

Methodological Aspects of Architectural Design as Criteria for Classifying and Defining Architectural Style.

Ingurds Lazdins (*RTU*)

Riga Technical University 57h International Scientific conference

13.10.2016

The generally known definition of 'architectural style' describes style as a 'sum of certain formal elements and means of expression that determine the image of the architectural object, and that are characteristic to a certain time period.'

Key known architectural styles have been defined in the history of architecture according to formal characteristic features of building structures, formation and decoration. Architectural styles have their movements and variations depending on the geographic location, nationality, tradition, etc.

It is a correct and sufficient classification system in terms of such generally known ancient historical styles as Romanesque, Gothic, Baroque, Eclecticism, etc., and a range of corresponding 'neo' styles and exaggerated, hyperbolic derivations (for example, Rococo). This is how Art Nouveau, Art-Deco, and, later on, Modernism, Functionalism, Brutalism, and 'International' styles were classified during the 20th century.

Some of this century's newest and brightest architectural styles still have their own chronological periods. But they already have also corresponding sets of particular methodologic features that are characteristic to and used for creating of the elements of concrete style. Most recent and latest generally known styles (or stylistic movements) that have been defined this way are - 'Organic' architecture in the sense that it is close to natural shapes, High-tech, Minimalism, Post-modern, partly - the Biomorphic or Sculptural Architecture (as done by Frank Gehry).

But the following styles - namely the Deconstructivism, nor Parametric Architecture later-on, which started emerging as part of the Metabolism Architecture movement already during the 1960s and 1970s, and not for instance the sensation- and emotion-based, or so-called Humane Architecture (represented by Peter Zumthor) cannot be defined similarly within applying former definition of style according to external features and elements of objects.

Thus also, style or trend names have not yet been formulated for several other recent architectural movements (such as the bright one represented by Bjarke Ingels Group BIG). Moreover, the names

of the movements cannot even be formulated within applying only known definition of style.

So then, from the second half of the 20th century, the general picture does not seem to be so clear and certain, distinct in terms of classification of architectural styles. The turn of the centuries, and especially the beginning of the 21st century, are characterized by the fact that majority of known traditional architectural styles no longer exist, or they have transformed and can no longer be defined according to their external features or the represented time period. **In other words, the external features, or even the totality of similar features, are no longer adequately substantial characteristics in order to separate one architectural movement from another.**

The situation that has occurred nowadays is that due to the availability of a comprehensive range of technical, architectural engineering and technological tools in modern architectural practice, each architect is able to use the achievements as well as structural and genesis principles of any style, or even use several of them simultaneously.

The former definition of 'architectural style' is partly outdated and incomplete considering the most recent phenomena and movements of contemporary architecture. In order to highlight and separate what is important now, one should instead discuss the doctrine, concept or theory characteristic to an author or movement for classification and definition purposes of them.

The existing and expanding diversity of the above mentioned movements and possibilities renders it increasingly difficult to define, classify and analyse separate objects, architectural style movements, and authors themselves according to formal features, that is - structurally technical, or compositional and visually esthetical, principles, attributes and elements. This makes it also increasingly hard to determine and categorize them as subjects of one certain style, movement, or architectural principle, as Charles Jenks mentioned in his book *Critical Modernism*: **architects and their work no longer represent one particular style -**

History is neither „just one thing after another“ nor a predetermined set of roadways but, in this metaphor, a coherent set of broad boulevards that allow **architects** to '**switch lines**'. [2]

Any architect may operate in several opposed traditions at once (..). The reason is that training, friendships, the Marketplace, specialisation, ideology, taste, building type and economics form 'basins of attraction', centres of gravity (*in creative process. iL*). [3]

For this reason, it is of key importance to define modern, logically comprehensible and conveniently applicable classification principles, as well as establish and continuously update a system for classifying

dominant architectural movements that enable one to name and characterize contemporary phenomena of architectural genesis, as well as to navigate, comparatively analyse and evaluate them - to analyse and classify the contemporary emerging architecture according to other, more in-depth structural and formational principles of architectural objects.

Therefore, understanding, analysing and substantiating **each author's working methods, or methods employed** for developing each separate object. The methods that can be used to trace and assess the common and distinctive features of modern architectural styles in each particular object acquires an increasingly large and important role nowadays.

The analyse of creative working methods of an architect in this case means and is taking in account also the following:

We have to admit that in this case the analyse of creative working methods of an architect means also and in particular the following:

- the totality of set priorities, values and other assumptions by the architect;
- the aims and ultimate goal - definition of the proposed added value of an object;
- sequence of making decisions, drawing conclusions and forming opinions in creative process;
- theoretical substantiation as a system the application of which results in the particular building, structure or object acquiring its final form and appearance.

Thus the new supplementation to definition of architectural style, that can be more suitable for the real contemporary situation, could sound like this:

'style is also, the way in which an architect performs his task - conceptual methods of design, a defined set of creative work concepts and theoretic assumptions that architects apply to particular objects, buildings, situations, structures, volumes, or spaces,' as a result of which an object, a solution or a building looks in a certain way, and is significantly different from other similar buildings or objects created in a similar place and time period, applying similar software but by another architect.

REFERENCES

[1] Pothorn Herbert, "A guide to architectural styles". London: By Phaidon Press Ltd., 1983.

[2], [3] Jencks Charles, "Critical modernism". John Wiley & Sons, 2007.