

URBAN RITUALS

IN ITALY AND THE NETHERLANDS



Heidi de Mare
Anna Vos (eds.)

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	VI
Franziska Bollerey	
<i>Preface</i>	1
Heidi de Mare and Anna Vos	
<i>Urban Rituals in Italy and the Netherlands</i>	5

ITALY

Peter Burke	
<i>Cities, Spaces and Rituals in the Early Modern World</i>	29
Richard Ingersoll	
<i>The Possesso, the Via Papale, and the Stigma of Pope Joan</i>	39
Anton Blok	
<i>Ritual Space in Sicily. Town, Countryside, and their Borderland</i>	51
Anna Vos	
<i>Testaccio: Change and Continuity in Urban Space and Rituals</i>	58

THE NETHERLANDS

Willem Frijhoff	
<i>Ritual Action and City History: Haarlem, Amsterdam, and Hasselt</i>	93
Heidi de Mare	
<i>The Domestic Boundary as Ritual Area in Seventeenth-Century Holland</i>	108
Karen Wuertz	
<i>Ritual Communication in Groningen and The Hague</i>	132
Arnold Reijndorp	
<i>No Slaughterhouse without a Fair: the Anti-Structure of a Dutch City</i>	144
<i>Bibliography</i>	163
<i>Contributors</i>	183
<i>Sources</i>	185

Urban Rituals in Italy and the Netherlands

Heidi de Mare and Anna Vos

How should we think about the use of public space, architecture, and the urban environment? This is the main question explored in this volume, in which the views of various scholars from different fields of scholarship are presented and contrasted. There are many ways to answer this question, it turns out, each with its own long history.

If we look at modern West European history, we notice that the concept of 'use' plays a highly specific role in the architectural design process. Ever since large cities began to grow unrestrainedly in the nineteenth century and attempts were undertaken to control or plan urban development, architects have been facing a fundamentally new task. As soon as mass housing takes a central position in modern town planning and architecture, and architects therefore start designing for the anonymous resident, the formulation of a general programme of requirements becomes the inevitable starting point for the design process. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Dutch engineers for instance, in imitation of English initiatives and in consultation with experts, took steps towards putting into *words* the way in which a working-class family, or various derivative categories such as single women, did or should be able to use its dwelling (Bentinck and Vos 1981; Vos 1986). In the first decades of the twentieth century, the dwelling issue was tackled not only by the social sciences, then in their infancy, but also by specialized disciplines such as ergonomics, borrowed from the study of industrial mass production. This resulted in a programme of requirements, a formula to be applied by the architect. Efficient design would meet these requirements as closely as possible. The dwelling was presented as a machine that permitted the execution of routine operations.

With the advent of the Modern Movement, this programme took on an international character; moreover, its scale increased to encompass the district and even the city as a whole. The CIAM congresses dealing with *Die Wohnung für das Existenzminimum* (Frankfurt 1929), *Rationelle Bebauungsweisen* (Brussels 1930), and *The Functional City* (Athens and S.S. Patris II 1933) resulted in *La Charte d'Athènes* (1941), a document setting out the programme for the twentieth-century city in terms of housing, work, recreation, and transportation. The establishment of residential and urban programmes streamlined urban life and the use of architecture and public space, and reduced these to a common denominator. In effect, the modern city became a projection of abstract schemes on the ground that erased existing details and differences. This new-fangled discipline of town planning received the direct support of new areas of specialisation, such as rural planning and social geography, which permitted far-reaching quantitative and programmatic predictions with regard to urban developments.

During the post-war reconstruction period, functionalism received criticism from various quarters. The mental and emotional aspects of 'use' were introduced

into the functionalist framework as result of this criticism, again supported by scholarly disciplines such as psychology. A major exponent of this process was the *wijkgedachte* or *quartiere* (the concept of the neighbourhood unit), which combined the notion of a social unit with a spatial identity. Society could be built up by means of the spatial design of the district. Following naturally from this concept, post-war CIAM congresses focused, among other things, on *The Heart of the City* (Hoddesdon 1951), *Habitat* (Aix-en-Provence 1953), and *Habitat, the Problem of Relationships* (Dubrovnik 1956).

The ideas of the international Team X and the Dutch Forum further accentuated the criticism levelled at the functionalist programme and its results. In 1959, Aldo van Eyck, the most prominent spokesman of Forum, wrote *Het verhaal van een andere gedachte* (The story of a different thought), in which architecture is assigned the role of an ideological authority capable of conveying new cultural values and architects are given the part of 'imaginists' of a human society. Gradually, the orientation on the family came to be criticized as too strict, and other sectors of society, for instance feminists in the second half of the 1970s, claimed their share in the functionalist programme by demanding a *vrouwvriendelijke stad*, a city that takes account of the needs of women (Edhoffer, De Mare and Vos 1986; De Mare 1987).

Although the impact of the purely functionalist interpretation of 'use' — based on the idea that a programme of requirements coincides both with 'use' and design — has diminished in the course of time, no powerful frame of reference has arisen to replace it. Belief in the 'form-follows-function' doctrine, the criticisms levelled by Team X and Forum, and the postmodern debate on the formal autonomy of architecture are in fact three chapters of the same story, in which space and 'use' represent quantities directly reducible to one another through the programme. Meanwhile this view has been incorporated — at least in the Netherlands — in government policy at all levels and is still the basis for the architectural design process.

A different view emerges from international inquiries into the use of public space, architecture, and the urban environment. From the 1960s on, fields of study outside the planning and design disciplines have been increasingly interested in the use of space. Separate fields, such as urban sociology and urban anthropology, have arisen, and the description of spatial use has become a set element in, for example, historiography. Because this type of knowledge is generally lacking in Schools of Architecture and Urban Planning — at least in the Netherlands — in the planning and design disciplines, 'use' has become a diffuse concept open to any arbitrary, subjective interpretation.

The legacy of functionalist thinking still determines the present, as is evident from the rapid succession of ideas characterized by the fact that they offer an overall synthesis. An excess of 'theories' and 'philosophies' have been intermingled by designers on their own authority — still for the purpose of improving design practice. Using these ideas, they persist in trying to capture heterogeneous reality in a single conceptual framework or in one universally valid concept. The compact city, the chaotic city, the 'woman-friendly city', the socially safe city and the like are the emerging metaphors, and terms like 'individualization' and 'flexibility' have acquired an almost magical meaning, as evidenced by the credence attached to them. Insofar as the discipline of architecture has renounced its belief in sociocultural theories and analyses (at the

Delft Faculty of Architecture attempts have recently been made to remove the final vestiges from the curriculum in favour of a market-oriented, technical and management training programme for construction engineers), architects interested in cultural history have little choice but to draw on a variety of sources of inspiration, such as literature, cinema or the visual arts, and construct personal truths to legitimize their design practice. Instead of these rather unprofitable developments, we would like to propose a scholarly exchange of different kinds of knowledge: knowledge possessed by construction engineers, who are primarily concerned with producing new urban environments and architecture, and that generated by scholars concerning the past and present sociocultural use and significance of the urban environment, whether planned or not.

The aim of the present collection of studies is neither to give yet another exegesis of 'urban use', nor to pick two cultures at random to support yet another all-embracing world view. On the contrary, these studies reveal that sweeping statements about the use of urban space are of little or no significance. Our aim is to show in which way and by which means notions and source materials, elements of the use of the urban environment might be analyzed and given their due.

We have selected eight studies dealing with Italy and the Netherlands. Although the cases discussed are widely separated in location and time, the approaches are comparable, as shown by the kinds of questions posed by the authors. They have attempted to analyze 'urban use' by approaching this concept in terms of its constituent elements, 'use' and 'city', rather than as a unit. 'Use' and 'city' are shown to be two complex, stratified phenomena, neither of which is reducible to the other. Urban use is subject to rules of its own and changes according to its own dynamics, in contrast to the rules and dynamics governing the production and transformation of the city. On the basis of this fundamental distinction, it is possible to study the interplay between both phenomena.

The selection of two contrasting cultures such as Italy and the Netherlands was prompted by the consideration that a comparison might reveal in what respects these cultures actually differ, and how they might and do affect one another. For centuries they have felt one another's influence on different levels, but this influence has not led to increasing similarity. In any case, such a comparison is a slight compensation for the pessimistic view that, thanks to the impact of the media and our increasing mobility, we are heading towards complete cultural homogeneity, as some believe.¹ This prompts us to introduce an inquiry into the pace and nature of cultural transformations. Do the hectic changes in 'use' that we observe daily really denote fundamental transformations in modes of behaviour, or are they striking, but in fact superficial mutations in lifestyles?² Only after having acquired greater insight into the individual nature and temporality of, and the interplay between both phenomena, 'city' and 'use', will we be able to ask how the disciplines of planning and design might productively relate to the way people use the urban environment.

In this introduction we will first elucidate how we — as representatives of the Women's Studies Section at the Delft Faculty of Architecture — came to introduce the theme of *urban rituals*. Secondly, we will give a description in outline of the way in which the phenomena 'city' and 'use' are stratified. Thirdly, we will briefly describe the various contributions to this volume.

Fourthly, we will point out some differences and similarities between the articles. Fifthly, we will resume the issue of the discipline of architecture and the construction engineer. Finally, we will present a proposal for the future of women's studies in architecture.

Women's Studies and Urban Rituals

Two main issues — the effects of gender difference in architecture and urban planning, and the nature of the architectural design process — constituted the points of departure for education and research in the Women's Studies Section at the Delft Faculty of Architecture. This twofold presentation had its origin in two preceding developments in the Netherlands. One was in the fields of architectural criticism and art history; the other was linked to the formulation of theories in women's studies in general.

In the 1970s, a number of Italian and French views were introduced, at conferences held in the Netherlands and in Dutch publications, that initiated a discussion on prevailing notions within the disciplines of art history and architecture.³ We will only touch briefly on some of the aspects relevant within the scope of this volume. For instance, the inquiry into the history of architectural design and into the intellectual work done by the architect — a study initiated by Manfredo Tafuri et al. — took a step back from the social commitment which architects displayed in the twentieth century. 'Historical criticism' as advocated by these Italian researchers, in which the provenance of topical, at times contradictory, views was investigated, generated an approach to architectural history that formed the opposite of that in which history was rewritten for the benefit of a social movement. In the field of art history, a similar question was raised by Nicos Hadjinicolaou, in this case focusing on the relationship between social commitment and the historical investigation of visual material.

In both cases the intention was to investigate cultural products (works of art and architectural design) as relatively autonomous constituents of society. Neither the intentions of the producer (artist or architect), nor socioeconomic and political goals and interests could be held responsible for the nature of cultural production. These developments within the fields of art history and architecture took place within a wider context in which progressive intellectuals in the Netherlands followed developments closely, particularly those in France and Italy.⁴

Analogous to this interest in theories was a growing interest in the feminist movement from the mid-1970s on. On a national level this led to the founding of the *Tijdschrift voor vrouwenstudies* (Journal of Women's Studies) in the early 1980s. In the early stages in particular, general discussions focused on defining the relationship between politics as manifested in the feminist movement and scholarship as manifested in women's studies. Besides the option of creating a direct link — implying that women's studies would offer scholarly support for the political demands of the feminist movement and help to achieve 'knowledge through change' — there was also the argument for 'change through knowledge', i.e. maintaining the autonomy of women's studies and reformulating political demands in the form of scholarly enquiry.

One of the results of this debate was that the term 'oppression' was dispensed with, thereby eliminating a direct link with the political pressure group. The term was replaced by others, such as 'the sex-gender system' or 'the construction of femininity'. In addition, the initiation of a discussion about the differences between the sexes yielded concepts such as 'equality' and 'deconstruction'. The discussion may have been of particular interest for women's studies within the framework of social sciences. It is, however, less relevant for women's studies within fields in which first of all an object, rather than 'woman' is put into a pivotal position — art, architecture, urban planning, literature, and film.

From the outset, the Women's Studies Section at the Faculty of Architecture was marked by these developments. Women's studies were included in the Faculty's curriculum from 1978 on, along with the appearance of the first feminist publications criticizing the urban environment.⁵ The criticism levelled by feminists in these publications was that the fields of architecture and urban planning were male bastions which restricted women in their personal development. Women architects were supposed to carry out a programme of feminist requirements. Diametrically opposed to this criticism were the questions that the Women's Studies Section wished to raise. In education more importance was attached to the way in which design issues were formulated, to the role of the planning and design disciplines in this process and to the instruments that were applied in the act of designing. Studies were conducted into 'housing for workers and their families', the development of housing blocks that included communal facilities, supervision activities as initiated by Hill in London and Mercier in Amsterdam, in which people were taught how to use their homes (*woningopzicht*), and housing for single women. In short, the theoretical object of research was the relationship between programme and design, and the status of both.

By 1980, these educational and research experiences had led to the publication of the *Beleidsnota*, a policy document arguing in favour of a permanent academic post (Vos 1980). The purpose of instituting such a post was, according to this document, to investigate how the specific fields of architecture, urban planning, and public housing conditioned both women and men. Following on from the above-mentioned 'historical critique', this approach questioned the social pretensions of design practice and the need to legitimize design products ideologically. Consequently, the investigation would be aimed not only at the status of the planning and design disciplines and their products in the society of today, but also at the demands of the feminist movement. Therefore it was essential to maintain a certain distance from both design practice and the feminist movement.

After the institution of the permanent academic post in 1984, the following significant step was the internal publication in 1986 of *Vrouwen en de stad* (Women and the City).⁶ This set out a three-stage programme of investigation by the Section, thus initiating the inevitable methodical subdivision of the issues to be explored in women's studies in the field of architecture.⁷ The first stage was to inquire into the history of architectural shapes and architectural knowledge; the second was to study the history of sociocultural phenomena (the concepts of 'woman' and 'man'); the third was to eventually explore and understand the mutual relations between these phenomena.

For this reason we focused at the time on approaches that investigated *how* the mutual dependency of women and men in the social and symbolic community functioned, emphasizing the *productivity* of power effects — *gender*, as it is called nowadays (Lévi-Strauss 1956; Foucault 1977). A second axiom was that the relationship between the social community and architecture is not causal in nature (Rossi 1966). This line of thought was elaborated by exploring the various fields of study separately. After all, what is considered important in town planning and architecture is often not so considered in women's studies — and vice versa.⁸

The international workshop held in 1989 under the title *Ritual Spaces — Ruimtelijke Rituelen* marked a third 'period' by introducing not so much a demarcated object of study as a method of approach (De Mare 1989).⁹ This methodology connects thinking about gender (a women's studies issue) and thinking about programme issues (urban planning and architecture) to enable a systematic study of urban use and life patterns as culturally determined phenomena. It provides an entry for recognizing spatial patterns of action dictated and governed by registers other than the spatial order of the urban ensemble. Taking ritual spaces and urban rituals as a starting point offers insights into the far-reaching complexity of the interplay between the use of urban space and the spatial arrangement of the city.

The relevance of rituals cannot be taken seriously enough. Mary Douglas states that ritual is more important than language and words, as far as the social community is concerned. Whether they are sacred or profane rituals, grand ceremonies or everyday behaviour, all are suitable for ritual processing precisely because rituals are capable of assimilating new developments. According to Douglas, social reality cannot exist without ritual acts, whereas one may have knowledge without having the right words for it. Peter Burke puts it differently when he states that rituals establish communication, not by exchanging messages, but by making connections on a sociocollective level. Performing ritual acts creates experiences and supports memory.

'Ritual spaces' and 'urban rituals' focus primarily on stereotype, stylized, collective, public and formal 'modes of behaviour' that are enacted in a certain place.¹⁰ All kinds of ideas, impressions, stories and myths may be attached to this behaviour, but these signifying practices do not determine the *form* of the physical practices. Modes of behaviour are dictated by unwritten rules. It is sort of 'second nature' that automatically settles those matters that do not require conscious decisions. Like a body of thought, such physical forms — modes of behaviour, gestures, acts — are also (often unconsciously) transmitted in a culture.

Apart from spectacular events, such as processions, ceremonies, and festivities, a culture or subculture also incorporates seemingly insignificant 'modes of behaviour', such as trivial, banal, or routine acts and small everyday rituals.¹¹ Although this volume concentrates primarily on public rituals, we do not wish to imply that other kinds of rituals are without importance. Trivial acts, their rhythms and their nature, often determine in minute detail the sociocultural identities of people, identities that are registered and recognized immediately. Ritual may therefore be interpreted as the *physical aspect of the memory*. We do not intend this in the sense of 'body language' or 'sign language', that is as the *expressions* of inner and personal feelings and ideas. On the contrary, we are

talking about gestures and acts that evoke emotions and bring about experiences. In addition, the physics of gestures has its own pace of transformation, which is of a *longue durée*: the rate at which gestures change is much slower than that of the content of the stories told about them.

Against this background, the interplay between women and men can be seen in an entirely different light. It is one of the most fundamental questions to be 'solved' in every culture. Next to symbolic solutions, spatial arrangements play a prominent part. In many cultures we see that in addition to the distinction between sacred and profane, the irreducible difference between the sexes is articulated spatially and temporally in many different ways (Van Gennep 1977). Marriage and the home constitute in many cultures the essential connection between two separate territories and ways of life, an observation which might explain as well why unmarried women and men — who oversee only a part of the social network — have a subordinate position in many communities (Lévi-Strauss 1956; Harding 1975; Leenders 1990). Such a gender separation is 'not amenable to reason', because it does not belong to the level of consciousness, but to the symbolic universe and the physical modes of behaviour that precede consciousness.

City and Use

In order to show how the various texts in this volume relate to one another, we will first present a system of classification — in the first instance in outline — to highlight the stratification implied in the terms 'city' and 'use'.

The city may be seen as consisting of three levels. The first is the composition of the physical subsoil (1a). It often appears that the condition of the soil (such as sand or peat) and the presence of all kinds of natural elements and dividing lines (moors, hills or rivers) become apparent in the environmental and social arrangement of the city. The second level is the urban ensemble consisting of an historical collection of urban and architectural elements that may be connected typologically (1b). Through all kinds of interventions, whether they be motivated by economics, politics, military considerations, urban planning, or religion, the city becomes an arranged and divided territory. The present-day city originated from a historical accumulation of urban elements such as parcels, streets, public areas, architectural markings and objects (Rossi 1966). The third level is the city's topology of significance (1c). This level, which is concerned with the production of meaning, i.e. the signifying practice, itself consists of different sublayers, as will be shown in the various contributions to this volume. It appears not only to include the city's toponymy, the nomenclature of streets and squares, the bad (or good) reputations of particular city districts, and the urban facilities that have ended up there (slaughterhouse, food distribution centre, cemetery), but also the attribution of sacred or profane values. Myths and stories featuring the city belong to this level as well. Along with many types of symbols, these myths and stories are capable of legitimizing and making permanent all the possible religious and political meanings, or, more in general, the ideological meanings which were attributed to the city in the past. Finally, this level also includes cultural products like novels, moralistic writings, paintings, and film. Although we have placed all these aspects at the level of the 'signifying practice' that is at work in the city, they are not derivatives of one another. Each of them has to be

studied on its own merits (De Mare 1990a, 1991b, 1992a). The only reason for classifying these codes of the signifying practice together is that they all in their own way assign meanings to urban spaces and architectural forms; in other words, they transform the physical city into a meaningful ensemble.¹²

It is also possible to distinguish three levels in the use people make of urban space. Here too, the first involves the physical circumstances and the conditions of existence that determine the life cycle (2a).¹³ All human beings are confronted with the boundaries of life and death, with becoming an adult, and with the birth of new life. They need to sustain life, acquire food, and dispose of refuse. These physical circumstances affect the other two levels. The second level consists of what people do, their gestures, and the way in which their behaviour is oriented spatially (2b). These spatial patterns might be associated with routines and trivial activities that are repeated daily or weekly but also with more public ceremonies by which the normal course of life is periodically (annually, for instance) interrupted, turned around, and confirmed (the religious calendar, Carnival, and royal, national or political festivities). The third and final level, analogous to the third level of the city, concerns the production of meanings: the values and meanings that are assigned to what people do. What people observe, experience, think, feel, tell, write — in other words *produce* in response to what they do or are — also comes under the heading of the signifying practice and leads a life of its own (2c).¹⁴

This preliminary outline enables us to unravel the various phenomena of historical and present-day reality, phenomena which we perceive as a unity. Each of the different levels has its own duration, rhythm, and logic, on the basis of which interplay with other levels is possible and takes place. Understanding the specific interplay of these layers at a certain moment in the history of a community requires a specific, scholarly perspective and a set of analytical instruments. For instance, the primary conditions of existence and the physical circumstances can be considered to be generally the same for all of us. There are great differences, however, in the way people shape their lives and in the meanings the conditions of existence take on. In other words, the ‘modes of behaviour’ in the widest sense will differ according to the cultural background and the technical and symbolic instruments a community possesses. The way in which modes of behaviour and the production of meaning overlap guarantees the collectivity of the phenomena and makes the existence of the various (sub)cultures understandable.

The primary goal of this outline, then, is to clarify that the arrangement of the ‘city’ and the arrangement of ‘use’ are two different ‘materials’, each characterized by a multi-layered structure. These structures do not emanate from each other; neither is one the expression of the other. This is in spite of the fact that, in reality, cities are built by people and that it is people who ascribe meanings to the city, and also in spite of the fact that people take their identity from their position in the urban community. For we can argue equally that the majority of ‘cities’ — their ‘use’ and their significance — existed before the people of the present day started to live in them.

If we want to do justice not only to all the various different urban forms (Sicilian agro-town, Roman town, seventeenth-century or nineteenth-century city, post-war Dutch suburb, provincial harbour town, or twentieth-century Italian working-class district), but also to all the possible differences between people (in subculture, class, gender, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic position, religion), we

are obliged to abandon the terms introduced in the beginning of this section — ‘city’ and ‘use’ — because they convey both too much and too little, to replace them by other terms that do justice to the multi-layered structure of both.

Urban Rituals in Italy and the Netherlands

The central theme discussed in these articles is the way in which public space is used. Special attention is given to formalized use as it is manifested in religious and political rituals and ceremonies performed in the urban ensemble, but also to other exceptional events that take place regularly in the city.

Peter Burke briefly investigates the form of and modifications to various formal rituals that took place in public places of big cities. Although he mainly restricts himself to early modern Italian ceremonies, his comparison with urban rituals elsewhere — in northern European, Islamic, and Japanese cities — reinforces the tenor of his argument. In his view, the nature of urban society is decisive not only for whether or not urban rituals are performed in public places, but also for the gender of the participants. Thus, in early modern Italy, public (religious and civil) processions or ritual fights confirm the identity of urban society or sections thereof, in contrast to northern European countries where, after the Reformation, public rituals underwent a change in character or even disappeared, whereas the spatial structures were not transformed. Neither the geographical, physical, and spatial arrangement nor the climate determine urban use; rather it is the historically determined culture that does so.

Richard Ingersoll discusses how, within the span of a century, the papal inaugural procession (the *possesso*) was transformed from a humiliation (fifteenth century) into a triumph (sixteenth century). He examines the route the procession followed through secular Rome, the changes effected in this route, and the locations along the way that were marked by specific meanings or ritual acts. In this context, the Via Papale functioned as the urban stage on which the political contest between the pope and the anti-papal elite was performed by means of architectural, symbolic, and ritual interventions. The papal victory, finally, not only involved a settlement with the elite, but also the definitive exclusion of the powerless: paupers, Jews and women.

Anton Blok's contribution introduces us to an entirely different kind of European urban area: the agro-town in twentieth-century Sicily. He describes how, using a variety of rituals, the transition between town and country is effected in a surrounding border zone of irregular width (the *corona*). The ritual acts performed there are characterized by the inversion or interruption of daily routines in the agro-town and the *campagna* (religious feasts, funerals, courtships, holidays). This is most evident in how, in this locale, women and men perform gender-specific acts normally reserved for the other sex. Such activities transform the marginal border zone into a ritual area, thus confirming, symbolically and spatially, the strict distinction between town and country and the categories ascribed to these territories.

Anna Vos's article takes us back to Rome again, albeit to a very special place: Testaccio. In contrast to the preceding authors, she first describes the physical condition and spatial structure, after which the specific significance of this location is built up layer by layer like a kind of reverse archaeological excavation. Even today, the subsoil still effects not only the approach to urban

planning that is developed in this area, but also the type of urban facilities, associated with urban metabolism, and the nature of exceptional events (pilgrimage, passion play, Carnival, trips to the country, wine festivals) that — in some cases after an interval of centuries — have collected here and have given this location a local (physical and social) memory.

Willem Frijhoff's contribution introduces the second part of this volume, which deals with the Netherlands. He discusses the different kinds of interplay between urban space, rituals, and historical identity. A city may derive its identity from a myth, which provides its citizens with a meaningful framework, either with different types of ritual acts, or (as in the case of Rotterdam), without them. Urban space may, for instance, be of a symbolic-religious nature (Haarlem); it may be occupied physically for a while by a religious procession that follows a predetermined route connecting different areas of the city (Amsterdam); or it may be the result of a physical intervention in the city (Hasselt). Only in the latter case, in which religious myth, procession, spatial demarcation, and buildings condense in a single location in the city, are we entitled to speak of a ritual space, according to Frijhoff.

Heidi de Mare's contribution continues the focus on the level of the signifying practice. She does not deal explicitly with a concrete town, however, but rather with different concepts of urban society produced in the Dutch Golden Age. Analysis of a literary text by Jacob Cats, of a number of paintings by Pieter de Hooch, and of the architectural theory of Simon Stevin, shows that the domestic boundary and the transition between house and street constitute a central theme, irrespective of the function of this area in the medium involved (as social metaphor, as part of a visual *mise en scène*, or as the object of architectural intervention). Alongside the mania for cleaning among Dutch housewives and handmaidens, as recorded by contemporary travellers and manifested in the recurrent, physical and symbolic manipulation of the wide strip between house and street, it would appear that we are dealing with the multi-level establishment of a ritual area at the site of a physical border.

Although Karen Wuertz returns us to the twentieth century, the boundary between public and private domain, and the housewifely behaviour displayed there, is also an important element in her contribution. She does not interpret the conflicts that have arisen in a number of heterogeneous new housing estates in Groningen and The Hague as registering conditions which are actually deteriorating, but rather as the result of a collision between different lifestyles. This confrontation is not in the first place a discursive exchange, for the very reason that a lifestyle is a system of spatial patterns, symbolic acts, and non-verbal behaviour. The residents seize upon the district's space in order to communicate with one another in different ways, using all kinds of opposing categories (beautiful/ugly, clean/dirty, leisure time/unemployed) to classify fellow residents as 'familiar' or 'unfamiliar'.

The last of the eight contributions is Arnold Reijndorp's inquiry into the negative reputation of the Rotterdam district of Crooswijk. The city itself is composed of a collection of places to which different, sometimes symbolic, meanings have been ascribed, actively preserved not only by reminiscences and historical consciousness, but also by daily routines and public rituals. In the mid-nineteenth century, Crooswijk became the destination of daily funeral processions, refuse collectors, cattle, fair-goers and pub-goers. Around 1850 an urban planning intervention, aimed at converting the area between Crooswijk and

the city into an exquisite residential district for the well-to-do, failed. Even today, the planned order in Crooswijk's present social housing projects, located on the former site of the slaughterhouse, is once again being disrupted. This example once more confirms the persistence of meaningful urban topology.

Differences and Similarities

A comparison between the articles reveals that 'the city' may have two meanings. On the one hand, it represents the physical, spatial arrangement of diverse urban elements, whose three-dimensional shapes and architectural manifestations are of primary concern. These elements may take the form of closed housing blocks with central courtyards, cellular buildings, arcades, a garden city with all its spatial characteristics, or a seventeenth-century gentleman's house with a remarkable façade arrangement, a nineteenth-century expansion plan, or the sixteenth-century architectural reconstruction of a Roman street. On the other hand, the city appears as a spatial setting in which the urban community has its place and which is characterized by a meaningful topology. In this case, the city consists of a sociocultural arrangement of urban facilities, religious sites, political or symbolic areas, which are connected by its residents at set times: for instance a transfer and distribution centre, working-class housing, a slaughterhouse, churches, marketplaces, the doge's palace, a community centre, a gentleman's house, modern residential areas, the Vatican, or a harbour. The city is interpreted here as a designed *society*. Whatever the city counts as part of its own domain (the urban facilities located within its borders, within the city walls, for instance), whatever it situates outside that domain or in between (at an historical periphery or in the *corona*), and wherever the city ends and the house begins, all of these aspects determine the nature of the urban community.

Although in both cases the object of discussion is 'the city' — for example, the same actual cities of Rome or Rotterdam — the city as a spatial structure (1b) is at a different level than the meaningful city (1c), in the same way that traversing certain routes or occupying particular locations (2b) is distinct from the meanings people ascribe to these activities (2c). Comparing the contributions, we can ascertain that 'urban use' — both in the early modern period and the present day — is largely independent of urban structure. Ritual acts may demarcate areas, by marking them symbolically and sometimes physically (Blok); rituals may take place in suitable locations, even though the latter may not have been designed for ritual purposes (Vos); rituals may employ specially designed locales in a way that they are not meant to be employed (De Mare, Wuertz). At the same time it appears that in the past urban locales have been transformed to enable the performance of public rituals (Burke, Ingersoll, Frijhoff). Finally, it seems that urban use persists, even when the original urban context has been destroyed or assigned a different purpose (Frijhoff, Reijndorp). It is true that the physical urban environment (1b) is used, but this use (2b) is not necessarily the product of that environment. Urban use is not simply evoked by the environment's three-dimensional form. The existence of an impressive public city life depends neither on the presence of spatial facilities, nor on the climate. The driving force behind public behaviour is generated elsewhere, as the various contributions confirm.

All of the authors point out that the spatial use of the city is not derived from the spatial structure of the city, but has a design of its own. *Who* the participants and spectators are may vary per public ritual or collective spatial action. This applies as well to *when* and *where* in the city rituals are performed. We notice, for instance, that public space in Italy was dominated by processions in which male performers participated, while the women quite literally looked down upon them (Burke). In the Netherlands it is women who perform the rituals, creating public space by means of the trivial manipulation of a wide transitional zone. This kind of housewifely behaviour is metaphorically looked down upon (De Mare, Wuertz). In Italian cities, it is in times of crisis — real, such as war and famine, or symbolic, such as Carnival — women who move in procession through the streets. In the Netherlands, by contrast, it is men with a marginal status who appear at the physical edge of the public domain.

Of course, this characterization — which is only a brief comparison between two types of participants and three articles — does not do justice to the colourful parade of figures that will pass before the reader's eyes in the pages of the present volume. Youngsters and 'juvenile gangs', the rich and the poor, the dead and the carnivalesque, lovers and soldiers, popes and Jews, alcoholics and housewives, merchants and animals, foreigners and the unemployed: they are the urban residents and visitors who come into action publicly and recreate urban space, producing socioculturally ordered space. The physical ensemble is thus transformed into a symbolic and urban community.

Formalized use, whether explicitly ritual or not, generates the city as the location for the urban community. Routes laid out across the city connect certain religious, political, or otherwise meaningful locales. The same takes place when the physical borderlines in the city are being defended, as in the case of the youthful residents of seventeenth-century Venice, or twentieth-century Dutch suburbs. In both cases symbolic boundaries are ratified by these acts, although the meanings ascribed to them by each group will differ. So the function of such ritual habits goes beyond the actual motivation that any participant will be able to state, or beyond the opinion of any random spectator. The function of this ritual behaviour is of a collective nature. Internally, it joins individuals in an urban group; externally, it brings about a separation from other social groups. Ultimately all groups are tied to the city, making it possible for the city to function as a meaningful sociocultural ensemble. The result in every case is an identity: a social group, a social hierarchy, or the city as a whole.

In addition, the articles show that 'space' in and of itself is not decisive, but that it is the boundaries, symbolic or otherwise, that determine the significance of a location and how it is used. Urban space, the meaningful topology of the cities described, appears to be built on a foundation of binary opposites. On the basis of a few opposing categories, such as sacred/profane, town/country, day/night, land/sea, death/life, poor/rich, man/woman, pure/impure, and familiar/unfamiliar, the various meanings that play a role in urban use are generated. The rules are simple: combination, reversal, and exchange, through which a differentiated series of meanings is produced in a highly economical manner (De Mare 1990). Thus, the use of the *corona* becomes manifest in the reversal of the ordinary course of events in town and country, in the process by which women and men exchange the activities each sex normally performs (Blok); a location intended for the Holy Life is transformed into its opposite, in this case a field of execution (Frijhoff). What the city really is becomes apparent

from the elements it places outside of its boundaries (Blok, Vos, Reijndorp); what the neighbourhood or the house really is shows in the establishment of certain symbolic dividing lines (dirty/clean, beautiful/ugly, sacred/profane) by different groups of residents, and in the conflicts these lines provoke (Burke, Ingersoll, De Mare, Wuertz).

Finding any order at all in the apparently arbitrary phenomena discussed in the articles helps us view the possible interpretation of *changes* in a different light. Since the advent of the Modern Movement — which judges the new and the different to be right, and the traditional and the continuous to be wrong (Van der Woud 1992: 216) — the underlying principle of the design discipline has involved intervening in the urban ensemble on behalf of a society in transition. In short, design practice only exists by the grace of change. The nature and pace of cultural change, today and in the past, appear to vary, however, at the various levels of the city and of urban use mentioned before. Instead of monolithic revolutions, we are dealing with stratified transformations.

Fundamental changes, like economic growth, the migration of villagers to the big city, or the construction of a holiday home in the *corona*, do not appear to be simple signs of progress. New outsiders are assigned a place in the transitional zone which the agro-town had traditionally reserved for exceptional events (Blok). The outer metamorphosis of a section of the city does not imply that there will also be an immediate change in the way in which this section is used (Vos, Reijndorp). Other articles in this volume show that rituals themselves may undergo changes, though the transformation of such formalized action is slower than that of other kinds of use (Burke, Ingersoll); at the same time, new rituals may emerge, the fortunes of which may bridge centuries in some cases (Frijhoff, De Mare, Wuertz). Whenever there is change, it by no means occurs at random, because the structure and shape of rituals guarantee 'regulated' modifications. Rituals are seldom entirely new, and are often the result of minor modifications made to a basic pre-existing sociocultural pattern.

The contributions cannot be compared easily in terms of the actual objects of study, however. The authors' self-imposed limitations arise from their disciplinary backgrounds — ranging from history, architectural history, cultural anthropology to urban design — and demonstrate that, for the analysis to be productive, we cannot investigate 'the use of the heterogeneous, urban reality' as a whole. Instead, a choice is always inevitable. The theme of public use can be approached in every possible way: by performing a literature search, by analyzing historical maps, by browsing in archives, or by in-depth interviewing. Paintings, novels, newspaper clippings, films, or streetnames can provide information as well. Mixing a variety of such sources is risky business, however, while short-circuiting them altogether might result in conclusions that are too simple or even incorrect. Therefore, a well-considered study of urban use must always take into account the specific codes and scope of the source material involved.

Until now we have emphasized the unravelling of two different cultural systems, 'the city' and 'the human use of space', and the way they have been given shape in the historical interplay of forces. The various articles present some of the interventions in urban space applied in the past.

A third factor is important as well, however. We already mentioned that Western culture possesses an age-old tradition of architectural thinking which has long included thoughts about the city too. Since Vitruvius, architectural treatises have contained statements about 'urban use', whether in combination with proposals for technical-architectural interventions or not. This tradition has come to lead a life of its own: the discipline created its own frame of reference, in which new interpretations were generated and in which knowledge transformed itself at its own speed. Consequently, questions concerning what a building or an urban structure is refer to a third conceptual space different from the two discussed above. Such questions are related to the objects of the planning and design disciplines. Producing buildings and urban ensembles depends on numerous written and unwritten rules, on design procedures, on the building trade, and on reflections upon all of these.

With the advent of town planning as a separate discipline, interpreting the complex heterogeneity of urban use became a fixed ingredient, introducing new actors on a new stage. This stage has its own merits and forms coalitions with financial and political circuits. We would like to emphasize one aspect that has become the basis for interpreting 'urban use', especially in the Netherlands; we will then touch on its Italian counterpart.

Whether motivated by hygiene or by the need to adapt to changes in society after both world wars, in the Netherlands architectural and urban intervention is considered (in opinions ranging from the *KIVI-rapport* to CIAM, and from Forum to feminist criticism of the urban environment) a means to achieve a more 'dignified existence'. In these opinions the construction engineer has consistently striven — or was expected — to be a 'social engineer' as well. The kind of knowledge he bases himself on is characterised by the reduction of social reality to a single dimension, which might then be modified by means of architectural and urban planning interventions. Also typical is that the 'social engineer' draws at random from scholarly perspectives and scientific approaches. The result is often an unstructured and therefore incomprehensible patchwork of facts, views, ideas, and interconnections. It might be suggested that this has indeed contributed to the development of trends (with their own masters and disciples), but not to the development of schools in the scholarly sense, where knowledge is produced and passed on systematically.

In the Dutch construction engineer, therefore, two elements are brought together that are out of balance. On the one hand, he is part of a certain tradition in which areas of knowledge directly connected with the design process are passed on. In the past twenty years these areas — for instance visual training and design training — have been systematized to a greater or a lesser extent. On the other hand, he is also a 'social engineer' who acts more like a 'bricoleur' in the sense of Claude Lévi-Strauss: re-ordering the social material already available by linking everything to everything else, by discovering interconnections in all corners without being hampered by scholarly learning.¹⁵

Consequently, a universal human use is postulated which is both ahistorical and acultural. A scholarly approach is impossible because the raw material has not been prepared, arranged, and classified in advance. Though well-intentioned, the development of the 'social' side of the modern Dutch construction engineer is frequently inconsistent and rather limited (Vos 1986). For example, it has become customary to determine 'use' in accordance with each grade of the urban scale (house, neighbourhood, district, city, region). In this way architects and urban planners are succumbing to the illusion that 'use', or even life itself, may be guided in a positive or negative fashion. In the Netherlands, where for decades the 'social engineer' conscientiously strove for the best, this led to a rapid succession of solutions constantly superseded by reality. It also had an impact on the formulation of theories, in which 'use' was scarcely elaborated conceptually, if indeed at all.

The question is: why would users keep to one-dimensional arrangements planned by architects? Why would bodies adjust to such schemes, as if they could be stripped of their history easily and moulded into a desired shape, as if they were surfaces without memory or depth, much as the Moderns interpreted the urban substratum? In fact, the opposite seems to be the case. Not only does the soil resist, there is also resistance at the level of physical gestures and ritual acts. The 'user' appears to 'adapt' and 'fit' newly offered spatial patterns and modes of behaviour, at least in the studies presented in this volume. New developments are not incorporated unconditionally and completely, but rather interfere with existing modes of behaviour and thinking. In this (historical) sense of the word, the user is flexible (De Certeau 1988).

In Italy this social dimension has always been less profound. Housing as an issue which can be resolved through a programme of requirements (hygiene, social factors, ergonomics) does not seem to have drawn the same attention there as in northern European countries. Italy played only a minor part in the pre-war CIAM congresses. Formal discussions between traditionalists and moderns predominated for years. The former were in search of a modern, but primarily Italian architecture; the latter were looking for leads on new materials, techniques and production methods in an international context for an architecture that, in their view, should differ fundamentally from the classic type. Primarily they adopted the architectural forms of the Modern Movement, which were free of all historical reference. The appropriation of the modern style by Fascism (which considered itself modern as well) resulted in a distinctly Italian variation (Vos 1988: 50).

Like the Netherlands, in the post-war reconstruction period Italy could not ignore the social impact of urban renewal and urban expansion. To this end the *Associazione per l'Architettura Organica* even devised a type of architecture 'modelled on the human scale, on the spiritual, psychological, and material needs of ... man'.¹⁶ Based on traditional methods, this 'spontaneous' and regionalistic architecture arose in opposition to the re-introduction in Italy of international functionalist thinking. In comparison to the more recent, though related, complaint of the Dutch Forum against post-war functionalism, which had already been undermined, the human-scale architecture of the Italian AAO has been moulded not only in a written programme, but in particular has been given shape in an explicitly formal sense. Taking into account the typical choice of form and material made in 'organic' reconstruction districts as opposed to functionalist districts, the major impact of this discussion is once again in the area of spatial

arrangement. This criticism directed against functionalism once more brings the historical city into the picture.

That architects and urban planners in Italy stick closely to designing, in contrast with social engineers in the Netherlands, is also due to the fact that the Italian government has only a minor role in housing as far as programme, standardization, and financing are concerned. Because Italy does not possess a set of legal-planning and public housing instruments, housing is largely private. Building houses is therefore of a different order than designing architecture. In the post-war decades, the distinction between *edilizia* and *architettura* was greatly accentuated by, on the one hand, the unbridled building trade, in which the architect was no longer involved, and, on the other hand, the phenomenon that the orientation of architects became increasingly analytical and scholarly. The post-war Italian architect tends to be an intellectual, trained in theory and cultural history, who stands in opposition to the technically trained engineer.¹⁷

Architects were given room for reflection due to less institutionalized governmental interference in the building process and the marginal position they themselves have occupied in this process since the 1960s. They made thorough use of this room. In fact, morphological urban studies, which were initiated in Italy, constitute the most systematic response to the inadequacy of the functionalist planning concept (Muratori, Aymonino, Rossi, Dal Co et al.). In contrast to the abstract functionalist programmes, which, although they can be and have been executed, are not 'location-specific', the Italian studies take their lead primarily from the historical material of the actual city, from its meaningful 'locations'. The material structure of the city displays a type of permanence, going beyond dated, strictly utilitarian types of use. Again and again communities occupy, appropriate and transform this structure; in short, they *use* the city — in the widest sense of the word. This kind of analytical and theoretical orientation among Italian architects has also resulted in a design practice in which architectural design itself becomes part of researching the city. The design process is aimed not so much at realization or product creation, but primarily at the acquisition of knowledge. In this sense it is also understandable that these academic exercises consider the physical space and the development of a spatial programme first.¹⁸ Conversely, the very process of creating a design sheds new light on possible new types of use. In this way the architectural discipline itself contributes to investigations into cultural-historical aspects of the city and urban use.

Morphology of Habitat and Habitus

We have left aspects of this discussion untouched, but we would be going too far if we discussed them all. 'Culture' as an overall concept is of strategic importance in criticizing an image of society that is too univocal and elementary (such as that proposed by technicians and policymakers). As an analytic category, however, it is — as this volume will demonstrate — of much less value. We notice that each author was obliged to choose one aspect of the all encompassing empirical object of study, a choice related to his or her own disciplinary context. To do justice to and interrelate different kinds of knowledge the vague concepts of 'culture', 'city' and 'use' must be replaced by others that do justice to the complexity of the contributions included in this volume. Although these concepts

have already been 'used' and have been assigned many meanings, and although they have been replaced by other trendy terminology, we propose to introduce the *morphology of habitat and habitus*. Our principal aim, after all, is to analyse the multi-layered *form* of both the city and the human existence.¹⁹

In this light, the use of the urban environment, as we observe all around us daily, might be considered the result of interplay between two formal ordering systems, namely the (professional) environmental planning of the city and its architectural marking, and the spatial arrangement of social practice and the ritual underlining of this arrangement. Just as an historical morphology of the habitat investigates continuities and the nature and rate of change in the stratified physical and meaningful urban ensemble (Devillers 1987)²⁰, the morphology of the habitus constitutes a cultural-historical form of research, which likewise will enable us to detect continuities and modifications in the physical and meaningful modes of human behaviour in a particular sociocultural context (Bourdieu 1989).²¹

What conclusions may be drawn from the contributions to this volume? We now have more insight into where similarities and differences between urban rituals in Italy and the Netherlands can be sought. *Where* rituals are performed cannot be traced back to an existential difference in geography or climate, but appears largely to be an historical sediment deposited by the religious views about urban space at the time of the Reformation. Even today this sediment determines, for instance, what both cultures consider public or private domain, although these cultures no longer share an all-embracing, religious world view. It appears as well that ritual behaviour is not restricted to Mediterranean countries such as Italy, although their public and exuberant use of the city immediately catches the eye. Behaviour is equally ritual in the Netherlands, although it does not seem so to the Dutch. For example, the attributes used are less striking: they are trivial, everyday objects that are manipulated in public ritual actions.

Another issue is how topical questions might be interpreted from the perspective presented here. As to public urban practice in the Netherlands, the number of political rallies has increased steadily since the 1970s and have been characterized by much ritual display. And what about the marathons that have now become annual events in some big Dutch cities? What can we say about the renewed ambition to create an urban identity, as is evident in the 'city demarcation projects' recently concluded in Groningen and Amsterdam? A comparable counterpart in Italy does not spring immediately to mind. In contrast to the Dutch, who are extremely open to anything new from anywhere — witness the recent obsession with all things Italian — Italians seem much less receptive to foreign customs and trends.

Moreover, it appears that the positions presently held by women and men are determined largely by such 'multi-layered, cultural differences'. Places where the women movement was able to take root — in the Netherlands feminism has gained a much stronger foothold than in Italy — also coincide with the cultural boundaries laid down by the Reformation or even in Roman times. That feminist views to a certain extent correspond to Protestant thinking and behaviour only becomes apparent based on this historical awareness. Secondly, it makes clear that the desire for change or lack of such derives from a long historical tradition, and that these desires are impervious to direct political action or ideological proposals, let alone indirect architectural and urban planning interventions.

Current design issues, for instance the (re)structuring of metropolitan peripheries in Italy, could be reformulated from the perspective of an urban study involving both *habitat* and *habitus*. Because these areas are less crystallised morphologically, it is essential that we understand what factors play a role in these areas and what underlying logic there is to the fragmentation of this 'spontaneous' city. In the Netherlands, two issues — restructuring former dockland and industrial sites, and redefining the town edge — may be the most important questions requiring such an analysis.

The preoccupation with use might be replaced by a greater focus on analysis — similar to how the trained eye views architecture and urban design — which might serve to interpret instead of to legitimize the actual design questions.²² It cannot be denied that construction engineers have to sell their designs, and that poetic images are more appropriate for that purpose than scholarly analyses. This does not imply, however, that scholarly knowledge is made redundant by these images. At any rate, we would like to emphasize that the *analytic instruments* for the investigation of *habitat* and *habitus* should not be confused with *design instruments*, because the implication would again be that these two universes can be intermingled.

We do not deny that reality is much more complex than as it is presented in these pages, and this will also become evident in the wide range of scenes described by the eight authors. The articles show the complexity of urban life in all its splendour. On the other hand, after a while the images begin to blend with one another, so that Hasselt begins to resemble Crooswijk, and Crooswijk begins to resemble Testaccio, and Rome can be read as a religious, negative image of Amsterdam. The Sicilian agro-town, in spite of all its remarkable differences, also begins to be in rhyme with issues made manifest in Dutch houses of both past and present. Even the battle waged between youngsters from the different districts in Venice reminds one of present-day 'juvenile gangs' disputing territory in new housing districts in the Netherlands.

Neither the superficial differences, nor the striking similarities are decisive for the significance of these cases. Important is the fact that different cases can be arranged according to similar structures. Only within the context of *habitat* and *habitus* are they given their correct place, and only in this context is it possible to compare their value. These rich, multifaceted case studies into the historical-cultural use of the city show, in other words, that the analysis of reality need not result in unreal reductions, but can offer a variety of insights that serves first of all as food for thought, both historical and present-day issues.

Notes

1. A. Corbaz: 'This quantitative mutation, namely expansion of the city over the entire territory, corresponds to a qualitative mutation: the urban lifestyle, the sets of values and non-values of the city, impose themselves everywhere through the media, and especially through television. The remnants of traditions or even archaic customs in the agricultural plains and in the mountain valleys are making way for modes of behaviour that are the same everywhere' (1992: 51).
2. We see that today leading designers contribute greatly to producing a science-fiction-like image of the world as their interpretation of the rapid changes taking place daily. Such alleged mutations resemble SF-series on television: the characters wear unfamiliar outfits, manipulate all kinds of sophisticated

- machinery, and take pills instead of eating recognizable food. Nevertheless, they still fall in love and get married in the old way, still take trips, still have children, and still thrive on the same kind of gossip, with all of the same practical consequences. Beneath the superficial modifications are modes of behaviour dating back to other periods.
3. In the early 1970s, the Dutch art historical and architectural historical world felt the impact of a series of IKON-conferences, with such titles as *Kunstgeschiedenis tussen liefhebberij en maatschappij* (1974) and *De tijd rijp voor een nieuwe methodenstrijd?* (1977). In 1977 the Institute of Art History at the University of Utrecht hosted a conference entitled 'Architectural History a Social Science?', and a year later students of art history at the University of Nijmegen organized a seminar called *Kunstgeschiedenis als kritiek*, Art History as Criticism.
 4. For some time the magazine *Te Elfder Ure* played a prominent role in introducing new themes (see the general bibliography). In the Faculty of Architecture, especially in the areas of research and instruction headed by the *Projektraad*, a Permanent Work Group, these general issues focused, for instance, on 'urban analysis', and the analysis of the intellectual work done by the architect (see the general bibliography).
 5. The first Dutch feminist essays about the urban environment were published in 1977. For a review we refer the reader to: Lidewij Tummars (1988). The *Stichting Vrouwen Bouwen Wonen* (Foundation for Women in Building and Dwelling) was founded in 1983; until recently it organized all women in the Netherlands involved in any way in the field of building and dwelling.
 6. Not only Women's Studies at the Faculty of Architecture showed interest. The Summer University 1981 on Women's Studies (University of Amsterdam) was the first occasion for women to discuss this theme; the wide range of participants included political scientists, architectural historians, demographers, architects, social geographers, and urban and rural planners. During the Winter University 1983 (University of Nijmegen) and the Summer University 1987 (University of Groningen) the interest appeared to have increased greatly. Since then the attention given to this wide field has been divided between the various disciplines.
 7. This internal publication included essays on feminist criticism of the urban environment (Edhoffer, De Mare, Vos 1986), the history of architectural thinking in the Netherlands since 1850 (Vos 1986), and a first demarcation of the object of women's studies in architecture (De Mare 1986).
 8. We will mention here our subsidised study *Normering in de woningbouw in relatie tot veranderende woon- en leefvormen* — Standardization in Public Housing in Relation to Changing Forms of Dwelling and Living (Ter Horst, Theunissen, Vos 1987); a study of the architectural work of internationally well-known women architects in the projects *Proloog tot Zichtbaarheid* (Prologue to Visibility, in 1987 and 1988). Moreover, in research, teaching, and lectures, attention was given to diverse subjects such as the urban villa (Vos 1985), issues such as 'individualization and collectivization: programmes for residential areas', and more specific issues of urban planning involving the peripheries of Rome, the Dutch town of Nieuwegein and Amsterdam (Vos 1988, 1990, 1992). In addition, the use of spatial aspects in classic Hollywood movies was examined (De Mare 1990b, 1991a). Furthermore, research into the transformation of the architectural knowledge system has been initiated: a study comparing Renaissance Italian architectural treatises and seventeenth-century architectural thinking in the Netherlands (De Mare 1992a/b).
 9. The contributions by Peter Burke, Richard Ingersoll and Willem Frijhoff are based on lectures given at this seminar, at which Christine Boyer and Thomas Reese were invited speakers as well.

10. Rituals always concern a series of acts performed at particular moments. There is a canonical succession of gestures in combination with certain attributes, a sequence characterized by repetitions and reversals, by rhythm, by a beginning and an end. This basic form allows for internal additions and exchanges, while the structure is maintained, so that modulations and variations may occur that may differ remarkably in character, though not in structure.
11. Although ordinary acts can be performed in many ways, we often find cultural constants in the way they are actually enacted. This is why the functionalist description is inadequate in tracing significant cultural contrasts. Neither is functionalism interested in daily acts, as far as their rhythms, their endless repetitions, and the manipulated attributes are concerned, which may differ according to social class, gender, region or generation.
12. This would be the exemplary level for semiotical research, but here too we see that the architectural discipline deploys semiotics as a screen enabling the construction engineer to assemble *all* levels under one perspective, often directly on behalf of the design process.
13. Arnold van Gennep described the general conditions for existence, which have to be resolved in every culture, as follows: 'We have seen that an individual is placed in various sections of society, synchronically and in succession; in order to pass from one category to another and to join individuals in other sections, he must submit, from the day of his birth to that of his death, to ceremonies whose forms often vary but whose function is similar ... Two primary divisions are characteristic of all societies irrespective of time and place: the sexual separation between men and women, and the magico-religious separation between the profane and the sacred ... For groups, as well as for individuals, life itself means to separate and to be reunited, to change form and condition, to die and to be reborn. It is to act and to cease, to wait and rest, and then to begin acting again, but in a different way. And there are always new thresholds to cross: the thresholds of summer and winter, of a season or a year, of a month or a night; the thresholds of birth, adolescence, maturity, and old age; the thresholds of death and that of the afterlife — for those who believe in it' (Van Gennep 1977: 189-190).
14. Walter Benjamin separated the last two levels as well: 'Buildings are appropriated in a twofold manner: by use and by perception — or rather, by touch and sight. Such appropriation cannot be understood in terms of the attentive concentration of a tourist before a famous building. On the tactile side there is no counterpart to contemplation on the optical side. Tactile appropriation is accomplished not so much by attention as by habit. As regards architecture, habit determines to a large extent even optical reception. The latter, too, occurs much less through rapt attention than by noticing the object in incidental fashion. This mode of appropriation, developed with reference to architecture, in certain circumstances acquires canonical value. For the tasks which face the human apparatus of perception at the turning points of history cannot be solved by optical means, that is, by contemplation, alone. They are mastered gradually by habit, under the guidance of tactile appropriation' (Benjamin 1969: 240).
15. 'The "bricoleur" is adept at performing a large number of diverse tasks; but, unlike the engineer, he does not subordinate each of them to the availability of raw materials and tools conceived and procured for the purpose of the project. His universe of instruments is closed and the rules of his game are always to make do with "whatever is at hand", that is to say with a set of tools and materials which is always finite and is also heterogeneous because what it contains bears no relation to the current project, or indeed to any particular project, but is the contingent result of all the occasions there have been to renew or enrich the stock or to maintain it with the remains of previous constructions or destructions' (Lévi-Strauss 1974: 17).

16. The declaration of intent issued by the *Associazione per l'Architettura Organica* is cited by Carlo Aymonino in his history of one of the reconstructed districts that might be called prototypical: Tiburtino in Rome (Aymonino 1957).
17. In Italy, architects often (and out of necessity) restrict themselves to the production of a design; the actual construction process and its supervision are the domain of engineers (Vos 1992: 52 ff). See also Secchi's description of the practice of the urban planner, whose main task is to get to know the city (Dicke 1989: 24).
18. Noteworthy is the skill/habit of Italians to work out spatial structures and shapes concretely, without knowing anything at all about the programme for and the possible users of a building. In principle this variable has no effect on a design; it may affect its realization, however.
19. In biology, morphology is the study of *forms*, and this has been adopted by other disciplines, for instance in the study of fairy tales (Propp 1973). The focus is on the investigation of the elements that constitute the empirical object (plant or fairy tale), as well as the determination of their mutual relationships and their position in the whole, after which a structural analysis is possible.
20. 'The morphological analysis therefore consists of the determination of the various constituent levels of the urban form and their mutual relationships' (Devillers 1987: 17).
21. 'Habitus' was conceived as a scholarly concept by Pierre Bourdieu: 'Unlike scientific estimations, which are corrected after each experiment according to rigorous rules of calculation, the anticipations of the *habitus*, practical hypotheses based on past experience, give disproportionate weight to early experiences. Through the economic and social necessity that they bring to bear on the relatively autonomous world of the domestic economy and family relations, or more precisely, through the specifically familial manifestations of this external necessity (forms of the division of labour between the sexes, household objects, modes of consumption, parent-child relations, etc.), the structures characterizing a determinate class of conditions of existence produce the structures of the *habitus*, which in their turn are the basis of the perception and appreciation of all subsequent experiences. The *habitus*, a product of history, produces individual and collective practices — more history — in accordance with the schemes generated by history. It ensures the active presence of past experiences, which, deposited in each organism in the form of schemes of perception, thought and action, tend to guarantee the "correctness" of practices and their constancy over time, more reliably than all formal rules and explicit norms' (Bourdieu 1990: 54).
22. This detached view enables us to consider as cultural phenomena precisely those things we perceive as most normal, which we accept as natural givens. Or in Orvar Löfgren's words: 'There are two traps to fall into when studying one's own culture and society. First of all we often take too much for granted. Things are seen but not noticed. We simply fail to problematize life around us and to realize that much of what we view as "normal" or parts of human nature, are in fact cultural products which must be anchored in history rather than in biology and psychology. Secondly, we may underrate the otherness of other subcultures within our own society. We may try to analyse teenage culture, religious world views, or working-class life through our own middle-class academic lenses, using categories and cognitive frameworks which are alien to them. In this case we underestimate the need for *cultural translation*. To counteract these tendencies we need to develop research strategies which can de-trivialize everyday life and make the familiar a bit more unfamiliar' (Löfgren 1981: 26).

URBAN RITUALS

IN ITALY AND THE NETHERLANDS

In *Urban Rituals in Italy and the Netherlands. Historical Contrasts in the Use of Public Space, Architecture and the Urban Environment*, renowned authors such as Peter Burke, Richard Ingersoll, Anton Blok and Willem Frijhoff explain their concept of the city and its use from four distinct perspectives: history, architectural history, cultural anthropology and urban design. In doing so, they deliberately avoid taking a functionalist view, in which an immediate causal relationship between space and use is assumed. The city and its use are indeed inseparably intertwined, but it is not the case that one gives rise to the other. The urban ensemble is formed by the historical layers of a city's architecture, whereas urban use is expressed concretely in trivial and daily customs, as well as in grand displays of ceremony which interrupt the daily course of events. The architecture of the city and urban use each have their own genealogies and change according to their own laws at their own pace.

In their introduction, the editors of this volume of essays - art historian Heidi de Mare and architect Anna Vos, both from the Women's Studies Section, Faculty of Architecture, Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands - argue that the two morphologies, that of the *habitat* and that of the *habitus*, should be investigated separately. In her preface, Franziska Bollerey describes their proposal as a critique against the tendency 'to allow architectural training to be determined exclusively by the demands of technology or even business management, or to overestimate the importance of these demands'.

This book is intended for students of architecture and other disciplines in which the use of the urban environment plays a role. It also offers students of Women's Studies food for thought, because the process of exploring the relationship between space and use throws new light on the relationship between architecture and gender. This volume argues for an interdisciplinary dialogue between scholars studying elements of this relationship, such as cities, buildings or their use. Last but not least this book encourages discussion between such scholars and professionals like architects and urban planners, whose work it is to design cities and buildings and who attempt to designate their use.



Van Gorcum, Assen