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Abstract

Álvaro Siza refers multiple experiences, apprenticeships, memories and characters in his texts and interviews which are important theoretical and methodological references in his route as an architect. Alvar Aalto is one of the first, most determinant and frequently quoted references in his work, both in his writings and projects.

Among the Portuguese architects, who, from the mid fifties onwards showed interest in Aalto’s works in their projects, Siza was undoubtedly the one who could best understand and interpret the Finnish architect’s work beyond the rapture about forms. It is a multifaceted reference, which Siza believes to be based on the affinities of constraints to be found between Finland and Portugal: geographic contexts far away from the main cultural central European hubs, where the use of traditional materials and building techniques was still frequently found, owing to both cultural and identity questions and scarce economic and technical resources.

Siza refers to Aalto as an architect whose acknowledged mastery is necessarily based on a solid theoretical background. Aware of the influence of some of Aalto’s texts in his work, Siza denies the idea that drawing is the only legitimate way of architectural reflection and expression. Nevertheless, he points out that Aalto’s most relevant contribution consists of an exemplary methodological proposal of project development.

Aalto and Siza develop long-standing projects, full of advances, retreats and hesitations, based on an interaction between feeling and thinking, in a thoughtful and critical way through design and experimentation. This way they achieve an inclusive and contextual architecture, which joins together the requests and conditioning of the context in which they are to intervene and the author’s identity: his memories, his convictions, his understanding of tradition, his historical knowledge, his interest in compositive and peer searching as well as other art forms, such as painting, drawing or sculpture.

Therefore, we believe it is important to propose a reading of Siza’s understanding concerning Aalto’s project process and the existing parallelism between both architects’ theoretical and methodological assumptions, identifying what they have in common.

To achieve this and based on the cross-reading of Aalto’s and Siza’s works and writings, we tried to reflect on the affinities of their architecture resulting from the parallelism, acknowledged by Siza, between the productive contexts they both work in and the recognition of the artistic and subjective component inherent to the act of projecting, which we think is shared by both. It is our objective to evaluate how they value the role of theory and method in their design process.
1. Fernando Távora and Alvar Aalto

The career of Álvaro Siza (b.1933) was marked by two determinant references from the beginning: Fernando Távora (1923-2005), his Professor in the Architecture course, with whom he worked while a student; and Alvar Aalto (1898-1976), whose work first impressed him, when he read the monographic issue of the magazine *L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui*, May, 1950.

“I cannot forget that first contact with the work of Alvar Aalto, just as it was published and analysed, the fascination and emotion when I first saw the photos of Viippuri and the M.I.T. Dormitory, the curves of the objects made of wood, steel, glass, leather, copper – the winding of the lakes in Finland. Or that factory of implacable geometry, rising from a rocky massif – nature and concrete as the stuff for Architecture”.

In the fifties – a decade which encompasses the years of Siza’s academic education and the beginning of his professional activity – Fernando Távora participated in the International Congresses of Modern Architecture (CIAM) following the architectural debate of the post war period.

Távora’s approach towards the validity of modernist principles, then being debated in the CIAM, was convergent with Aalto’s. Both understood architecture as encompassing all areas of human activity, and therefore the concept of rationalism, as proposed, needed to be broadened. In their projects they tried to reconcile modern assumptions with the contribution of history, tradition and place, using old and new building materials.

Távora shared his point of view about architecture with his students, colleagues and collaborators. Siza was attentive to this critical approach to functional modernism.

In Portugal, a survey of traditional architecture, started in 1955, which was published in 1961, contributed to the ongoing reflection. It permitted to understand the tradition of adapting architecture to its physical, social, cultural and economic contexts, as well as to research national identity – convergent problems with those which accompanied Távora’s career: the search for the specificity of Portuguese architecture and the explicit intention of making it visible in his work. As Alexandre Alves Costa, Távora’s follower, stated: “Being a nationalist is not necessarily retrograde, and being progressist does not mean the adoption of an international language.”

Siza never tried to create an intentionally Portuguese architecture. As he stated: “the patrimony of Portuguese tradition can be used as regards concrete problems. Of what is valid, of what is useful, we should make use. What is no more than romanticism is not interesting”.

However, he appreciates the nationalistic aspect in Aalto’s architecture, which as he wrote in 1977, “finds its roots in the Finnish tradition, in a spontaneous and also profoundly intentional way and is structured from the solid rationalist education of the architect.”

According to Siza, the best of Aalto's works appeared, after the Second World War, when Finland was being rebuilt and asserting its identity. He considers Aalto understood and participated in that collective movement, converting the restrictions into opportunities to experiment and renew.

Aalto was facing a productive context, whose affinities with the Portuguese one Siza soon acknowledged: both were working in countries far from the main central European cultural hubs, where, owing to cultural questions, but mainly to scarce economic resources, to an incipient national industry and to abundant artisan labour, the resource to workmanship was still frequent.

“Aalto's work and thinking,” Siza explains, “became then – inevitably – a reference point and a source of meditation”.

2. Alvar Aalto and Álvaro Siza’s first projects

“It is not possible to copy Alvar Aalto. I realised this from the beginning”, Siza said in 1998. “What is important in Aalto is the essence of his architecture and not his forms.”

However, explicit references to Aalto’s work can be found in many of his works, especially in the first ones, as a consequence of the study he started while very young, about the work of the Finnish architect. A growing detachment from the superficiality of forms and the search for what is essential in them came in the course of his career.

In the Parish Hall in Matosinhos (1956-1959) (fig.2.1), the entrance patio, to which the surrounding bodies open, reminds the way Aalto uses this element in his buildings and suggests, despite the difference of scale, the introvert character of the Säynätsalo Town Hall patio (1949-1952). In the Boa Nova Tea House (1958-1963) the study of spatiality, of detail work on materials and of the expression of Maison Carrée (1956-1959), “with its wavy wood ceilings and white plaster” is evident. In the swimming pool at Quinta da Conceição (1958-1965) (fig.2.2), Siza experiments the delicate, but contrasting, relationship with the environment he appreciates in Aalto’s work. The white and straight walls stand out of the surrounding vegetation, but they are moulded to the topography. They point routes, announce and merge with the swimming-pool supporting facilities and limit the bathing area, without preventing the enjoyment of the surroundings. In this building the study of elements used by Aalto in his architecture is also clear: the design of the openings, of their frames and the wooden battens which close the south-east façade of the bathhouse, similar to those used in the library façade of the Säynätsalo Town Hall, or on the wall which borders the courtyard of the Experimental House in Muuratsalo on the west. In the sketches for a restaurant in Perafita (1960) (fig.2.3), a volumetric composition, a spatiality and the suggestion of a materiality based in the work of the Finnish architect are explicit. In the Lordelo do Ouro cooperative store (1960-1963) (fig.2.4), the fenestration at a low level and the massive character of the elevated body reminds us of a composition which is typically Aalto's, and which is present in the Finnish Pavilion in Paris (1935-1937) and in the Säynätsalo Town Hall. In the project for Dr. Júlio Gesta's house (1961) (fig.2.5) Siza explores volumetric compositions which recall the play of aslant roofs of the Maison Carré, of the experimental house in Muuratsalo (1953), or even of the elevated body of the Säynätsalo Town Hall. Like Aalto's own house (1934-1936) and office (1953-1956) in Helsinki, Siza closes this dwelling on the street side, originating intimist interiors related to patios protected from the public eye.

Figure 2.3. Siza’s sketches for a restaurant in Perafita (1960 – never built). Álvaro Siza’s sketches (1960), published in: Salgado, José, Álvaro Siza em Matosinhos, Santa Maria da Feira: Edições Afrontamento /Câmara Municipal de Matosinhos, 2005, p. 147.

3. Theory and methodology

Beyond the rapture about forms, in various spoken and written interventions, Siza specifically refers to Aalto’s contribution, he centres his discourse on the ideas and methodological approach of this architect. He considers his acknowledged mastery is necessarily based on a solid theoretical background. However, he emphasises his methodological approach as an exemplary contribution to the praxis of the project. According to Siza, Aalto proposes “not «his» way of projecting, but «the» way of projecting for our time”.

In 1950, at the Architectural Association in London, Aalto explained the difficulty he felt, as an architect, to express his ideas and beliefs, either verbally or through writing, due to the multiplicity of meanings words can express. “An architect (...) has to deal with form and material, and what he says does not mean a damned thing.” he stated, “What counts is what he does. What I think about architecture you can see in my work, and what I say you can just forget.”

Siza, too, considers his works the most concrete expression of his thinking. “I would like to try to express my vision of architecture through projects that I realised, or even simply imagined, as my thoughts were settled in them,” he stated, in 1998, in his book Imaginar a Evidência, where he exposed his reflection on his design praxis, in a fragmentary way, work after work.

Nevertheless, in the early seventies, Aalto composed a text – The White Table – he intended to be the introduction of the book, thought as his “spiritual legacy”, which he never actually wrote. That fact suggests an understanding of theoretical systematization not as a simultaneous and operative activity to the practice of the project, but as a result of the evaluation of that very practice. That concept is also expressed in Siza’s statement, in an interview in 1978: “My professional experience is not rich and global enough to allow me the theorization of what I do.”

Siza recognizes that the architect needs to have theoretical convictions, to transform his culture and the features of the reality on which he intervenes into operative matter in the design process. “The theoretical support is very important for practical work.” “It would be impossible to make good buildings without a strong theoretical base,” he says. However, he takes a stand opposite other architects of his generation, like Aldo Rossi, who want to formulate a systematic and explicit theory, parallel or even previous to project practice. Also Aalto stands apart from Le Corbusier in this aspect.

Of the “à posteriori rationalization of a determined action (...) comes the tendency to a norm, more than to a theory,” Rossi says in the text Architecture for Museums. “I propose”, he continues “to construct a theory of project properly speaking; that is, a theory of project as a moment of the theory of architecture”.

In alternative Aalto and Siza adopt an attitude of permanent doubt towards a global theoretical construction, which might contain all the problematic dimension of the project. They propose a fragmentary and partial approach to the themes and problems of architecture, as well as the valuation of the methodological aspect of the project.
In their writings, speeches and works they express implicitly ideas and convictions which support their practices, without ever defining precise rules – like Le Corbusier did in *Five points towards a new architecture* and in other texts. As Siza states, “the exercise of projecting does not accept a moment of security, of stable knowledge, even if it is known to be provisional” and, according to Aalto, “what you should do and what architecture is, frankly (...) nobody knows.” Therefore they undertake a continuous critical reflection on architecture, away from theoretical systematization, which they fear might include linguistic prejudice, and they tend to develop a learned, but empirical, approach to the practice, considering that the existing theoretical framings are enough to support their project activity.

For both, project intention only arises in face of concrete reality, whose tensions, conflicts, ambiguities and opportunities they try to understand, integrate and conciliate through design, which – as Siza wrote about Aalto’s work – “is born from the permanent dialogue between what pre-exists and the collective desire of transformation.”

“Realism usually provides the strongest stimulus to my imagination” Aalto says; “the idea is in the «site»,” Siza states “more than in everyone’s mind, for those who can see.”

However, they recognize the autobiographic and identity component of their theoretical convictions reflected in their projects, whatever their location and functional programme.

Their works result, just like Siza says about Aalto, from the “ability to include everything in the design, of taking everything as a stimulus”, the character of the place, the programmatic demands of the work to be designed, the construction means available, as well as the architect’s intuition, memory, culture, understanding of tradition, knowledge of history and convictions. It is a kind of architecture, socially and culturally implied in its time and place, but imbued with the acquired knowledge of history and tradition, both from the place to work on, but also of all the disciplinary field of architecture. An architecture engaged with the place, which simultaneously becomes autonomous, since it does not comply with miming the environment, but synthesizes in itself experiences, knowledge and memories of places and times, sometimes distant, which the architect recalls in the course of a process of complex and reflexive search for “serenity”, Siza says, for “stability and a kind of silence, the timeless and universal territory of order” which depends on the “conciliation of opposites.”

In the bank of Oliveira de Azeméis (1971-1974) (fig.3.1), such as in Aalto’s building Enso-Gutzeit in Helsinki (1959-1962), reality is summoned to the project, even though it does not reflect on the architectural language.

Aalto studies the alignment and the metrics of the profile of the classical city of Helsinki to inform and ground the new Enzo-Gutzeit building, as well as its relationship with the neighbouring Byzantine cathedral, by a fragmentation of the façade towards it. Siza, in turn, makes the volumetric form and spatial organization of the bank in Oliveira de Azeméis dependent on the complex articulation of regulating lines defined after the surrounding physical elements.

Aalto and Siza link both buildings to the surroundings, respecting its structure, defining the generating lines of implantation, spatial organization and volumetric composition, pondering relations of proportion – “touchstone of architecture” –, and exploring the possibility of reconciling different architectures in a whole, thought to be continuous and intercommunicating, but which does not have to be unitary.
The city is composed of a complexity of fragments, which, according to Siza, it is essential to know how to assemble.\textsuperscript{36} For him there is an exemplary relation of opposition and complementarity in the two volumes of Aalto’s House of Culture of Helsinki (1952-1958) (fig.3.2). “What is extraordinary in that work,” he says “is the strength of that very light, very delicate element, which makes the union between two very different languages.”\textsuperscript{37} He refers to the canopy whose shape conciliates the different parts – enabling the building to be understood as a whole – and simultaneously, articulates the two volumes with the surrounding area, shaping the streetscape and the entrance of the building. Siza believes that Aalto was aware of the challenge of designing this element, and so he delayed its definition until after the construction of the remaining parts of the project – the convenient moment to understand and conciliate tensions.\textsuperscript{38}

Siza, too, faced the problem of conciliating different bodies, corresponding to different programmatic needs in the same project. In the two houses of Schilderswijk, in Haia (1984-1988) (fig.3.3), he articulates two different languages – an expressionist volume and a rationalist one – in a building that is understood as a whole. In the Parish complex of Santa Maria, in Marco de Canavezes (1989-1996) (fig.3.4), the church stands out from the parish centre and expresses its religious character by its relevant position in the surroundings, its different building scale and its formal expressiveness. However there is an overall language, reinforced by the implementation of the two bodies and the elevated platform on which they stand. In his recent and not yet built project for the House of Architecture, in Matosinhos (2007-...) (fig.3.5), Siza divides the areas of public and restricted access, in two contiguous bodies with different languages, related through the feeling of continuity generated by the winding movement of the whole building.
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4. Rationalism and empiricism

Aalto and Siza appreciate experimentation and intuitive design, knowingly used as an alternative or complement of logical reasoning. “Architectural research can be more and more methodical”, Aalto states, “but substance of it can never be solely analytical. Always there will be more of instinct and art in architectural research,” intuitive feeling and personal warmth, (...) is needed for the very best work.\(^\text{40}\)

Nevertheless, they do not reject the rationalist aspect in architecture, but they consider it insufficient. They believe, like Aalto states, that “the frequently despised philosophy of doubt is an absolute prerequisite for anyone wishing to contribute to culture.”\(^\text{41}\)

Nevertheless, the way Aalto and Siza cultivate doubt is different from other architects like Le Corbusier – of a generation close to Aalto’s – and Aldo Rossi’s – Siza’s generation.

For Le Corbusier and Rossi doubt comes from the formulation of a theory. They consider it is necessary to enunciate a system and accept contradiction later, as a result from the confrontation with other systems and with the circumstances of their own works.

In Aalto’s and Siza’s case, doubt prevents them from systematizing in writing the theoretical assumptions on which their works are founded, as they never consider them safe enough to be fixed. They understand the place and the programme as the only starting points for the project, facing them solely with what they call architectural culture. Their theoretical approach does not start from a systematic idea. It is built case after case, theme after theme, along their career by partial and fragmentary approaches, they never come to systematize.

According to Aalto “Each order is different, so you can not take solutions in a systematic way.”\(^\text{42}\) The project process assembles a multiplicity of frequently opposing variables, and an infinity of possible and unpredictable answers “into a tangled web that cannot be straightened out rationally or mechanically. The sheer number of various demands and problems forms a barrier that makes it hard for the basic architectural idea to emerge.”\(^\text{43}\)

In an excerpt which Siza defines as the synthesis of the “most exact and penetrating analysis of the mental process of projecting”,\(^\text{44}\) Aalto explains:

“(...) what appears to be nothing but playing with forms may unexpectedly, much later, lead to the emergence of an actual architectural form.”\(^\text{45}\)
For Aalto and Siza, the intuitive gesture of the hand, used in a conscientious way as a creative source alternative or complementary to the analysis, articulates and develops the thinking process. The drawing, as well as painting and sculpture, prompts discovery, creation and critical reflection. They enable the triggering of a series of resonances which confer unity and identity to the process of architectural conception. “I can start with bizarre ideas (...) and the process which follows is difficult to explain because it is not linear, but contradictory”, Siza explains. “It does not mean that much remains of a first sketch. But everything begins.” The rapid sketches (...) help the awareness of the multiplicity of tensions around each hypothesis of answer to a concrete problem(...) they help to establish a permanent dialectic connection between intuition and rigorous inquiry, in a process of complete understanding and visualization.

Siza and Aalto's distrust towards formulating systems is also reflected in the materialization of their projects. They do not defend industrialization, nor workmanship. They believe both can co-exist, especially if that does not prevent the continuation of the design process at work stage. Both believe that the project should not stop before the construction: it must be continuously improved.

“The architect must be able to perfect this or that element until the end of the work”, Siza says. “The construction must be alive. Like a sculptor, we must keep the argile humid. A project depends on an architect as well as on a carpenter and on a plasterer. I do not like this convention which makes a project be conceived on paper alone.” In this sense, both appreciate the possibility of intentionally leaving some carefully selected points of the project not totally defined, allowing their intervention on the building site, in the search for solutions for problems whose complexity makes its equation difficult in a previous stage. As Aalto confessed in 1947, in a letter to his wife Aino, “the real inspiration comes and exact forms appear only after construction has started”.

Siza, reflecting on his praxis, writes:

“If theory means a set of rules which you can register and re-use, then I feel fine not having theory (as people say sometimes).

I know of none quietly applicable. The passing of time, fast as it is, does not permit or forgive it. It is always being reduced to a starting point. The very research abandons or overcomes it and this happens at each new project, in spite of successive experiments.”

According to Aalto, “there is but one rule that holds in architecture: build naturally. (...) Everything that is superfluous becomes ugly with time.”
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