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Abstract

This article examines realism in architecture based on Aldo Rossi's architectural works and Jacques Rancière's discourse on realism. Rancière views realism as an artistic capacity that gives impetus to new art rather than as a specific art movement. In addition, he considers realism not only in terms of this role in the history of art but also in terms of its aim even today to discover new aspects of art among art and non-art, that is everyday objects. This view is comparable to the idea of architecture espoused by Aldo Rossi. Rossi discovers the boundary between architecture and non-architecture in the process of searching for the architectural archetype, the hut (cabin). Furthermore, he proposes architecture that diverges from architectural methods, placing high value on his personal viewpoint and expression in architecture. In spite of the negative evaluation of his later architectural works, Rossi's architecture can be viewed as realism since they connect architecture with ordinary objects that are beyond the level of architecture. This article elaborates why the discourse on realism in architecture and the prospect of Rossi's architecture are still valid today.
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1. Introduction

This article examines realism in architecture based on Aldo Rossi's (1931-1997) architectural works and Jacques Rancière's (1940- ) discourse on art. The starting point for discussing realism in architecture can be traced back to the general viewpoint that architecture should fulfill the requirements of society either in form or function. However, architecture is rarely discussed using the term realism because architectural activities are directly related to the problems of reality compared to other art. In other words, the lack of discourse on realism in architecture partly stems from the idea that taking into account such practical matters as the functions to serve for the needs of reality and the economic values of buildings is considered an essential requisite of architectural design.

Realism in architecture has not been discussed sufficiently in a wide range although it requires consideration in various aspects due to the complexity of reality involved in architecture. On the contrary, realism in architecture increasingly withdrew into the inside of architecture as it advanced to matters of sociality and everydayness, locality and urban context, historicity and time. The domain of architectural design is expanding greatly with the introduction of new technologies and materials, but it is difficult to affirm that the discussion on architecture reflects today's reality. Associated with minor social and economic problems, consideration of reality in architecture is increasingly preoccupied with fixed formal matters. It is hard to find active acceptance of changes to achieve social communication. A different approach to realism in architecture is needed because of these problems.

This article attempts to review Aldo Rossi's later architecture in reference to Rancière's notion of realism and examines especially whether his later works can be interpreted as realism. Aldo Rossi left a significant mark in the history of architecture through The Architecture of the City (1966) and many architectural works. And yet, there have been many controversies over his later works including A Scientific Autobiography (1990). The controversy over his later works within Italian architecture was serious at the time, and questions raised over them did not wane over time but persisted even during retrospection of his work. At the heart of those controversies was the observation that the scientific approach to city and architecture demonstrated in The Architecture of the City was not maintained but changed to an emotional approach in A Scientific Autobiography. The issue was that Rossi's deep contemplation of city and architecture turned into a mere subjective sentiment.

Consequently, the predominant appraisal of Rossi now is that he retreated from realism. This article examines whether there is another approach in Rossi's...
later works, inquiring if a new realism can be found in Rossi who was overwhelmed with emotions while probing for a clue to broaden the scope of realism.

2. Representation and Realism

2.1 The Realism of Rancière

'Realism' is an old and complex concept: old not only because a long time has passed since its introduction in the early 19th century but also because its persistence throughout the history of art can be acknowledged under the assumption that the concept is related to 'mimesis', and complex because there are various ways of interpreting the 'real' itself and it is difficult to completely eliminate subjective viewpoints from those various approaches. The means of realism cannot be determined because realism is not objectified and also because the important reality in art could be the very emotions that are formed among people. For these reasons and the conflicting meanings inherent in the concept, realism which had started out as an art movement failed to hold the directivity proper for an art movement; the ground for the designation of realism is that it turned into a concept that signifies one of the art trends (Tatarkiewicz, 1980, p.279).

Realism swung back and forth between objectivity and subjectivity: with the simple and fair idea that art should reflect reality on one end, and on the other end, the idea that direct representation of reality is inappropriate since the creativity of an artist should be included in revealing reality. It was even argued that if a reality reconstructed from imagination makes people look squarely at their reality, then that artwork should be called 'realism' (Dufour, 1998, p.263). Therefore, when discussing realism, it is necessary to consider what kind of perspective is involved in the discussion and what kind of expression is to be called realism.

Then, how are Rossi's subjective and personal feelings (reflected in his later works) connected to realism and how can Rancière's perspective on realism help explicate this connection? French philosopher Rancière is one of the most influential figures in humanities today for his sharp interpretation of politics and art. His viewpoint and interpretation have drawn attention because he does not interpret art based on his theoretical framework but intervenes in the ideas that have been discussed so far and identifies problems in the historical flow of art through which those ideas have progressed (Park, 2014, p.442). Importantly, Rancière regards realism as an important momentum in artistic trends.

Rancière (2004, p.24) states that modernism emerged from the breakdown of division and hierarchy within forms of artistic disciplines and that the discourse on postmodernism is also associated with this dissolution. He also notes that realism served as a momentum for this breakdown of forms and hierarchy of art, which in turn brought about numerous approaches to and interpretations of art. His point is that the order of culture within traditional art was disturbed by the efforts to reflect reality. In other words, Rancière suggests that the regime of art collapsed with endeavors of including forms of life in art in opposition to the existing division between forms of life and forms of art which had an autonomous regime in terms of creation and interpretation.

According to Rancière (2004), various new attempts have been made in the arts after such breakdown in order to pursue the aesthetics of art itself in different directions, some following life and others distinguishable from life. However, the problems found in these various forms of art and the propositions included in respective works presented as alternatives to those problems were rather veiled because counter-efforts were made to combine the diversity of art once again under another '-ism' such as modernism or postmodernism. In fact, what changed through realism is the emergence of egalitarian art which is devoid of all hierarchy or importance based on the subject of art. This development had been mentioned by numerous philosophers and artists but was not seriously taken into account as an important concept leading the art trend. Rancière (2004, pp.22-24) emphasizes that, in numerous art works and interpretations thereof, there were divergent attempts to build the appearance of art detached from life and find the particular points where art reinstates its relationship with life, and that the ultimate purpose of these attempts was to create the minimal conditions for taking away all forms and values of art. Likewise, the rationale for reinterpreting Rossi's architectural works based on Rancière's view on realism is that sufficient explication for his works may have been hindered by the tendency of applying certain fixed framework in the examination.

Notable among many criticisms of Aldo Rossi's architecture is the critique by Rafael Moneo (1937- ). As a contemporary of Rossi and once a follower of him, Moneo examined the influence of Rossi's architecture in Europe. His retrospective account of Rossi's architecture covers many interpretations of Rossi; the many references to facts and interpretations even include his feelings about disclosing a negative stance on Rossi's architecture (Moneo, 2004). Moneo's criticism is reasonable and concrete in many aspects. And yet, it seems that other issues should be considered as well. The Bonnefanten Museum (1995), which Moneo meticulously criticized on the grounds that Rossi expressed his personal feelings in the work, was well received by the public as demonstrated in a visitor survey result showing 73% of visitors giving a positive review of the building (Richards, 2001, p.100). Of course, the value of a building should not be determined simply by people's vote. Moneo's criticism was that the architecture expressed the architect's subjective feelings, which are problematic because the social value of architecture cannot be assured through such deviation from the traditional context. The fact that the building was designed by a famous architect alone could have influenced the survey results. It is necessary,
however, to consider that different judgments are possible when looking back at the work from outside of the traditional viewpoint of the architectural circle, and thus from a more general standpoint.

2.2 The Aesthetic Regime of the Arts

Rancière treats realism as a matter of representation. He does not associate representation with resemblance but rather views it as a regime which makes the arts socially communicable, that is, a "regime of visibility" (Rancière, 2004, p.22). He is saying that when art conforms to a norm or a form, representation is the social agreement that ensures its communication in the capacity of art.

What is important here is that art is communicable even if it is separated from society since a communication system has been created. In other words, Rancière (2004, pp.22-24) thinks that it was because of the representative regime of the arts that art could be communicated even when it became autonomous and pursued beauty in itself. Noting, however, that this regime started to be negated due to realism which raised questions about the gap between the arts and society, he explains that what emerged after the collapse of the representative regime is the aesthetic regime of the arts. Here, 'aesthetic' is defined as a unique sensibility which makes the arts the arts, a specific mode distinct from the everyday. The aesthetic regime of the arts, however, is a substitute for the representative regime. Accordingly, the word 'aesthetic' should connote autonomy, which makes an artwork the arts and also contains the string to reinstate the relationship with life in the arts: it should embrace two conflicting aspects. Rancière (2004, p.52) describes this situation of having to embrace conflicting things as 'dissensus'.

Rancière (2004, p.24) argues that the 'aesthetic regime of the arts' is the correct name for 'modernity,' and perceives subsequent discussions such as postmodernism as various attempts by artists to create the aesthetic regime. Thus, the 'aesthetic regime' Rancière asserts is a concept that encompasses the situation in which art has been placed since the modern age. His notion of realism is profoundly related to this structure.

Furthermore, its inaugural moment has often been called realism, which does not in any way mean the valorization of resemblance but rather the destruction of the structures within which it functioned. Thus, novelistic realism is first of all the reversal of the hierarchies of representation (the primacy of the narrative over the descriptive or the hierarchy of subject matter) and the adoption of a fragmented or proximate mode of focalization, which imposes raw presence to the detriment of the rational sequences of the story (Rancière 2004, p.24).

In other words, Rancière's realism approaches reality by denying hierarchy and destroying the order of representation inherent in art. The damage or loss of rational continuity is a matter of importance since it becomes more concrete when extended from novel to other forms of art.

2.3 Theater and Realism

Given that negating the logical association matters in realism, Rancière (2007) explains realism in painting in terms of the relationship between the pictorial image itself and the story that emerges when the image is reconstructed in representation.

In regards to realism in painting, Rancière (2007, p.76) states that the representative regime collapsed with the reinstatement of genre painting in the early 19th century and views this destruction as the reorganization of the relationship between words and images. Rancière negates the hierarchy of art which prioritized poetry over painting and explains that destruction of the representative regime in the visual arts is a different way of relating pictorial image with words in that the viewers' gaze penetrates the surface of a painting to create a story under the pictorial image.

The relationship between images and words deserves particular attention. For Rancière, images include not only visual images, but also things that are not visual, such as stories and sounds. This means that image itself is not singular but has diversity. While this approach may be taken as a matter of viewpoint, his way of understanding image, it should be noted that such an approach is inevitably required to overcome the hierarchy in the forms of art, in which words or poetry occupied a privileged position, and to break away from the unique form of a specific art to testify the destruction of forms altogether.

But how are images, which are not included in a specific art form, and thus indeterminable, being communicated? How can we think about the aesthetic regime of the arts from the standpoint of embracing diversity? For Rancière, images cross over different forms of art and even go beyond the realm of art itself. And yet, the images he speaks of in effect merely function according to the usual ways of communication in our lives, and in this sense, become a way of approaching realism.

When the thread of history—that is, the common measurement that governs the distance between the art of some and that of others—is undone, it is not simply the forms that become analogous; the materialities are immediately mixed... [W]e had to wait until the Cubist and Dadaist age for the appearance of words from newspapers, poems or bus tickets on the canvases of painters; the age of Nam Jun Paik for the transformation into sculptures of loudspeakers given over to broadcasting sounds and screens intended for the reproduction of images... But as early as 1830 Balzac could populate his novels with Dutch paintings and Hugo could transform a book into a cathedral or a cathedral into a book. Twenty years later, Wagner could celebrate the carnal union of male poetry and female music in the same physical materiality... As early as the 1820s, a philosopher Hegel... [showed] that the separation between spheres of
rationality entailed not the glorious autonomy of art and the arts, but the loss of their power of thinking in common, of thinking, producing or expressing something common (Rancière, 2007, pp.42-43).

Rancière's explanation may seem long and complex, but his point is simple. If the representative regime requires a special grammar for the communication of art and a special education is needed to participate in such a culture, then realism is found at places where things come together in daily life: for instance, in such a situation in which bus tickets are sold together on a news stand and someone reading a poem beside the news stand buys a bus ticket. Also, as Rancière's examples of artists and philosophers suggest, the possibilities of art will be found in greater abundance from the things encountered by chance rather than from artificially established territorial division and the communication system conforming to such division. This is why realism is important in art.

From this standpoint, theater merits special attention. As Aldo Rossi likens architecture to theater, Rancière sees theater as an important example. This is because theatrical art is a complex form of art in which diverse images are intermingled and because it openly imitates life. Accordingly, theater is a place where a variety of forms of art collide: within that collision, it becomes a site that expresses the impurity of art, "the 'medium' which clearly shows that there is no peculiarity of art or of any art; that forms do not proceed without the words that install them in visibility" (Rancière, 2007, p.88).

An architect's description may not be as strict as that of a philosopher. There is a gap in the clarity of concepts. In particular, Rancière distinguishes art from life, but Rossi does not. Nevertheless, they both speak of realism from the viewpoint of connecting theater to architecture and theatrical art to life.

The theater is very similar to architecture because both involve an event—its beginning, development, and conclusion. Without an event there is no theater and no architecture. I refer, for example, to the procession in which Hamlet's body is carried away, or to Uncle Vanya's solitude, or to any two people who are talking in some house with hatred or with love, and of course to the grave. Are these events forms of functionalism, of necessity? I certainly do not think so; if the event is a good one, the scene will also be good, or it should be so. And I believe that in this sense life is rather good; this is my realism, even if I do not know what type of realism it may be (Rossi, 1981, p.48).

What is important to Rossi is the fact that something, an event, happened. Borrowing Adolf Loos's reference to a grave, Rossi (1982, p.107) states that the simple form of a grave and the fact testified by the grave that someone has been buried stir up a lot of thoughts and feelings in our minds. He affirms that scenes from life are staged in architecture just as plays are presented on a theater stage. Thus, architecture is the stage that gives birth to scenes from life. But it is not confined to any form nor is it operated by an intended architectural space. The key point in Rossi's analogy between theater and architecture is that theater serves as a momentum to tear down the conventional perception of architecture.

The concept of 'event' in Rossi's explanation may be unclear, but that is beside the point. It is neither an issue that his explanation on how an event creates scenes in our senses is insufficient. This also differs from Rancière's notion of juxtaposition, that is, the blending of materialities. The gist here is that architecture should be able to contain any faces of life just as theater is able to present any play. Hence, architecture should not be limited by function or necessity but rather appear at the heart of everyday life in the simplest and purest form to the senses of our lives, just as we discover a grave by accident and feel that the traces of a person's life are dissolved in that place, or as we find again the forms of life from the ruins of a shattered house.

For Rossi, theater depicts the realism in architecture and is the very example of what deconstructs the form of architecture. He borrows Raymond Roussel's description and insists that it is not necessary to define architecture nor is it significant to talk about forms of theater.

In order to be significant, architecture must be forgotten, or must present only an image for reverence which subsequently becomes confounded with memories. Likewise, every theater is subsumed by Roussel's description, which shatters every image of the theater by referring to it as something that has always existed, that arises in one place as in any other, and whose major distinction is its inscription "THEATER"... A similar thing occurs in children's drawings, where the inscription "THEATER," "CITY HALL," "HOUSE," "SCHOOL," serves to define and refer to the actual edifice that the child is unable to draw. Architecture is a reference in everyone's experience. But it should only be evident insofar as it serves imagination or action (Rossi, 1981, p.45).

Rossi's perspective on architecture is perhaps captured in the last two sentences quoted above. They attest to his intense pursuit for realism in architecture.

3. Realism in Architecture
3.1 Aldo Rossi's Realism

Transcending specific analogies, I saw more and more clearly how much beauty lies in the place where matter encounters different meanings. Nothing can be beautiful, not a person, a thing, or a city, if it signifies only itself, indeed, if it signifies nothing but its own use. With this recognition I went beyond the most banal and commonplace aspects of architecture: the old truths of the classical treatise-writers filtered through nineteenth-century positivism, the over-refined beauty of functions divested of referential images, signifying only themselves (Rossi, 1981, p.65).
Among many sections in *A Scientific Autobiography* where Rossi's realism intersects with Rancière's realism, this part eloquently demonstrates that both are equivalent. Rossi's use of the term 'analogy' to explain his perception of realism may seem problematic. Still, it would not be easy to judge an architect's comment with academic rigor nor is it appropriate to address only philosophical issues while dismissing the everyday meaning of analogy. What Rossi is trying to convey through the term is the same as what Rancière is trying to distinguish by speaking of what is not analogy: "a great chaotic juxtaposition, a great indifferent melange of significations and materialities" (Rancière, 2007, p.43).

Rossi's confessional narrative elucidates how he came to look at diverse objects as one, how he was able to link them solely based on the fact that they have interior and exterior aspects, and how it was possible to extend such an impression to many more objects. He is professing that objects inducing such an impression existed for a long time and will continue to be present in our lives.

There is no point in deliberating on whether it is reasonable or not that Rossi associates diverse objects using the theme of interior-exterior as a medium. So long as the impression of the interior-exterior aspect of things was real to Rossi, exploring it in terms of architecture is purely his choice as an architect. We have to acknowledge his autonomy of architectural expression. What we need to examine, then, is whether Rossi attained realism in architecture through such an awakening impression.

This assemblage of things is found in his sculptures experimented and installed in the early 1960s. And yet, such a quality is most prominently reflected in Teatro del Mondo (1979). The work is indeed unique and amazing since it is a real boat and a theater. What adds to the exceptional significance of this project is that it captured the city view of Venice and sailed through the Adriatic Sea to cities that were deeply involved in the history of Venice. The view of the theater floating on the water and its tower creating a seamless contour with the factory chimneys and the most beautiful domes in Venice demonstrates how easily Rossi included the forms of a city in architecture. However, as much as it is special, the project is not a proper case that generally represents the gist of Rossi's entire body of work. Rather, it would be better to examine how the forms used in his later works differ from those in other works.
In this respect, Fagnano Olona Elementary School (1976) and Bonnefanten Museum (1993) are comparable because there is a considerable time difference between the two projects and both buildings include a circular structure associated with a piazza in addition to the typical architectural features.

Fagnano Olona Elementary School was designed with the city as its motif and is commonly regarded as a building in which various forms frequently found in urban spaces are reconstructed (Arnel and Bickford, 1985, p.107). But the forms Rossi selected also include those which are seemingly incongruent. Examining his sketch (Fig.2.) and the different forms included in the project (Fig.3.), it seems that the forms were arbitrarily chosen. Even if specific functions were allocated to respective forms, it is hard to assume that such forms intended any purposeful meanings. Nevertheless, the many scenes seen through the row of windows shaped alike (Fig.3.) appear to indicate an identical object.

It is difficult to judge this work, which concurrently shows heterogeneity and association, solely based on its form. And yet, it appears to be standing against the flow of time of the world and as if to be found in neighboring cities as well. Rossi's arbitrary choice of these images in fact indicates an illogical approach, which suggests his own realism that connects urban life with architecture.

What needs to be verified here is whether the forms introduced in Rossi's works strictly belong to the domain we call architecture. Also, it should be inquired how his works differ from one another as we compare his major works: the circular structure in the Fagnano Olona Elementary School which contains unusual structures but is still considered a typical architecture, the theater structure which contains a singular steel structure preoccupied with the relationship between the interior and the exterior but seems far from heterogeneous, and the dome of Bonnefanten Museum which is said to have been borrowed from 19th century architecture although its consequential appearance is different from conventional architectural choice.

3.2 City and the Image of City

In “Verlust der Mitte,” Rossi describes one of the most prominent features of the Bonnefanten Museum as below:

Rather let us consider a number of the features which impress visitors, even the hasty ones, in the museum as a whole. Were you to ask the simplest person in Europe, there would only be one answer: the dome. There are two main reasons for the magnificence of the dome: the first is its link with the architectural tradition of the classical world tight up to the nineteenth century Turinese architect Alessandro Antonelli; the second that between river and sea it boldly signals the lie of the land in that country (1991).

He mentions two things about the dome: its association with history (or the history of architecture) and the geographical features surrounding the Museum. In terms of historical association, there is no doubt that Rossi has referred to the 19th century example and has sufficiently expressed such an image. However, it is hard to say that the dome faithfully reflects the geographical features of the Museum. The architectural set-up such as the stairs, which cuts through the Museum, indeed reflects the surroundings. Hence, it wouldn't be far to state that the Museum does not reflect the topography of the site. Still, the dome does not explain much about the location other than being conspicuous.

Moneo argues that the images of various parts of the Museum including the dome are not the result of Rossi's rational choices, as Rossi claims, but are his subjective selections picked out from the world he viewed from his room.

Finally, these images of the building of Maastricht's Bonnefanten Museum of 1993 show to what degree Rossi's last works were not so much a reflection of the
construction, but a reflection of images. If at the start of his career construction was a metaphor that helped him understand the city and architecture, by the start of the nineties Rossi had gotten us accustomed to seeing the world as a set of images. His architecture then contained images racked by sentiment. At some time, Rossi drew his room: a drawing in which the world of objects that accompanied him in life, his things, coexists with the world that unfolds in the architecture we see through the window, the city of Milan that he loved so much. Paradoxically, Rossi became a master of constructing objects. He was capable of putting his feelings into an object without harming its construction, completely satisfying the use expected of it. Think of his furniture pieces, his watches, his coffee makers. In the object lives the iconography, the image, but freed of all the demands that come with architecture. The building was something much more complex. It resisted the process of simplification that Rossi had subjected it to in those years. An object admits the tyranny of form. A building cannot (2004, p.142).

Interestingly, Moneo's view on Rossi is comparable to Rancière's opinion about Peter Behrens (1868-1940). Between Mallarmé and Behrens, between the pure poet and the functionalist engineer, there therefore exists this singular link: the same idea of streamlined forms and the same function attributed to these forms—to define a new texture of communal existence. No doubt these shared concerns are expressed in very different ways. The designer engineer intends to revert to a state prior to the difference between art and production, utility and culture; to return to the identity of a primordial form. He seeks this alphabet of types in the geometrical line and the productive act, in the primacy of production over consumption and exchange (Rancière, 2007, p.97).

Rancière (2007, pp.95-96) finds some common ground between Mallarmé and Behrens in that they both sought after 'types,' which form the common denominator of life rather than an 'archetype,' and on which the icons and nature of products are in accord and the unity of industrial and artistic forms are realized.

On the other hand, Moneo distinguishes buildings from other objects. In his view, architecture rejects the simplification Rossi mandates. He thinks that other objects accept Rossi's coercive form, while architecture does not. Moneo believes that the architectural requirements of a dome are missing from Rossi's dome.

In his own unique way, Rossi strived to find a type albeit different from what Behrens pursued. That type proved to be a theater indistinguishable from other architectures or the cabins Rossi consistently mentions in his Autobiography. The images of 'the four walls,' 'the tympanum' and 'the colored stripes' construct life at its minimum (Rossi 1981, p.42). However, a 'type' is only to create a momentum of communication, not that which holds rigidity by itself. From Rancière's point of view, it is of little importance whether the type is an architectural element. Whatever Rossi had chosen, the choice itself could only remain subjective. This is the same for Behrens.

As mentioned earlier, Rancière states that realism overthrows the representative regime and impairs logical association to show things as they are. In his view, the type pursued by Behrens resists the regime in the course of finding common denominators and breaks the accuracy of expression by allowing mutual exchanges between products and the arts as equivalents. And this is the point which is related to the architecture Rossi tries to present.

In addition, it should be clarified here that the purpose of discussing Rancière is to understand realism: it is not intended as a way to examine what makes architecture outstanding. The issue raised by Moneo is that there are many important aspects of architecture that have been laid out in its long history and so should not be ruled out. From Rancière's viewpoint, Moneo may seem to be in the representative regime because he distinguishes architecture from other objects and recognizes the autonomous expression of architecture. Thus, from Rancière's stance, Moneo's approach is not realism as he is still bound by the strong and heavy tradition of architecture.

Then, how is the value of realism judged? Discussing medium, Rancière explains that art is involved with attaining something that is different from the original purpose and participating in the composition of a particular milieu: "It is art when its productions belong to a sensory milieu in which the distinction is blurred between that which is and that which is not art. In short, the 'means' [le moyen] is also a means to achieve something other than its own end. It is also the means of participating in the configuration of a specific milieu." (Rancière, 2011, p.35)

The milieu here will depend on what kind of medium is involved in the realization of art. In architecture, it will surely involve the materials for the realization of architecture and, at the bare minimum, the daily surrounding environment. Composing a specific milieu signifies the creation of a new configuration or space, no matter how minor it will be. Rancière's allusion to art also applies to his notion of dissensus. That is, it aims at realism.

Why did realism emerge in the first place? It emerged not because of a sense of mission within art to contribute to society through better works, but from the effort to create a new art. Realism was pursued because a new kind of art was needed. New art does not start from an overall outcome but from a new domain. Consequently, Moneo is concerned with architecture as an end product, while Rossi sees architecture as realism. Rossi's architecture may be criticized in terms of the result, but needs to be reevaluated in that it presented a new domain and continues to generate a number of controversies.
4. Conclusion

In the postscript to A Scientific Autobiography, Vincent Scully summarizes Rossi's accomplishment:

> When I finished reading it I felt utterly solitary, shorn of ideologies, alone with the memory of the things I have seen... [Every] object, tower, or coffeepot has an identical being, the same scale. One feels that a great thing has happened, that Rossi has opened a white window onto sight. He has been able to divest himself of ideology almost entirely. Consequently there is no predetermined connection between things, no hierarchy. Everything is seen afresh, may be connected with other things in some new way (p.111).

Scully's impression is consistent with what Rancière explains about realism. A Scientific Autobiography assumes notions and modes different from those of Rancière, but it includes many sections that are in line with Rancière's realism in terms of intent. As for the attitude towards architecture, there is no doubt that Rossi pursued realism. Whether Rossi's later works were the products meeting his intent may be open to question. And yet, Moneo's critical appraisal is not the only way to look at Rossi's architectural works. Meanwhile, what Moneo tried to present using the descriptor of architecture is not limited to the realm of typical and traditional architecture. He is not insisting that a high level of art should be created through associations derived from the long history of architecture and according to the representations of architecture. Rather he is pointing out as a problem that Rossi's intent can be authoritative. Thus, placing the attention on the posed problem rather than the words or expression used, the question raised by Moneo is whether Rossi's personal choices can act as some restraint beyond leaving a strong impression. It is undeniable that Aldo Rossi's position and his influence largely led to such problem-posing, which argues that a person of considerable influence to the discussion of architecture has immersed himself in emotions abandoning the history of architecture and the sense of mission as an architect.

Compared to Fagnano Olona Elementary School, the Bonnefanten Museum did not even propose an architecturally remarkable space. It was neither a product of such high quality when his entire body of work is reviewed in chronological order. This is why Moneo described it as obsession: he was saying that it fell short of his previous works. But despite all its shortcomings, the Bonnefanten Museum is clearly a move closer to realism with its intent aimed at a new point of architecture. What kind of new point is it expressing and where is this new point being directed? Indeed, the fact that Moneo made such negative criticism paradoxically proves that Rossi paved a new place in architecture.

According to Rancière, both the heaviness of modernism and the lightness of postmodernism originated from realism. This trend emerged as realism discovered new places and paved new paths. This trend is perhaps not over yet. Architecture is still adding this and that comments to Modernism to create new terms. This shows that the provocative experiments posed by Rossi's later works that were undervalued have not come to an end.

Rossi's architecture is not an experiment of postmodern figuration. It is different from the practice of Venturi and Brown, who cut and pasted to today's architecture things found from past architecture. It is completely different from the situation produced by Frank Gehry who placed binoculars at the entrance. Rossi's architecture is subjective, but it is the outcome of a combination between the long tradition of architecture and everyday objects. Even if the value maintained by the long tradition of architecture is lost due to everyday objects, it is necessary to expressly examine the implications of such combination.

In this respect, Rossi's architecture should be viewed as a new attempt towards realism, an attempt that is incomplete as his sudden death. Allowing that Rossi's architecture is incomplete, the value of his body of work can be found in that he showed it was possible to practice realism in architecture and that such practice is the path towards constructing a new architecture.
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