent of architecture.

The Hut And The Temple

The binary of *culture-nature*, evident in Quatremère's contrasting of the hut with the cave, is also present within the historical development of the hut itself. This dialectic is not simply one of difference but of emergence for it marks the way in which the hut, being made of natural elements (namely branches), comes to be marked off against its natural surroundings. This movement, from the *primitive* origins of nature towards the reasoned state of *modern* culture, is formed through an act of imitation. With the cave this act of reasoned imitation is wholly lacking for its principles of construction are a direct replication of nature's own provision, hence, the cave does not emerge from the natural.

The emergence of the hut type was, for Quatremère, the first step towards the creation of an art of architecture. A second, possibly more fundamental step, was still required in which the principle of the hut was to be imitated in stone. The timber hut had achieved the principle of a type whilst the temple, of stone, which was to follow, would achieve a symbolically enhanced sense of permanence and idealised abstraction. The creation of a 'classical language of architecture' was, in this way, contingent upon a double imitation - an imitation of nature in the first form (or type) of the hut followed by an imitation of the type into stone. The progression from the one level of imitation to the other resulted in aesthetic 'enrichment':

> Let us add that when stone replaced timber, by conserving all the forms of the former material the art enriched itself even more by the means suggested by the latter and thus reunited the qualities of the two.

> (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 29)

For Quatremère, the significance of the type was that it determined the aesthetic nature of this second level of imitation. Decisive, in this regard, was the substitution of materials necessitated by the recreation of the first shelter in stone. With the cave he believed that there was an insufficient change in the nature of material since both the natural rock face of the cave and the building block of stone hewn from rock were of the same kind. All that was required of such an architecture was to model itself directly upon its type. For Quatremère, this constitutes a relation of copying not of imitation. Only the hut, with its timber carpentry, was able to present a favourable relation to the permanence of stone: Carpentry, on the other hand, at once solid and light - or, at least able to more or less acquire these two qualities - was the happiest medium for architecture. (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 29)

Quatremère's criticisms of the architecture of Greece and Egypt mirror his prejudice concerning the character of their type. The vast and 'monotonous simplicity' of Egyptian facades are accredited to the way in which this architecture rendered a literal presentation of its medium - stone. Speaking of Egyptian architecture he argues, "...stone, in copying nothing, has offered no form to art, no variety to the eye, no relation to the spirit..." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 30). This 'literalness' of stone directly mirrors the 'literalness' of the natural cave: "... [an] underground construction [which] everywhere offers only flat surfaces. Nothing in the dens hollowed out by necessity presents the idea of parts, of relations." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 29). The harmony and beauty of Greek architecture, on the other hand, was a consequence of its composure - the order found in the relation of its constituent parts.

Situating his position in direct opposition to a functional naturalism Quatremère opens architecture up to the possibility of fictitious representation. The imitation of the hut in stone introduces into architecture a sense of illusion and it is precisely this illusion which he deems essential to the poetic nature of the Classical.

> Let us not doubt it: it is this happy deception that man enjoys in architecture a pleasure of imitation, without which this pleasure would not have arisen which accompanies all the arts and constitutes their charm, pleasure of being half deluded, which makes dear to man the fictions and poetry, makes him prefer disguised truth to naked truth.

> (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 30)

This insistence upon the fictitious is given direction by reflection on the historical particularity of type. Quatremère's fictitious play is far removed from the autonomous and relativising 'game' of historicist reference common to Post-Modern practice. Although Quatremère posits historical type as the guide for fictitious representation the advance of new building technology provides the means for such aesthetic mediation. His typological fiction, therefore, also resists a simplistic desire for nostalgic return.

The real and the illusory which he sought to proclaim as essential to the aesthetics of an enlightened architecture can be shown to reflect the process of architecture's historical progression from its earliest origins towards its enlightened condition. Thus, the type speaks doubly: as a repetition of an architectural principle, rooted in the confines of socio-historic conditions, and as a distancing from the past through fictitious representation within a new medium when stone replaces timber.

In his entry for the "Encyclopaedia Méthodique" (1788-1825), under the heading "Architecture", Quatremère provides a summary of his theory concerning the origins of architecture. In this passage he argues that the enlightened condition of art is borne out of the necessity to recreate, within the urban abode, the pleasures of nature (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 27-23). Here the aesthetic role of architecture is of particular importance. At the precise moment that the primitive shelter is removed from its natural surroundings, to become

the fabric of civilized urbanity, the status of shelter changes as it now, due to the increased 'opulence' of urban living, develops the potential for artistic expression. Thus, it is simultaneously called upon to bring back, through artistic imitation, the pleasures of nature to the social domain of urban life. Architecture, therefore, in its enlightened condition serves a double function of separation from and imitative substitution for the natural.

This double relation of separation and substitution is possibly a consequence of every mimetic act. Imitation requires that an artifact be formed in a manner which is like the thing it imitates. This relation of likeness is not only one of similarity but also one of difference. It is only by virtue of the difference which exists between the nature of the medium and the thing towards which imitation is directed that imitation is possible and so it is intrinsic to the act of imitation that a double relation of separation and substitution exists. This can also be described as a re-presenting, that is presenting, in a substituted form, the work of aesthetic mediation. It is this very relation which Quatremère describes in his analysis of architecture. In imitating nature, the natural abode of man, the first man created his first shelter and, in so doing, successfully protected himself from nature. Protection from nature signifies a literal degree of separation from that nature. The hut-type with its inherently 'rational system' of construction and its sense of permanence, allowed for gradual refinement. Thus, the hut through a process of self-imitation developed into an aesthetic type.[6] The hut-type, therefore, in its earliest evolution already speaks of imitation but it is only with the imitation of the hut in stone that the illusory nature of symbolic imitation becomes self-conscious. Thus, in the modern temple of stone, a literal separation from the natural is accompanied by a self conscious and illusory substitution. Man's urban landscape is constructing its own nature while at the same time allowing for an aesthetic mediation of man's past relation to the natural.

Architectural Mimesis

By analysing the way in which Quatremère relates his categories of culture and nature the emergence of architecture from its primitive beginnings towards its transformation into a modern art can be explained. The question remains, however, as to what exactly constitutes, in an aesthetic sense, the transformation of architecture from its humble beginnings to its role as monument and collective symbol. For Quatremère, architecture's progression from its natural origins, its aesthetic and symbolic content, is contingent upon and grounded within his conception of *direct* versus *ideal* imitation.

For Quatremère, imitation is imitation of nature, and so he starts his discussion of *Imitation* in the "Encyclopaedia Méthodique" by clarifying his ontology of the natural.

It is necessary here to take the word nature in its widest sense, that is, the one which includes the domain of physical beings, and the realm of moral or intellectual things.

(Hinchcliffe, 1985: 37)

He considered nature as consisting not only of the material world but also of a distinct realm of ideas both moral and intellectual. This realm of ideas cannot be comprehended through sensual experience of the world but have their own existence within the Platonic domain of the human mind. This domain of the Platonic, whilst distinct from the corporeal world, is just as much a part of nature as the objects of our everyday world: "Nature exists as much in what she has of the invisible as in what strikes the eye." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 37). This is an important point for Quatremère since the content of architectural imitation which he has sought to vindicate through his analysis of the hut is unlike the content found in the other visual arts of painting and sculpture. The imitating hut does not picture its natural surroundings since there is no sensual content to which the creation of the hut corresponds. Instead the hut has captured a sense of order expressed by the composure of its parts. Thus, architecture's order, derived from the constructional rationality of carpentry, forms the content of architecture's 'ideal' imitation.

To imitate does not necessarily mean to make a resemblance of a thing, for one could, without imitating the work, imitate its nature thus, in making not what she makes, but as she makes it, that is one can imitate nature in her action, when one does not imitate nature in her work.

(Hinchcliffe, 1985: 36)

For him architectural imitation corresponds not directly to nature the way she appears to the senses but in accordance with our idea of her order. Although he does argue for the importance of architecture's fictitious representation of the type his concerns seem to lie elsewhere. The kind of ideal imitation of nature which Quatremère seeks to vindicate entails nothing other than the order of Classical poetics - an order of harmony, proportion and balance. This kind of ideal imitation, in its Platonic form, fulfills a higher obligation than that ascribed to direct imitation. For in Platonic ontology ideas constitute primary truths which are more trustworthy than sense perception. Architecture, grounded upon an idealised imitation of nature can, therefore, sanction for itself a privileged role as an art of reason. His entire typological argument could be interpreted to be nothing other than an elaborate sophistry. A Neo-Platonic preference for Classical order and permanence whose true origin is to be found in an eager support for Neo-Classical architecture and which is then projected back on to Laugier's theory of the primitive hut. This support for the 'reasoned' architecture of the carpentry hut might portray nothing other than conservative ideology.

Quatremère posited nature as the model for all artistic imitation and allowed at

least two ways in which nature could become an object of imitation: "Each art has in nature a general model and a model which is particular to it." (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 37). The *general* and *particular* imitations of nature correspond to a two-stage historical development where the first dwelling of man participates in a general (pragmatic and functional) imitation of nature establishing the natural basis for a type. Once made conscious through a process of aesthetic refinement this type ultimately leads onto a second stage where a particular, more culturally considered, architecture develops through an 'idealised' imitation of the type.

This binary of the general and the particular can be explained by Quatremère's linguistic analogy where he asserts that the imitation of nature, in both its general and particular senses, is akin to the relationship which exists between 'universal grammar' and the language of a particular nation.

> Thus it is that there is a universal grammar which includes the laws of language, as far as language, characteristic of the human race, is founded upon a few principles deriving from the laws of intelligence and sensations; and there is the grammar particular to each tongue or each idiom which includes the varieties and modifications that local or particular conditions in each country impress on the art of revealing thoughts by sound or by signs. (Hinchcliffe, 1985: 37)

The idea of a type is therefore to be understood as parallel to a particular language. The type, in this sense, provides evidence for an existence of a language of architecture which remains particular to its culture but is at the same time representative, in its general sense, of a universal language of architecture. If we apply this idea of the universal and the particular to a single architectural element, such as the column, then it may be said that columns are universal to architecture by virtue of their function to support yet each tradition of architecture forms for itself a particular significance and order for the column. For instance, in the Classical tradition the column takes on an anthropomorphic symbolism where the heroic Doric speaks of the masculine and the slender Ionic represents the feminine.

Quatremère's theory of imitation thus allowed him to conceptualise the relation between the parts of language, namely words, the parts of architecture, namely the column, beam, pediment etc., and of their composed relation. He makes explicit this linguistic analogy: "... the forms, types and details of Greek architecture... are nothing other than what words are, so to speak, to the art of writing." (Lavin, 1992: 116). However, he did not make the mistake, all too common today, of substituting a notion of architecture's 'language' for a study of the architectural object. Rather, he points to the similarity which he believed to exist between the ontological status of architectural mimesis and poetic language.

His contrast of the *general* with the *particular* reproduces certain features of the distinction which his theories make between *nature* and *culture*. Whilst clearly both the universal and particular grammar of architecture need to be understood under the category of culture, i.e. a human invention, the universal domain within architecture may be interpreted to tend toward the natural in the same way that the particular tends towards the cultural. The functional demands made of architecture, that is the restrictive confines of nature, may therefore be associated with an idea of the universal whilst the demands of culture may be associated with the particularity of a socio-historical condition. In relating the *general* to the *particular* he was able to claim for architecture a 'universal order' of functional and programmatic necessity whilst still allowing architecture a particular character determined by local economy, climate and culture.

This demonstrates a subtlety and richness of thought lacking in the theories of the Modern Movement. The functionalists of the Modern Movement proposed an 'International Style' - a universal language for the modern world. This universality of the modern style corresponds directly to functionalist theory, which is contingent upon an aesthetic derived from a seamless correlation of form and utility. In Modern Movement orthodoxy the problems of architectural production are strictly technical and can be solved within a universalized approach to design process. In contrast to this Quatremère's dual concerns for the universal and the particular allow him to acknowledge the universal datum of utility and structure that pressures all design processes while, at the same time, his idea of type allows for different traditions of architecture - the character of particular aesthetic resolutions. These different traditions, or types, of architecture, contingent upon socio-historic conditions, correspond to various manners of architectural imitation. Hence, for him there can be no direct relation between form and function. Forms do not simply derive from the dictates of function, as Modern Movement orthodoxy would suggest, but rather both form and function, which are brought together in a precise relation within the work of architecture, are mediated by history and society.

The Type And The Model

Quatremère made his final definition of the word type in his entry for the "Encyclopaedia Méthodique", under the heading *Type*. Here he comments that whilst the words type and model are often used synonymously, there exists between them, a clear distinction: "The word 'type' presents less the image of a thing to copy or imitate completely than the idea of an element which ought itself to serve as a rule for the model." (Vidler, 1977: 148). Hence, Quatremère introduces two distinct modes of aesthetic imitation namely the mode of direct imitation, or copying, and the mode of ideal imitation which is guided by understanding.

He continues in distinguishing these two modes of imitation by stressing that it would be wrong to think that a model: "... a statue, or the composition of a

finished and rendered picture." can serve as a type for artistic imitation but rather only when "a ... fragment, a sketch, the thought of a master, a more or less vague description..." gives birth to a work of art, "...in the imagination of an artist, may we speak of the influence of type." (Vidler, 1977: 148). The type is therefore associated with these 'vague' elements be they sketches or concepts which, in the process of artistic creation, give birth to the work of art. The type, whether drawn or thought, evidences the conceptual and contains aesthetic principles which inform the technical execution of the work. In contrast the model is associated with the materiality and visibility of the object being imitated. The word model signifying, for Quatremère, what one would refer to as the artist's model, be it a nude figure, landscape or another work of art.

His distinction of type from model clearly demonstrates his reliance upon idealist, Neo-Platonic aesthetics - a metaphysical reference that is somewhat idealist, Neo-Platonic aesthetics - a metaphysical reference that is somewhat difficult for contemporary architecture. Yet, however idealist Quatremère's idea of type may be, it is perhaps of greater importance to see how this distinction of type and model allows him to ground his typological investigation of architectural origins (and thus also the sociological domain of architectural identity) within a theory of imitation. It is precisely this ground of aesthetic imitation which produces architecture's unique character. Thus a great significance can be read into this contrasting of the type with the model for this contrast introduces a dialectic similar to the others previously observed. The oppositions presented as *culture-nature* (the hut versus the cave), *primitive-modern* (the hut versus the temple), *direct imitation-ideal imitation* (arts of the senses versus the arts of reason), and *general-particular* (universal language versus national tongue) can each be posited within the processes of architectural creation precisely because this creative process is, for him, contingent upon the imitation of type in relation to the model.[7] Quatremère's theory of imitation can therefore be re-stated as follows:

1) The creation of the hut was historically favourable towards the formation of a type whilst the cave was dependant upon a direct copying from nature as a model.

2) The early or primitive stage of architecture's development determines the nature of its type whilst the modern stage consciously separates type from model and, hence, allows for a mode of architectural production which reproduces the type by imitating it from the model.

3) Direct imitation is a mode of copying which is fixed upon the model whilst ideal imitation, or typological imitation, is a mode of representation which allows for the re-invention and continuity of type.

4) The general laws of representation derive from the existence of nature as a model whilst the particular moment of a representation will derive its character through the representation of an architectural type.

Conclusion

This idea of type as a material mode of architectural production (a mode of typological imitation) goes a long way towards remedying the Neo-Platonic assumptions of Quatremère's thought. Whether aesthetic types exist or not, in the Neo-Platonic sense which privileges the realm of ideas, is less interesting than the observation that a culture may construct for itself an idea of typological identity. This construction may operate in the political sense of its opposition to the negative effects of economic globalization and finds its material existence within the realm of symbolic identification. Therefore, it is necessary to formulate Quatremère's typological imitation in a way which avoids Platonic idealisation.

Working from his distinction of type and model it may be argued that there are various sorts of objects which may stand as an artist's model. Of particular interest is the art work itself for, although an art work is created in accordance with a conception of type, it can, once complete, stand as a model for future artistic imitation. The work of art, therefore, in its physical, visible manifestation may operate as a model whilst the aesthetic principles which informed the work's creation correspond to its type. Since it is essential to nearly all modes of historical speculation (and indeed historiographic study) that aesthetic ideas, or types, can be read from (or 'constructed' from) the aesthetic experience of any given art work the type which has informed a work of art may be read from the work itself. Therefore, in imitating an art work as a model it is possible either to imitate the model directly, and in so doing to replicate it through the production of a copy of the model, or to imitate the type which may be read from the model and create a new and different work which will refer to, but not replicate, the model and which may itself stand as a model for future artistic imitation. An architectural type is, thus, required to be constructed and re-constructed through an imaginative reflection upon architecture's typicality - a typicality which has been formed in response to the particular circumstance of locality, climate and economy.

The model, as understood in the practical execution of the art, is an object that should be repeated as it is; the type, on the contrary, is an object after which each can conceive works of art that may have no resemblance. "All is precise and given in the model; all is more or less vague in the type." (Vidler, 1977: 148)

In this way Quatremère's idea of type might secure for artistry the necessity of change and creative development whilst continuing in the domain of the typical which gives a particular period or tradition its character. The typological can, therefore, be said to possess a concrete existence within the domain of aesthetic representation to the degree that art reflects upon its past

and upon the aesthetic traditions within which it has been formed. Themes of the typical are thus transferred from one generation to the next through the reading of type from the model and its creative re-adoption in the formation of 'the new'. The relatedness of past to future is thus mediated through an awareness of type whilst the idea of type is founded upon relations of typical similarity which can be read across historical change.

Notes and References

[1] References with regard to Quatremère have predominantly been taken from Hinchcliffe (1985) and Vidler (1977a) as these translations are the most primary source material available to the author. Since both Hinchcliffe's and Vidler's translations of Quatremère each form part of their own journal articles these translations have been referenced to Hinchcliffe and Vidler respectively. Reference has also been made to Lavin's (1992) translations which form part of her book.

[2] In contrast to the view presented in this paper Lavin (1992) downplays Quatremère's Neo-Platonism in favour of a reading which emphasises his development of a modern theory of 'architectural language'.

[3] See Lavin (1992), section 2, pages 62-85.

[4] The tent whilst defined as a distinct type is interpreted by Quatremère to exist between the extremes represented by the hut and cave. The tent could be described as a movable hut which in its 'contractedness' tends towards the permanence of culture whilst in its movability tends towards impermanence and an adaptation to nature. This adaptation to nature is understood by virtue of the shepherd's economy where his nomadic life is not conducive to the creation of art.

[5] Lavin demonstrates how this idea of historical continuity can be linked to other orthodox concerns of the day which began to be challenged by the emerging sciences of etymology and ethnography.(Lavin, 1992: 62-64)

[6] Note that for Quatremère the first hut is not yet a type, it requires to be refined before it become the type for Classical architecture.

[7] The word 'imitation' is here deliberately used. It is felt the idea of artistic 'imitation' possesses great creative opportunity and critical potential for architecture than the more limiting and by now out worn idea of architectural 'language'.

Bibliography

Colquhoun A., *Modernity And The Classical Tradition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1989

Hinchcliffe T., Extracts From "The Encyclopédie Méthodique D'architecture", 9h, 7. 1985

Laugier M., (Trans. W.Herrmann and A.Herrmann) *An Essay On Architecture*, Hennessey And Ingalls, Los Angeles, 1977

Lavin S., *Quatremère De Quincy And The Invention Of A Modern Language Of Architecture*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1992

Noble J., *Writing Type: The Sceptre Of Quatremère De Quincy In Architectural Theory Since 1960*, MArch Dissertation, The University Of The Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 1997

Quatremère De Quincy A.Q., *De L'architecture Egyptienne Considérée Dans Son Origine, Ses Principes Et Son Goût, Et Comparée Dous Les Mêmes Rapports À L'architecture Grecque*, Paris, 1803

Quatremère De Quincy A.Q., *Dictionnaire D'architecture.* Part of "Encyclopédie Méthodique D'architecture." 3 Volumes, Paris, Liege, 1788-1825

Quatremère De Quincy A.Q., *Dictionnaire Historique D'architecture*, 2 Volumes, Paris, 1832

Vidler, A. *Type, From Dictionnaire Historique D'architecture.* Oppositions, 8, 1977