

Architectural History Research and the Universities in the UK
Adrian Forty

Architectural history in the UK has always occupied an ambivalent relationship to universities and academia. One of the best known and respected British architectural historians of the twentieth century, Sir John Summerson (1904-1992) never held an academic position (he was director of the Sir John Soane Museum from 1945 to 1984), and many other well-known figures spent no more than part of their careers attached to universities.¹ The single greatest asset to architectural history created in post-war Britain, the RIBA Drawings Collection, was assembled without sponsorship or support from any university, by John Harris, who himself never obtained a higher education qualification.² Two of the most outstanding architectural history publications, the *Survey of London* (founded in 1894 and still continuing) and the *Buildings of England* series, started by Sir Nikolaus Pevsner in 1951, have both thrived independent of any attachment to a university institution. Some of the most active interest and engagement with architectural history has taken place through two voluntary organisations, the Victorian Society (founded in 1958) and the Twentieth Century Society (founded in 1979 ?mention origin as Georgian Group earlier than that?), whose members have been active not only in the appreciation of past architecture, but also in generating research and new knowledge. Their respective publications (*Studies in Victorian Architecture and Design*; *Twentieth Century Architecture*; *20th Century Magazine*; the series of monographs *Twentieth Century Architects*, and numerous other occasional publications) have played an important role in promoting and disseminating new research.

The flourishing existence of architectural history independently of universities has a long tradition in Britain - and indeed the discipline's origins in the UK lie in the research done by scholars with private means, or alternatively, by scholars who though attached to

universities, pursued their interest in architectural history as a sideline to their main disciplinary interest. For example, Robert Willis (1800-1875) , the nineteenth century historian of Gothic architecture, was a mathematician, engineer and Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy at Cambridge; E.A. Freeman (1823-1892), who pioneered the study of anglo-norman architecture, was best known as a constitutional historian, who became Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge.

The impulse to study architectural history in Britain arose from two circumstances. One was the Gothic Revival, and the need to establish an exact taxonomy of styles, so as to set precedents and ground rules for the restoration of old churches and the construction of new ones. The leadership of this branch of architectural history came partly from clergymen, partly from architects, for both of whom the classification of styles of mediaeval architecture, and the establishment of a chronological line of development was a matter of great importance. The other impulse for the study of architectural history came from the expansion and consolidation of Britain's overseas empire. Encounters with cultures in other parts of the world, especially India, provoked both curiosity, and a need to legitimate European superiority over native cultures. Just as the experiences of colonial administrators stimulated the comparative study of languages, so too they inspired comparative studies of western and non-western architecture. The author of the first comprehensive British history of architecture, James Fergusson (1808-1886), whose *A History of the Modern Styles in Architecture* was published in 1862, had spent his early life as an indigo merchant in India, and his encounters with the Hindu architectural legacy prompted him to assemble a general history of the architecture of the world. Notwithstanding the fact that Fergusson regarded all non-western architectural traditions as dead-ends, his was the first attempt to make a serious assessment of the entirety of the world's architecture. By far the best known work on architecture to

result from Britain's Imperial experience was Banister Fletcher's *History of Architecture on the Comparative Method*, first published in 1896, and continuously revised and republished ever since. The book was a work of collaboration between Banister Fletcher (1833-1899), and his son, Banister Flight Fletcher (1866-1953); Fletcher senior was Professor of Architecture at King's College London, and was allowed to appoint his sons as assistants, on condition that he paid them himself. The *History* was therefore a product of Fletcher's architectural office, rather than of his tenure as Professor, and the impulse for it came both from a need for a teaching manual, but also out of a desire to catalogue the architecture of the world - in such a way as to demonstrate the ultimate superiority of the western tradition.³

The transformation of architectural history in the UK from a discourse exclusively populated by amateurs and historically-minded architects into a discipline of trained and professional scholars started to occur in the 1930s. The immediate cause was the rise to power of the Nazi party in Germany, and the exodus of many German scholars, Jewish and non-Jewish. England benefitted with the arrival of the Warburg Institute, its library and staff from Hamburg in 1933, to be joined in 1934 by Rudolf Wittkower (1901-1971), who had been working at the Biblioteca Herziana in Rome for the previous ten years, on the study of baroque and mannerist art and architecture.⁴ His presence in Britain, where he stayed until 1956, when he went to Columbia University in New York, was to have a significant effect on British architectural history scholarship, introducing British historians to systematic studies of iconography and meaning in Renaissance architecture, based upon rigorous historical methods rather than the pure conjecture and taste that had previously been the only customary tools of British writers, in so far as they considered such questions at all. Among those influenced by Wittkower was the architect, critic and historian Colin Rowe (1920-1999), who studied with Wittkower at the Warburg Institute, and went on to apply Wittkower's pursuit of

questions of meaning, and of cultural exchange, in a more speculative vein, to modern architecture.

The other emigrant from Nazi Germany who was, in the long run, to have an even greater effect upon architectural history in Britain was Nikolaus Pevsner (1902-1983).⁵ Pevsner arrived in Britain in 1935. Although he had previously studied British art, it was only after his arrival in Britain that he became seriously concerned with architecture, and, through association with his compatriot and fellow-emigré Walter Gropius, specifically with architectural modernism. Pevsner was not appointed to a university position until 1941 - at Birkbeck College in the University of London - but once there, and as editor of the *Architectural Review* during the wartime years, started to produce a formidable range of scholarly books and articles, informed by German pre-war art historical scholarship. An outstanding early success was his slim *An Outline of European Architecture* published in 1942 in a cheap paperback edition by Penguin Books. Presenting Western architecture in terms of a story of aesthetic development, as 'a history of man shaping space', Pevsner enjoined that 'the historian must keep spatial problems always in the foreground'.⁶ With his emphasis on aesthetic intention in architecture, Pevsner's history provided a narrative to architecture -superseding Banister Fletcher, who had none. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, Pevsner also wrote a large number of articles, mostly published in the *Architectural Review*, on aspects of British and European architecture, most of them again primarily concerned with establishing aesthetic intention. At the same time, Pevsner was teaching courses in the History of Art at Birkbeck College, and while also lecturing in architectural history at Cambridge: through his teaching, Pevsner established architectural history as a rigorous university discipline with its own methods. Pevsner also started to take on doctoral students in architectural history, providing a framework within which it was possible to pursue academic research into architectural history - and the majority of the first British doctorates in architectural

history were carried out under Pevsner's supervision. Notable among his students were Reyner Banham, and Robin Middleton. During the same period, Pevsner also started work on the *Buildings of England*, the county-by-county survey of British architecture. This remarkable project, which started in 1951, was conducted not as university-based research, but in collaboration, and with the financial support of Allen Lane, the publisher of Penguin Books. Between 1951 and 1974, Pevsner researched and wrote forty six volumes of the *Buildings of England*, after which the editorship of the series was taken over first by Bridget Cherry, and later by Simon Bradley, who have continued to revise and update the volumes. Pevsner's motive for the *Buildings of England* was in part his interest in democratising architectural historical knowledge, and his desire to remove it from the preserve of a self-appointed elite of 'experts', and to enable any man or woman of average education and intelligence to form their own judgements about architecture. Pevsner's desire to bring knowledge into the public domain, and to bring to an end the class-based snobbery that dominated British culture was an ambition that he shared with Allen Lane, whose ambition with Penguin Books was to make specialist knowledge available to all. Anti-élitism was a recurrent feature of all Pevsner's scholarship - and one that was to be shared by his most famous student, Reyner Banham.

The other key figure in the transformation of architectural history into a recognised academic discipline was Sir Howard Colvin (1919-2007).⁷ Colvin had studied mediaeval history at University College, London with the intention of becoming an archeologist. Wartime service, in Gibraltar, intervened, where during his spare time he found himself reading John Gould's 1835 *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Artists*, which became the inspiration for his own *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects*. Back in England after the war, he was appointed as a lecturer in history at University College, London, in 1946, and then a year later was offered a Fellowship at St John's College,

Oxford, where he remained until his death. While in London, he had discovered that the architect Sir Albert Richardson (1880-1964), Professor of Architecture at University College from 1919 to 1946, had been in the habit of providing owners of historic houses with certificates authenticating the designers of their properties. Shocked by Richardson's irresponsible attributions, based on no more than his judgement of style and hearsay evidence, Colvin was determined to establish a more reliable record - which is what the *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600-1840*, first published in 1954, became. Colvin's aim was, he said, 'to apply to architecture the ordinary processes of historical scholarship'⁸; as distinct from Richardson, interested only in establishing a stylistic canon, Colvin sought to verify all his judgements against archival sources. The strength of Colvin's teaching, and his own writing, was the meticulous corroboration of the physical evidence of buildings with evidence from documents and drawings. Colvin set a model for architectural historical scholarship that displaced the earlier, connoisseur's tradition; relatively uninterested in questions of style, or of aesthetic intention, Colvin's mission was to make architectural history into a respectable, and respected, branch of historical scholarship.

By the early 1960s, anyone considering doctoral study in architectural history in Britain had more or less two options: to go either to Nikolaus Pevsner at Birkbeck (or Cambridge? - when did people eg Middleton and Tarn start studying with him at Cambridge?), or to Howard Colvin at Oxford. The choice between the two lay partly on their respective approaches - Pevsner's interest being in aesthetic intention, Colvin's in accurate historical attribution - but more distinctly in their preferred areas of study: Colvin's students studied pre-nineteenth century and exclusively British topics, while Pevsner attracted students interested in nineteenth and twentieth century architecture, often with more cosmopolitan themes covering European and American architecture.

In the mid-1960s, there was a major expansion of Higher Education in Britain, as a result of which a series of new universities were created. Amongst these was the University of Essex, where a Department of Art History and Theory was set up, to which, in 1967, Joseph Rykwert (1926-) was appointed. Rykwert, who had studied architecture in England, had spent a period teaching at the Hochschule für Gestaltung at Ulm, where he had become familiar with the developments taking place in Italian architectural culture at the time, especially over semiotics and meaning. From what was essentially a debate about contemporary architecture in Italy, Rykwert brought these questions to bear on the study of architectural history, combining a close reading of architectural texts with an interest in the origins of architectural motifs and ideas: two outstanding early books emerged, *The Idea of a Town* (1963) and *On Adam's House in Paradise* (1972). At Essex, Rykwert established a post-graduate programme in architectural history that rapidly attracted students who were interested in questions of meaning and value, and sceptical about the legitimacy of modernist architecture. Those who went to study with Rykwert at Essex included several who were to go on to gain major reputations in late twentieth century architectural history and theory: Alberto Perez-Gomez, David Leatherbarrow, Robin Evans, Moshen Mostafavi, Daniel Libeskind (but not only the loons - Simon P as well!). In 1980, Rykwert left Essex, and with his colleague Dalibor Vesely, moved to the School of Architecture at Cambridge, where they developed a distinctive programme of research with a strong emphasis on hermeneutics. When Rykwert left Cambridge for the University of Pennsylvania in 1988, the locus of research into Renaissance architecture that he had promoted shifted to the University of Bath, where two historians who had studied with him, Robert Tavernor (1954-) and Vaughan Hart continued in this tradition, later joined by a historian of Roman architecture, Mark Wilson Jones.

Whereas Pevsner had been committed to the popularisation of architectural historical scholarship, the Rykwert group was

not. On the contrary, for Rykwert and Vesely, it was the vulgarisation of architecture, and its reduction into a purely instrumental practice that was the cause of architecture's loss of value in the modern world. Their concern, therefore, was to restore to architecture the authority that it had once held, prior to the advent of modernity, a project that by no means demanded simplification or transparency. Pevsner, and subsequently Reyner Banham, regarded this desire to reinvest architecture with meaning as needless mystification, and were strongly hostile to it. As Banham wrote in a review of Rykwert's book *The First Moderns*, it was not the proper business of architectural history to preserve architecture's secret 'for the deeper illumination of the mystery for those who are already *illuminati*'.⁹ The rift between those who saw the task of architectural history scholarship as to the popularisation of knowledge, and those who saw its purpose as to protect architecture from vulgarisation was to be one of the sharpest and most substantive divisions in British architectural history in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Up until the mid-1960s, virtually the only institutions where research into architectural history was conducted were departments of art history - the Warburg Institute, the Courtauld Institute, Birkbeck College, with the addition in the late-1960s of Essex University. However, changes in architectural education in Britain in the 1950s, when full-time courses in higher education institutions superseded older apprenticeship systems, brought about a substantial review of architectural study in universities. Many of these changes were confirmed and codified at a conference organised by the Royal Institute of British Architects at Magdalen College Oxford in 1958, an event usually referred to as the 'Oxford Conference'.¹⁰ Of the conclusions of the conference, one in particular had a profound effect on the future development of architectural history, and this was the decision that as well concerning themselves with the training of architects, schools of architecture in universities should also conduct

'research'. To some extent, this principle followed from the modernist axiom that all precepts must be re-examined - and rather than locate this process in architectural practice, the delegates argued that it should best take place within the context of the university, which was after all dedicated to the discovery of new knowledge. The argument helped to legitimate the place of architecture within universities, where it had previously been regarded with some suspicion, as a trade. The designation of university-based schools of architecture as research institutions did much to win favour with university authorities, who during the 1960s frequently came to regard architecture as an exemplary fusion of science and art, a satisfying resolution of the 'Two Cultures' explain for Italian audience debate that had engrossed academics and intellectuals since the late 1950s, while in its applied skills providing a model for other disciplines. 'Research' became part of the justification for architecture's presence within academic institutions, and the more enterprising schools were able to develop research projects that took advantage of the new sources of government research funding provided through the newly established research councils. Cambridge, led by Sir Leslie Martin (1908-2000), who had been appointed Professor in 1956, and was one of the prime-movers behind the Oxford Conference, became one of the first schools to develop substantial research programme, into land use and built form, using geometric and mathematical modelling. Pevsner supervising people there from ?mid 60s? Cambridge's example was followed by the School of Architecture at the University of Liverpool, and at the Bartlett School of Architecture at University College London, where, following the appointment of Sir Richard Llewelyn Davies (1912-1981) in 1960, the department was renamed the School of Environmental Studies, and reconceived as an institute for research into the built environment, employing building economists, planning experts, psychologists, physicists and engineers. Unusually, Llewelyn Davies also in 1964 appointed a historian - Reyner Banham (1922-1988), previously a journalist on the staff of

the *Architectural Review* - as Reader, and subsequently Professor of the History of Architecture.¹¹ Llewelyn Davies's reasoning was that the presence of a historian would facilitate the rethinking of solutions to building and design problems, and help to reveal where and why past practice had taken wrong turnings or had remained stubbornly resistant to the incorporation of new knowledge when that had been available.¹² Banham responded to this initiative with enthusiasm, and was inspired to research his two most methodologically adventurous books, *The Architecture of the Well-Tempered Environment* (1969), and *Los Angeles, The Architecture of Four Ecologies* (1971), the first a historical study of the impact of the development of mechanically-controlled environments on building design, the second about the historical growth of Los Angeles. In both books, Banham investigated things that previously had lain outside the normal range of architectural historians, and in particular focused upon objects whose designers were unknown, or even if they were known, whose intentions were unrecorded. These demands stretched architectural history beyond its customary limits.

As well as stimulating a new direction in his own research, Banham, during his tenure at University College London (he left for the USA in 1976) also took on doctoral research students: amongst those whom he supervised were Charles Jencks (1939-), myself (1948-) and Mark Swenarton (1952-). More significant than any particular direction that Banham imposed upon these researchers (the character of his students' research was notable for its diversity and disparity) was the fact that for the first time, doctoral study was emerging from a school of architecture rather than an art history department. This was to be the beginning of what has turned out to be the single most significant change in doctoral research in architectural history over the last forty years in the UK - the shift in its location from art history to architecture departments. Although doctorates in architectural history continue to be produced from art history

institutions, the majority now come out of schools of architecture.

In the expansion of university-based architectural research, architectural history played a modest, but ultimately far more significant role than the delegates at the Oxford Conference had anticipated. Although the kind of research envisaged at the Oxford Conference was to be scientifically orientated, and directed towards the solution of design problems, the reality was that the methods for such research were frequently insufficiently well developed, and the results often disappointing. Even if its concerns were of less obvious relevance to contemporary design practice, architectural history had the great advantage of having a secure and robust methodology, and was often able to deliver more substantial research, of quality that measured up to recognised standards, than the nascent discipline of architectural research. For deans, anxious to demonstrate the benefits of the shift to university located, research-based architectural education, the work produced by historians often provided a valuable talisman to legitimate the new arrangements. Although not what the delegates to the Oxford Conference had had in mind as 'research', architectural history has proved a reliable, and relatively stable component of architectural research. This situation moved even further to architectural history's advantage following the British governments's decision in the 1990s to link the funding received by university departments to the quality of their research. Periodic assessments of research, in 2001, 2008 and next in 2014, set the share of 'Quality Related' research funding received by all university departments, with the highest rated departments receiving significant enhancement of their income. In these assessments, architectural history has turned out to be a disproportionately large component of the research submitted by architecture departments relative to the number of staff employed, and has proved to be the sector of architectural research achieving the highest ratings: in 2008, one in three of the monographs submitted in the category

of architectural history and theory were rated in the top category, a level not equalled in any other branch of architectural research. Architectural history research has turned out, in the current circumstances, to be unexpectedly valuable to departments of architecture.

In 1976, Reyner Banham left for the USA, one of many British architectural historians and critics to emigrate. Others who took the same route included Colin Rowe, Anthony Vidler, John Shearman (1931-2003), Howard Burns, Kenneth Frampton (1930-), Alan Colquhoun (1921-2012), Robert Maxwell????, Robin Middleton and Robin Evans (1944-1993). This exodus may be regarded as a loss for architectural history in Britain; on the other hand, British higher education has been particularly successful in attracting research students from overseas, and amongst these have been a number of architectural historians, some of whom, able to take advantage of the relatively porous structure of British higher education, have gone on to be appointed to academic posts. Their presence has enriched the discipline, and done much to overcome the traditionally anglo-centric focus of architectural history in Britain.

In the late 1970s, around the time that Banham and others were leaving the UK, there occurred one of the most explosive episodes in architectural history in Britain, when David Watkin (1941-) an architectural historian in the art history department at Cambridge, mounted a vituperative attack on the Germanic tradition of architectural history, with its ambition of setting architecture within a historical process. Watkin's 1977 book *Morality and Architecture* polarised opinion between 'traditionalists', who saw it as their mission to preserve the values of a socially élite architectural culture, and 'modernisers', who wished either to promote the values of the new architecture of the twentieth century, or alternatively to shift attention away from architectural history as a story of 'great buildings', and to look more generally at the processes through which buildings of all kinds came into existence, and

the part that buildings played in the wider processes of society.

Various developments that had already occurred by the 1970s made Watkin's attack seem out of touch and irrelevant er... - not sure about this - value judgements based on mysterious 'various developments' is not very convincing!, though it drew support from individuals such as Gavin Stamp, active in the Victorian Society and as a journalist, and subsequently teacher of architectural history in Glasgow. The result of this episode was that for at least two decades, the choice of subject matter was seen as confirming the allegiance of the researcher within this particular polarisation: studies of the work of renowned architects invariably aligned the researcher with the 'traditionalists', while studies of say, vernacular architecture or speculative building were assumed only to interest a modernist and a moderniser.¹³ There arose, as a result, an absurd situation in which researchers were marked by their choice of topic, irrespective of the questions that they might be asking, or the approach to study that they might adopt; a wall came into place between those who studied 'traditional' topics, and those who studied 'progressive' topics. For the best part of twenty years, studies of the classical tradition and of leading establishment architects became the exclusively linked to a resistance to the 'modernisation' of the discipline. This regrettable state of affairs only started to be worn down in the 1990s.

Some of the passion that fuelled the modernisers versus traditionalists controversy came from the development in the 1960s and 1970s of the study of urban history, and of vernacular architecture. Both of these two fields came about through the initiative of British scholars, and gained international reputations as British scholarly achievements. Urban history was largely the creation of the H.D. Dyos (1921-1978), trained as an economic historian, and who set out to use statistical data, census returns, records of estate development, of investment in railways and transport systems,

and such like, to throw light on the patterns of urban growth. Initially, at least, he was less interested in the appearance of what was built, than in the processes that led to development, though later his collaborators became interested in the form of buildings, and the images of cities. Dyos built up in the 1960s a large and thriving department of urban history at the University of Leicester attracting numbers of research students, though the department did not survive after his death.

? Planning history as something that developed out of urban history- slightly later - 1970s development - Sutcliffe, Gordon Cherry

Also - Summerson one of the few arch historians who connected with Urban History and brought its concerns into Arch Hist
The other significant development was the study of vernacular architecture, pioneered by the architect Paul Oliver (1927-). Concerned with the development of informal building throughout the world, Oliver's approach was not so much historical as ethnographic; nonetheless the group that he formed at Oxford Polytechnic, later Oxford Brookes University, had an effect on architectural historians, partly through the methods that were developed for analysing informal building practices, and partly for its decidedly non-Eurocentric view, and determination to consider building practices not in terms of western standards, but in relation purely to local criteria. Both developments were to be important to architectural historians as they started to give their attention to buildings not designed by architects, and as they began to think of architecture not so much in terms of nationalities, but in terms of cultural exchanges across the world.

A significant shift in the study of architectural history occurred in 1980-1, when two London institutions set up graduate programmes in the history of architecture. Prior to this, there was no intermedial level between undergraduate study of architectural history as part of a history or art history bachelor's degree, or an architecture programme, and doctoral study. As a result virtually the only people in any

way prepared for doctoral study were those who had already gained experience as journalists, architects, or employees of one the state agencies concerned with historic buildings. The Architectural Association, an independent school of architecture, set up a Masters programme in History and Theory of Architecture in 1981, under the direction of the architect Royston Landau (1927-2001). At the Bartlett School of Architecture at UCL, Mark Swenarton and myself, who had both trained as historians, but transferred our interest to architectural history, set up the M.Sc programme in the History of Modern Architecture (subsequently renamed MA in Architectural History). Our purpose was to introduce to the study of architecture in the previous two centuries the same principles as Colvin had brought to early modern architecture see my comment in email 1: 'to apply to architecture the ordinary processes of historical scholarship'. However, over the thirty years since Colvin had articulated this statement, there had been not only a good deal of re-examination of what constituted 'architecture', but there had also been some major arguments, resulting in particular from the propositions of certain French philosophers, as to what the 'ordinary processes of historical scholarship' consisted of - see my comment in email 2. Furthermore the recent translation into English of the German theorist Walter Benjamin had provoked serious questions about the motives for the study of history, as well as ideas about the methods for the study of culture. And, additionally, in Italy, the work of Manfredo Tafuri and the Venice School, then just translated into English, suggested a new agenda for research into architectural history, within which the main question became the role of architecture within the formation of ideology. It was the purpose of the new Masters programme to introduce these issues into architectural history, if necessary in a critical and reflective manner, and at the same time to divest architectural history of its traditional role of providing an apology for one or another style of architecture - a role that had been re-ignited by the Watkin-Pevsner controversy.

Both the Architectural Association and the Bartlett, having established Master's programmes, went on to develop doctoral programmes. The AA, with Birkbeck College, the British Film Institute and the Tate Gallery, formed the London Consortium, which under the direction of the social and political theorist Paul Hirst (1946-2003) and the philosopher Mark Cousins (1948-), provided a broad programme in cultural studies and theory, generating a wide range of theoretically sophisticated doctorates. At the Bartlett, the Ph.D programme in History and Theory of architecture, already present since Banham's time, grew substantially, and by the early 2000s regularly had between 30 and 40 students enrolled. Many of these students, as also at the London Consortium, were from overseas: the very limited funding for doctoral research in the humanities in the UK has severely restricted the number of British students able to take up places on the programme.

The situation in 2013 is that there are between a hundred and a hundred and fifty doctoral students of history and theory of architecture in the UK. The largest concentrations are at UCL, the AA/London Consortium, and Cambridge, all in schools of architecture; there are smaller groups at the universities of Edinburgh, Liverpool !!!!!, Newcastle, Bath and Sheffield. Although the majority of doctoral students are in schools of architecture, there are also doctoral students of architectural history at the Courtauld Institute of Art, in the History Faculty at Oxford University, and at a few other this is needlessly disparaging - to York, Warwick, Manchester art history depts.?? art history departments.

The last twenty years has been a fertile period for research into architectural history: there has been a strong demand from students wanting to take doctorates, and there has been strong support for the discipline from schools of architecture, on account of its contribution to their research ratings. Larger groupings of research students have been beneficial, stimulating more dialogue - the relative isolation of the doctoral student was always a problem in architectural history, as in all humanities disciplines. Exchange and

dialogue between students in different institutions has been increased through the activities of the Architecture Humanities Research Association (AHRA), a voluntary non-profit organisation founded in 2003 to promote research in non-science aspects of architecture: amongst its activities, the AHRA organises regular student conferences, where doctoral students can present their work. However, growth in the discipline has not been matched by a growth in funding for doctoral study, and a declining proportion of those studying architectural history at doctoral level are from the UK. Nonetheless, even taking account of the uncertainty over funding in the future, it seems certain that the future of architectural history research in the UK lies in the universities. The various voluntary organisations - the Victorian Society and the Twentieth Century Society - will continue to thrive, but it is most unlikely that any historian of architecture will be able, or will want to contemplate, a career independent of a university - as was still possible in the twentieth century. The state agencies - English Heritage, the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland - that once they still do !!! See also comment in email 3 employed architectural historians have been reducing their establishments, and increasingly looking to contracting out their various research activities. The beneficiaries of this process are likely to be universities, who in their turn are keen to develop commercial, profit-making applications of their expertise.

While architectural history in the UK may look forward to a healthy future, it should be said that the discipline in its current state would hardly be recognisable to an observer of fifty years ago. First of all, there has been a dramatic decline in research into pre-twentieth century topics. Whereas once almost all the most methodologically advanced work was carried out in relation to Renaissance and Baroque architecture, this is no longer the case: twentieth century research dominates the field. Secondly, there has been a sharp decline into buildings themselves as objects of study.

Much of the new research lies either in representational practices - photography, drawing - or in seeking out potential applications of cultural, or post-colonial theory, in which while works of architecture may serve as the vehicle, they are not themselves the primary object of study. Architectural history has changed, in response to developments in other branches of the study of culture; while it may never return to its earlier concerns with the playing out of evolutionary processes within built form, or with the exercise of aesthetic intention, it seems equally unlikely that it will ever be able to avoid the role within which Hegel cast it, as a palimpsest upon which theories of culture are played out.

¹ On Summerson, see *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; Alan Powers, 'John Summerson and Modernism', in L. Campbell (ed.) *Twentieth-Century Architecture and its Histories*, Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, 2000, pp.153-176; Michela Rosso, 'An Open Space at the Constricted Centre of the City: Summerson and the Artificial Inflation of Victorian Values', in F. Salmon (ed.), *Summerson and Hitchcock, Centenary Essays on Architectural Historiography*, Yale U.P., 2006, pp.155-170.

² See J. Harris, *No Voice from the Hall, Early Memories of a Country House Snooper*, John Murray, London, 1998.

³ See *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; and Gulsum Baydar Nalbantoglu, 'Toward Postcolonial Openings: Rereading Sir Banister Fletcher's History of Architecture', *Assemblage*, no.35, April 1988, pp.6-17.

⁴ On Wittkower, see David Watkin, *The Rise of Architectural History*, Architectural Press, London, 1980, pp.149-155.

⁵ On Pevsner, see *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; and Susie Harries, *Nikolaus Pevsner: The Life*, Chatto & Windus, London, 2011.

⁶ Pevsner, *An Outline of European Architecture*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1942, p.10.

⁷ See *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

⁸ H. Colvin, *Essays in English Architectural History*, 1999, p.292.

⁹ R. Banham, 'Masonic Moderns and the Soho Connection', *New Society*, 18/25 December 1980, p.573.

¹⁰ See M. Crinson and J. Lubbock, *Architecture, Art or Profession? Three Hundred Years of Architectural*

Education in Britain, Manchester University Press, 1994, pp.137-144.

¹¹ On Reyner Banham, see A. Forty, 'Reyner Banham, "one partially Americanised European"', in L. Campbell (ed.), *Twentieth-Century Architecture and its Histories*, Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, 2000, pp.195-206.

¹² See Richard Llewelyn Davies, *The Education of an Architect*, inaugural lecture at University College London, 1960.

¹³ The polarisation is described, from Watkin's point of view, in Watkin, *The Rise of Architectural History*, chap.VII, pp.183-190.