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1 Introduction

At the beginning of the 20th century, the domestic architecture of Ventura Terra (1866-1919) and Raul Lino (1878-1974) illustrated their readiness to incorporate new spatial values and new practices into their production of architectural projects. These new aspects, which appeared in different ways in the work of the two architects, showed that their academic training and professional practice had kept them fully apprised of the debate taking place within the discipline at that time, in which one could detect signs of the conflict between a much-desired wish for progress, considered essential for improving the quality of life, and a reaction to change, understood as representing a loss of cultural identity.

In this specific case, the works of Terra and Lino can be seen as complementary for an interpretation of modernity, because they shared the same need for reflecting on the legacy of the 19th century and the new ways of creating architecture, leading to the (common) concern with finding (different) answers to the problems of their time.

Based on a consideration of the Retrospective Exhibition of the Work of Raul Lino (FCG, 1970) and of “common housing production” in the work of Ventura Terra, as particular but significant narratives in the contexts in which they both worked, this essay examines the modern experimentation in which these two architects engaged. This aspect, already studied by Pedro Vieira de Almeida, did, however, coexist with 19th-century revivalisms and with nationalism, in a socio-cultural framework that was so riddled with inertia, so polarised between development and underdevelopment, that it was able to continue under different forms until the end of the 1960s and left a significant mark on 20th-century life in Portugal.

The identification of these dialectical processes in Portuguese architecture opens up the possibility for a reconsideration of its history.


This essay is based on the idea that, while eclecticism in architecture is invariably bound up with the ideal of a regeneration of tradition, underlying an idealised and romantic vision of a *golden age*, it is equally influenced by the ideal of progress, supported by science and innovation, as central aspects of the modern dialectic. By removing the formal and decorative features that are generally connoted with the design systems in vogue at the end of the 19th century, this interpretation focuses on the reading of the architectural work in its context, in which greater importance is given to the essence of the spatial device, the conditions under which the project is produced, and its programme. This attitude makes it possible to gain access to the various foundations of Modern Architecture that were to be noted at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, asserting the singular importance of the works of Raul Lino and Ventura Terra in this process.
2 The exhibition of Raul Lino’s work in 1970: a final episode

On the place and time

In October 1969, the buildings that house the Headquarters and Museum of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (FCG), designed by the architects Ruy Athouguia (1917-2006), Pedro Cid (1925-1983) and Alberto Pessoa (1919-1985) and with an area of roughly 25,000 m², were inaugurated in the centre of Lisbon. This was a unique moment in the cultural and political atmosphere of that time in Portugal, with the Foundation taking on an exclusive role in the development of artists and the dissemination of modern art, but it was also an equally singular moment because of the significance of this influential work in the panorama of Portuguese modern architecture, representing a deviation from the International Style that, during that period, was belatedly beginning to establish itself in the country. At that time, which was marked by the disbandment of the CIAM (Congrès International d’Architecture Moderne) and the loss of that movement’s hegemony in the orientation of modernism, both foreign and Portuguese architectural critics, led by Nuno Portas in the magazine Arquitectura, pointed to ethical (rather than formal) alternatives, which called for modern architecture to take on a new and different responsibility.

One year after the opening of the buildings of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (FCG), in October 1970, the retrospective exhibition of Raul Lino’s work was inaugurated, with its opening being

3 In 1958, Nuno Portas was relentless in the criticism that he made of the Portuguese Pavilion at the Brussels Universal Exposition, designed by Pedro Cid (1958), offering another reading of modern architecture: “It should be remembered that, in Portugal, the formula suggested by the International Style served (...) as a basis for the attack launched upon the neo-classicisms and pseudo-traditionalisms, the unconditional long-term acceptance of that type of architecture began to appear dangerous as it did not correspond to our realities. (...) Its insistent attitude partly dictated the need for conducting a survey of spontaneous architecture (...) and certain works today already bear witness to the favourable position of its authors in regard to this aspect of the problematics of Portuguese Architecture.”


But it was not until 1959 that, in referring to the international debate on this subject, he pointed out the responsibility of the new generation for “revising the concept of modernity”.


4 The full title of the exhibition was Raul Lino. Retrospective Exhibition of his Work.
attended by the President of the Portuguese Republic Américo Tomás.⁵ (Figs. 1 and 2) The exhibition was the result of the “proposal-scheme” drawn up by the architect Diogo Lino Pimentel and addressed to the President of the FCG’s Board of Trustees, in May 1969. This proposal stressed the multidisciplinary, complex and controversial nature of Lino’s work, moving away from the idea that the exhibition would amount to just another commonplace tribute. Instead, the possibility would be created for an interpretation of his work, so that “through this, more than 70 years of our culture [could also be] rethought.”⁶ For this project, he was to meet with the FCG and propose that the exhibition should be organised into three separate sections, devoted to history, architecture and decorative arts, curated by José-Augusto França, Pedro Vieira de Almeida and Manuel Rio-Carvalho respectively.⁷

This exhibition, held in a building that was one of the symbolic architectural works in Portuguese modernity, was an event that, in the 1970s, marked the end of the period of Portuguese architectural culture that had continued uninterrupted since the end of the 19th century.⁸ In a parallel process, but nonetheless different from the one that had taken place in the 1960s in Europe and North America, with the criticism made of the internationalist orthodoxy of the Modern Movement in architecture, this exhibition signalled a change in architectural culture in Portugal. The interpretation of this event allows us to recognise the path leading to another idea of modernity and another understanding of architecture. Above all, it was the historiography of Portuguese 20th-century architecture that would be called into question, this being the central aspect of the research project developed by Pedro Vieira de Almeida in his presentation of Lino’s work (1970), and continued at the exhibitions of Carlos Ramos (1986) and Viana de Lima (1996). Other

---

⁵ This ceremony was filmed by the documentary filmmaker António Campos: “Inauguration of the Raul Lino exhibition (1970)”, Art Library, FCG.

⁶ Letter from Diogo Lino Pimentel to José Azeredo Perdigão, President of the Board of Trustees of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 19/May/1969, signed. FCG Archives (Fine Arts Department): “Sundry Exhibitions” Folder, 1968/68/70 ED 8.


⁸ PEREIRA, Paulo, op. cit.

The conditions were created that would make it possible to understand that in 1900 there was a practice, particularly in domestic architecture, centred upon the work of Lino and Terra, in Lisbon, but also on that of Marques da Silva (1869-1947), in Porto, that, in different ways and with different consequences, showed that all three architects were open and attentive to the European modernist agenda. Lino and Terra showed a mastery of foreign influences within their work, which can be understood, quite extraordinarily, as a tension between the world outside and the world inside Portugal. Their interlocutors were outside Portugal. As we shall see later on, the tension between internal (Portuguese) and external (foreign) practices has always been the subject of incessant negotiation in Portugal.

*These are the aspects that I wish to present in this essay, and, in so doing, I hope to make a contribution towards a reinterpretation of 70 years in Portuguese architecture that were marked by the difficult relationship with its tradition as a discipline. In other words, in this case, I am seeking to illustrate how subsequent generations have struggled to absorb the meaning of both Lino’s and Terra’s works into their modern dialectic and to examine it further. The decade of the 1970s was notable for works that confirmed a turning point in this self-sufficient dialogue with oneself. The Caixinas housing estate (1970-1972) and the Casa Beires (1973-1976), designed by Álvaro Siza, brought a return to a critical dialogue that had been left in abeyance in the 1920s, about the relationship of the Work with the World, making it possible to explore

---


For a reinterpretation of Marques da Silva as an aesthetic operator in the building of the Casa de Serralves, see:

the question of its inclusion in the different narratives that gave it its shape and form. This expansion of the meaning of the work also opens up the Place, or, in other words, the “drawing board” on which the architect designs and projects the work, to the World, to which, in turn, the work itself wishes to belong. By pursuing the lesson of Portugueseness proposed by Távora – erudite and not parochial – in the decisive manifesto of the Tennis Pavilion (1956-1960), these works of Siza’s were to shape the postmodern contemporaneity of Portuguese architecture until the present day.

The historical construction that had been popularised until the 1970s, marked by a biased knowledge of the Portuguese architecture of this period,10 a typical situation of the first modern historiography,11 was also to condition the activity of the architects. In fact, we could even talk about a non-historiography of 20th-century Portuguese architecture, since the first systematic reflections upon the subject were only published between 1963 and 1974, by José-Augusto França, and were still included in the history of art of the 19th and 20th century.12 It was only at the end of the 1950s that the first essays written by Nuno Portas, and later by Pedro Vieira de Almeida13, were to appear. Or, in other words, if we do

---

José-Augusto França was the founder of studies in the History of Art in Portugal (Balanco das Actividades Surrealistas em Portugal, 1949) and in the History of Portuguese Urbanism (Une Ville des Lumières: la Lisbonne de Pombal, 1965).
13 We may consider the works mentioned below, if not as the first, at least as the most significant in the careers of their authors. In the case of Nuno Portas and Pedro Vieira de Almeida, in the field of theoretical thought, we might also consider the CODA (Competitive Examinations for the Award of the Architect’s Diploma), presented in 1959 and 1962, respectively.
FRANÇA, José-Augusto, A Arte em Portugal no Século XIX, Lisbon, Bertrand, 1963.
FRANÇA, José-Augusto, A Arte em Portugal no Século XX (1911-1961), Lisbon, Bertrand, 1972.
not consider the rare articles of reflection and the presentations of projects, to be found scattered around the specialist magazines between 1900 and the 1970s (with the exception of Raul Lino, who always used the written word as a way of defending his ideas), then the architecture of those decades was not written about or studied in any systematic or extensive manner.

This condition interfered with the actual architectural production of this period, which, in this way, saw itself deprived of a fundamental instrument for the criticism of projects. During the period from 1900 to 1970, the action of architects can be seen as an expression of the last phase of romanticism, which allowed for a nostalgic oscillation between picturesque, regionalist, nationalist and modern architecture and the international style. Here, one can identify the difficulty, experienced by one generation after another, of effecting a form of self-criticism and the difficulty of having a knowledge of history together with a consciousness of history. As T. S. Eliot stresses, “consciousness of history cannot be fully awake, except where there is other history than the history of the poet’s own people: we need this in order to see our own place in history.”

Or, in other words, by not entrusting the mediation of the architectural design to criticism, theory and history, architects limit their production to the evocation of style and its random images.
Or can it be understood that the suspension of the modern prelude, observed in the period of transition to the 20th century, was the expression of their conditions of production, thereby continuing the many centuries of pragmatism exhibited by Portuguese architecture?

**On the catalogue**

To coincide with the exhibition, a catalogue was published containing various interpretations of the different aspects of Raul Lino’s work in essays by José-Augusto França, Pedro Vieira de Almeida, Manuel Rio-Carvalho and Diogo Pimentel (who edited the synopsis). Through their texts, one discovers an oeuvre that was marked by a blend of experimentation and *joie de vivre*, running not only through Lino’s architectural production, but also through other substantive aspects of his activity, from theatre to literature and music, from travel to the study of the landscape and nature, from decoration and furniture design to the graphic arts, in what amounted to an extraordinarily erudite and individual multidisciplinary attitude.

The importance of these essays was due to the fact that they went further than any studies undertaken until that time in the field of art and the decorative arts, amounting, for the first time, to a complete and carefully structured investigation into the work of this architect. The works presented (in a modern-style exhibition at the FCG) and the essays published, because of their extensive, documentary and organised form, offered visitors to the exhibition a study about 20th-century Portuguese architecture of a type that had never previously been attempted. They

---


19 Later, this work would be continued with the support of the Foundation, at other monographic exhibitions that made it possible to undertake a deeper and more consistent investigation into the history of that period. Until the 1970s, few exhibitions were held and these also had other objectives. I draw attention to the exhibition held in 1951 by the Organisation of Modern Architects (ODAM), at the Ateneu Comercial in Porto, where the work of 25 architects was presented on 120 drawing boards. This was one of the most important initiatives organised by this group of architects and one of the most critical manifestos produced in favour of modern architecture, reaffirming the conclusions reached at the 1st National Architects’ Conference in 1948.

RAMOS, Rui J. G., *A Casa Unifamiliar Burguesa na Arquitectura Portuguesa: mudança e continuidade no espaço doméstico na primeira metade do século XX*, PhD Dissertation in
based their critical analysis and historical perspective on the study of architectural devices and work processes, multidisciplinary investigations and biographical research, shedding new light on the subject under study, its context and ramifications.

The critical re-interpretation that was proposed continued to refer (especially in the essays) to Raul Lino’s activity as a technician working for state organisations, an essayist and doctrinist, which was certainly one of his more controversial sides. The various different aspects to be noted in Lino’s work, which have not yet been fully researched even today, clearly underlined the importance of the single-family bourgeois housing projects that he undertook in the first two decades of the 20th century, immediately after his return from a training period in Germany in 1897, as part of his most significant architectural oeuvre in a Portuguese and European context. This analytical process and its resulting exhibition and catalogue were, however, to be misunderstood, as we shall see, by those who criticised it as being nothing more than “tendentious interpretations seeking an artificial enhancement”.

**On his youthful work**

Until the 1920s, the young Raul Lino produced work that was unique for its innovative conception of the dwelling space and the building’s adaptation to the site, programme and the needs of the user. His work during this period, with its emphasis on domestic architecture, did not follow the canons of the *beaux arts*, being more concerned with searching in the project for an organic relationship between construction and life. Just like other contemporary architects, he found in the culture of his country, and, in particular, in the imagery of the original (rather than the traditional) house – an aspect linked to the German sense of *Heimat*, as the place and time for seminal life experiences – the

---

20 Protest against the exhibition signed by 70 architects and published in *Diário de Lisboa* on 21 November, 1970.

21 Although he travelled a great deal in order to get to know his country better, Lino did not consider the possibility of the *Survey*, which was, in fact, carried out in 1955-1960 by modern architects.
arguments for his language and the necessary emotional depth and imaginative density to propose a non-academic architectural alternative. As we shall see, this was to be an incomplete project that did not succeed in transcending its passionate side and promoting the changes that had already been foreshadowed in the field of architecture and society, reconnecting tradition and innovation.

Young Lino’s search was based on his understanding of “walking while thinking” or wandern, a principle outlined by Bollnow as movement from one place to another, on foot, wandering without any hurry, walking for the love of meditating and walking. This experience in space and time was seen by romanticism as expressing an empathy with nature in order to discover the meaning of life. Lino’s long walks were exactly this, the experience of the territory for the sake of gaining a profound and intimate knowledge about it, which would enable him to develop the idea of a genuine movement “back to the land”. It was a search for a projectual truth, an aspect that allowed him, by identifying (and diagnosing) Portuguese rural culture as a central idea and driving force, to reject the urban world and its sense of modern progress. This neo-Garrettian vision, which proclaimed the opposing nature of town and hilly countryside, appeared to the young Lino as an opportunity for realising the ideals on which his education had been based, without, however, having to confront the sociological reality of Portugal, marked by poverty and underdevelopment.

This attitude was not, however, based on ideologically picturesque foundations, nor was it guided by the search for a mythical nationality. Instead, it was the result of his formative background in German romanticism, influenced at that time by Anglo-Saxon paradigms of quality, comfort and suitability. In Germany, under the guidance of Albrecht Haupt and in the midst of the refined Central European culture, Lino had learned the importance of proportion, of a welcoming reception, of wonderment, of the surrounding environment, of the landscape and of

creating cultural values as his core, aspects that, by enhancing the value of craft-based production, determined the links between the project and its implementation as an artistic realisation. In giving importance to these aspects, he drew closer to other European movements that, in their examination of the social and urban disaster generated by industrialisation, sought to achieve a culturalist path for reforming art and society.

The houses designed by Raul Lino – Casa Montsalvat (Estoril, 1901), Casa da Quinta da Comenda (Outão, 1909) and Casa do Cipreste (Sintra, 1907-1913) – which marked his youthful work, were forgotten by the following generations of architects, who were to pay attention, above all, to his activity in defence of the cultural tradition and his rejection of progress as an idea that was solely based on technique and science. (Figs. 3 and 4). These aspects were understood as obstacles to the debate about the urban question and housing conditions, and, generally speaking, to the implantation of a Modern architecture. By excluding these works produced in the first two decades of the century, no importance was consequently given to the new architectural values that were recorded in them as embryonic elements in a culturalist discussion of modernity, a subject that was well-known to Raul Lino.23

This lack of understanding, resulting from the cultural and political panorama existing in Portugal at the turn of the century, was also promoted by other interconnected aspects: the difficulty of reading the German, Viennese and British matrix that influenced Lino’s work, in a context habitually marked by French academicism; and the absence of a project for the transformation of society that both called for and nourished the cultural experience grounded in modernism. And, as a result of all this, we must raise the hypothesis of a change, if not indeed a weakening, in the training of the following generations of architects. Because of the increase in their number, among other reasons, the new architects were mainly not recipients of scholarships enabling them to

23 See the reference to his library in the following pages.
study abroad (as the previous generations had been).\textsuperscript{24} This change in the educational background of architects seems, among other aspects, to have conditioned their historical understanding of the creative processes and their meaning in artistic activity. If we pay close attention to these conditions, we can note that there was a break with the following generations, who therefore did not learn to think with History, which had been the cultural basis of European intellectuality in the 19th and 20th centuries.

* 

The young Lino’s work and activity also showed the presence of antithetical values that, with some perplexity, were to shape his character and public image. Such a situation has led people to forget his youthful work, which was innovative and dependent on the ideal of cultural identity, a theme that rapidly became immersed in (and corrupted by) the growing nationalist debate, which first began at the turn of the century and was later continued in the 1930s by the rhetoric of the “Portuguese house” in the propaganda of the New State.

There was therefore an implicit polarity to be found in Lino, such as the one that can be noted between his appreciation of erudite works and the simplistic popularisation of architectural models. The introspective and idealistic revelation of the experience of the natural environment – but also the anti-urban tradition of Thomas A. Jefferson (1743-1826) – which he found in the reading of H. D. Thoreau’s *Walden or Life in the Woods* (1854) may be contrasted with the textbooks that he wrote, reducing the contents of the architectural experience that he sought to transmit and resulting in the disastrous massification of their images and, on rare occasions, of their ideals. (Fig. 5).

Yet, also, the creative freedom of his work can be contrasted with the intolerance that he showed towards other ways of thinking and forms of expression. His intellectual roots were grounded in the reading of H. D. Thoreau (1817-1862), R. Waldo Emerson (1803-1882), Goethe (1749-

\textsuperscript{24} A study has yet to be made of the State scholarship holders studying abroad, which would enable us to see whether these aspects were in fact related with the increase in the number of architects and the decrease in the grants awarded.
1832), the teachings of his master Albrecht Haupt (1852-1932), the lessons in good taste provided by the magazine *Studio*, in which the artistic experience of the *Arts and Crafts* movement was presented, or in other works from his library, such as the secessionist magazine *Ver Sacrum*, the catalogue *Die Ausstellung der Darmstädter Künstler-Kolonie* (published by Alexander Koch in order to publicise the colony of artists at Darmstadt), as well as books by proto-modern authors such as Ruskin (1819-1900), Muthesius (1861-1927) and Baillie Scott (1865-1945), but these did not so much temper the fierce line of argument and authority that he adopted towards the modern expression of architects, as impose it both in his dealings with the official bodies in which he was present and in the texts that he published in defence of his ideas.

This can be seen in the intransigent way in which he assumed the defence of his principles during his activity, from 1934 onwards, at the Directorate-General of Buildings and National Monuments (DGEMN), where he was to oppose the policy of that institution, which was concerned with restoring the “purity of the original design” of monuments. He defended conservation instead of restoration, as a principle for maintaining the buildings’ constructive features from different periods. His arguments in favour of this principle, which can be found in his written opinions and in various published articles, were based on the thought of Ruskin as opposed to the ideas of Viollet-le-Duc.

---

25 This publication is significantly mentioned by Raul Lino as being important in his work, in contrast with others such as *L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui*.


26 Raul Lino’s activity at the official bodies with which he was connected (in 1940, he was a member of the 1st sub-section of the 6th section of the National Board of Education; in 1947, he was vice-president of the National Academy of Fine Arts, and its president in 1967; in 1934, he began his activity at the Directorate-General of National Buildings and Monuments (DGEMN) working for the Department for the Building of Economical Houses, being appointed Head of Department in 1936 and Director of Services in 1949) has not yet been fully studied. On this subject, see:


27 In this struggle, for example, he requested, “mandatory standards, imposed by a special emergency law, until the end of the transitional period that we are passing through”.

who was frequently mentioned in a somewhat laconic and superficial manner in the speeches of the leaders of the DGEMN.\textsuperscript{28}

This illustrated opposition, in the case of the DGEMN, which went beyond a problem of simply preserving the built heritage, makes it possible to comprehend the polarisation between a culturalist and a progressivist understanding of architecture\textsuperscript{29}, which, since the beginning of the century, had been assumed by Raul Lino and Ventura Terra as paths leading to modernity.

Already as early as 1903, Terra (with whom Lino thought of working, when he returned to Portugal, although he immediately realised the incompatibility of their personalities and educational backgrounds\textsuperscript{30}) cited Viollet-le-Duc in order to defend the functional, in keeping with the progress of the modern sciences, against the undesired resurgence of the old architecture.\textsuperscript{31}

The defence of restoration, proposed by Lino, was coherent with the organic nature of his work, namely that which he produced during the first decades of the 20th century, capable of including local values and being adapted to different ways of life, in a process uninterrupted by time; or, in other words, in which cultural identity was the central attitude in the project. Obviously this was not the modern (or progressivist) project suggested by Terra, in which each construction or intervention was supposed to mark out a new period of efficiency and rationality, which was projected into a future.

The clear disciplinary confrontation between these two architects highlights the fact that, in the first decades of the century, there was a critical discussion taking place about the terms of modernity in Portugal.

\textsuperscript{28} NETO, Maria João Baptista, \textit{op. cit.}

It was his opposition to the superficial activity of the DGEMN that led Lino in 1949 (when he was already Director of Services) to gather together excerpts from texts (translated into Portuguese) to be distributed at the offices in Porto, Coimbra and Évora, where discussions were being held, at an international level, on the policies and principles of intervention to be adopted. Lino’s actions were always erudite and educational… he sought “to put an end, once and for all, to the inveterate and inflexible concept of restoring buildings to their original design, which has already had such harmful effects here in this country.”


\textsuperscript{29} CHOAY, Françoise, \textit{L’urbanisme, utopies et réalités}, Seuil, Paris, 1965

\textsuperscript{30} LINO, Raul, “Raul Lino Visto por ele próprio”, \textit{Vida Mundial}, No. 1589, 1969, pp. 28-42.

\textsuperscript{31} TERRA, Ventura, “A cidade. Palestra com Ventura Terra”, \textit{O Dia}, 5 March, Lisbon, 1903, p. 1 [interviewer not identified].
1901: the Casa Montsalvat

On his return to Portugal, at the age of 17, Raul Lino kept in close touch with the circle of friends of the pianist Alexandre Rey Colaço, whose influence was to prove decisive for strengthening his ideals and providing him with his first commissions. This was the context in which, in 1901, he was to build the Casa Montsalvat for the Rey Colaço family (the land and building being a gift from the Duchess of Palmela) and, in 1902, he began work on the Casa de Santa Maria for the O’Neil family, which would later be subjected to successive alterations and enlargements. (Fig. 6)

Of the domestic architecture produced by Raul Lino, the Casa Montsalvat represents an important link for the reinterpretation of his work at the crucial moment constituted by the turn of the century. It should be explained that Montsalvat was not a virtuoso project; on the contrary, it was a conventional project in both morphological and typological terms. In other words, it was in keeping with the architectural research of his time and fitted in with the new requirements of the modern domestic programme. But it is precisely for this reason that it remains a unique piece of architecture in the Portuguese context of 1900.

If the purpose of this essay were different, the study would certainly pay more attention to one of the most marvellous houses built in the first half of the century, the Casa do Cipreste.

The project for the Casa Montsalvat reconciled the search for new forms of housing with the simplification of spatial relations, and consequently with a reduction in the dwelling area. At the beginning of the century, these aspects had an innovative significance, which has been generally overlooked by the history of architecture in its excessive

32 According to Diogo Lino Pimentel, the drawings for this work have been lost, since they have not been found either in the family archives or those of the FCG, nor even in the possession of the Rey Colaço family. Furthermore, according to the research undertaken by Patrícia Duarte, the process relating to this house is not to be found at the offices of Cascais Municipal Council.

DUARTE, Patrícia Alexandra da Silva Antunes, Casas de Verão entre Belém e Cascais: uma leitura sobre a arquitectura do lazer através da “Construção Moderna””, Master’s degree dissertation in Studies of Space and Housing in Architecture, Lisbon, FAUTL, 2008 [photocopied text].
concern with the decorative systems that were used to cover the façades of buildings. Simplifying and reducing are decisive factors in altering the space of a house, and they should, above all, be interpreted as part of a process that was already in progress and would lead to the creation of both the Modern house and the contemporary house.

The Casa Montsalvat can be synthesised in its entrance hall, characterised as its central space, which, besides linking together all the horizontal and vertical paths for circulation around the house, also connects and extends both the “dining-room” (refeitório) and “living-room” (salão) in a quite innovative fashion. This aspect, in itself, would not be significant, were it not for the fact that, in establishing this link, Raul Lino created an unexpected fluidity between living spaces and those intended for circulation, between the secondary, side access to the house and the service areas, succeeding in transforming an entrance hall into an informal living-room and a place of movement and making a complete break with the traditional systems based on the segregation of domestic spaces. At a time when bourgeois dwelling spaces were still marked by the formality of a segregated form of organisation, this house pointed towards future developments of the domestic programme that would later be confirmed over time. It clearly reveals the research that was carried out into minimum areas or the transformations of the social spaces leading to the common living area. (Fig. 7)

The simplicity of the structure of its space, organised around a central living hall, appeared as an effective response to a small-scale domestic programme, not unlike the experience of the English Country House developed, among others, in the work of C. F. A. Voisey (1857-1941), an example of the reformulation of housing as a continuation of the English tradition, which was well known in Europe at that time.  

---

33 Among Raul Lino’s books, we find:  
SCOTT, M. H. Baillie, *Houses and Gardens*, Southampton, Georges Newnes Limited, 1906 [with the signature, Raul Lino London 1907];  
The definition of the dwelling space also extended to the link between the interior and the exterior afforded by a large circular covered balcony, appearing as if it were yet another compartment inserted into the logic of domestic life. In the 20th century, housing was to develop around the dream of outdoor living (with the powerful images published by Le Corbusier), with the extension of the house outdoors being one of the most important aspects for the transformation of lifestyles. (Fig. 8)

The innovative consideration of the way in which people lived in houses was also the result of a process for formulating projects that (in 1900) began to move away from the academic practice of drawing. Our knowledge of the sketches of the project for this house is made possible through the graphic material disseminated in various publications of that time, most particularly in A Construção Moderna. Among the different elements normally used in these publications, such as the floor plan and elevations, this project was presented with two sketches: one of its main interior space, the central hall, another of the exterior as a whole. A study of architectural periodicals published between 1900 and 1970 highlights the unusual nature of publishing this type of drawings. This fact allows us to infer the importance of the drawing, not only as a way of communicating the architect’s ideas, but also as a research instrument of the project itself. An aspect that we know to be included in a normal exercise of rapid drawing and more carefully worked sketches, as a way of researching proportions and keeping a personal record, as confirmed by Lino’s sketch books. (Fig. 9)

The enhancement of the inner dwelling space, underlined by the design of the entrance hall as the essential aspect in the conception of the house, was not in any way a new phenomenon. Several examples may be mentioned, and the work of Ventura Terra itself abounds in examples of monumental treatment, with a scenographic enhancement of staircases, galleries and entrance halls, or in the geometrical organisation of

34 A systematic study of images and projects from 20th-century architecture, through A Construção Moderna (1900-1919), was made possible by the research project entitled Paper Architecture(s).
35 RAMOS, Rui J. G., op. cit.
36 Raul Lino family archives.
compartments in order to provide a powerful image in terms of perspective. However, this drawing of Lino’s, in capturing the three-dimensional space of the central hall with a precise organisation, occupied with furniture and with the paths between compartments marked out on the floor, describes the idea of a domestic welcome as being a major concern that was present in the house right from the moment of its first conception. This was decisively innovative and modern as a practice to be followed in the projection and design of a space. This search for the qualities of the space brought Lino closer to the movements of Arts and Crafts, Jugendstill and the Viennese Secession, all of which were extensively documented in his library and displayed the same concern with regard to the need for the project to respond to all the dimensions of humankind and to satisfy the intimate requirements of dwelling.

The house as a differentiating socio-economic element also shifted from a representation of monumentality and ostentation to the enhancement of its appropriate positioning between a functional and built programme, in a proposal that paid attention to the needs of everyday domestic life. Aspects that the sketch of the exterior perspective of the house can help us to understand. This drawing highlights the autonomy of the volumes in their direct relationship with the function that they fulfil, presenting a compound group of buildings, in which what stands out is the unity afforded by the lines of the eaves, the smooth plastered walls, the small openings for windows and doors and the use of the same materials. These were common aspects in traditional Portuguese architecture (and one of the reasons for the various misunderstandings about Lino). The entrance to the house, reached by means of a narrow, winding path, in which one’s gaze is directed, with a sense of discovery, towards the passage to the interior, also seems to underline the importance of constructing a particular spatiality that makes this house quite distinct from any other.

In this way, the intentionality of Lino’s drawing helps us to understand the changes taking place at the beginning of the 20th century. At the same time, Ventura Terra was also developing the theme of
housing (in a different way, as we shall see) on a much smaller scale, as a parallel proposal to the large-sized bourgeois house.

In this house, and in the others that Lino designed in his youth, we find the idea of changing and updating the formal elements of traditional architecture; and not the idea of copying and establishing these elements as a fixed notion. For Lino, this was the vitality that represented the originality to be found in the architecture of any nation of people, which subordinated an architectural code (Gothic, Modern or of another kind) to the conditions of the climate and landscape, the nature of the materials used, the flora, the religious concept, history, poetry and temperament of the artists. Aspects that are generally ignored and are the source of ambiguities in the criticism of his work.

In the light of this attitude, his houses did not seek to reproduce an authentic historical period, not least because he knew that such a precise reproduction of History, besides not even existing, would not satisfy the needs of contemporary life. Instead, they sought to evoke a certain traditional homely atmosphere, a solid domesticity of the home, that we can associate with the past life of our family and with the image that we have of that primitive house, supposedly the one from where we originate. “In a certain way, that is also equivalent to speaking of a metonymic logic, according to which a simple trace of the past is more significant than a supposed recovery of its integrality (which, in fact, can never be more than a trap).”

The innovative and anti-Modern Lino

The interpretation made by Lino of both the national and European cultural contexts, at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, allowed him to reject what he designated as intolerable revivalisms, thus setting himself up in opposition to the mere adoption of imported styles, especially those denoting a French and academic influence (an area of architecture in which Terra was included). Thus, Raul Lino was led to

---

formulate an architectural alternative based on local invariants, in an attempt to find a pragmatic design for housing suited to the means and conditions existing in Portugal. This search was adapted to the cultural milieu in which he himself moved after his return to Portugal, and synthesised, in the form of architecture, the debate taking place on the Portuguese identity that had been causing so much discomfort in intellectual circles since the late 19th century.38

His youthful work may therefore be considered innovative in relation to 19th-century stereotypes, as well as erudite and up-to-date in relation to European movements, and, as we have said, it showed itself to be ready to engage in a culturalist discussion of modernity.

At this particular period at the turn of the century, the country that Lino encountered and studied was marked by an archaic form of ruralism and a poor urban environment, with populations living in degrading conditions without any basic infrastructures, accompanied by extremely low levels of education among the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. For Pedro Vieira de Almeida, Lino was able to grasp the nature of these conditions and, without believing in the progressist solution of town planning and architecture based on science and technique, he understood that this set of circumstances represented an opportunity for the spread of his ideas. Lino had faith in the regeneration of the qualities of the nation of people who had built the typical Minho house, the Alentejo farmstead, or the palaces of Sintra… and he believed that, above all, it was these qualities that constituted the greatest value, identity and foundation of his architecture. It was through the identification of these seminal qualities that he thought he would be able to improve the quality of people’s lives. In order to attain this objective, education was necessary; this was Lino’s project. This was also the main reason for the distortion of his intentions: the fact that there was a gap between his naive educational pretensions and the society towards which he was directing his teachings.

38 José-Augusto França’s article about Raul Lino and the generation of 1890 establishes a complete contextualisation for this period, pointing to the main lines of influence in the field of art, music and literature, as well as the articles and works of an ethnographic nature, in which it is demonstrated that “the Portuguese House was, at that time, a symptom”.

In his pursuit of these ideals, he based his anti-urban and anti-progressist convictions on a society that showed signs of social change and urban growth, and in which avant-garde movements were clearly budding. At the end of the 1920s, he was to synthesise this understanding in the architectural models known as the Casa Portuguesa (the Portuguese House), thus pursuing his role as an instructor in the art of living, with the publication of the book A nossa casa: Apontamentos sobre o bom-gosto na construção das casas simples (Our house: Notes on good taste in the building of simple houses). His first intention was to have this publication included in the collection entitled Livros do Povo, but, as José-Augusto França mentioned, he soon realised that this was an absurdity. The education of the people could only be achieved under the auspices of the bourgeoisie, since the example should come from above…. The seductive manner in which, in this publication, he sought to control (or educate) people’s taste, through illustrations of houses based on the popular and bourgeois traditional architecture of the different regions of the country, relegated to a secondary position the text in which he stressed good sense, the essential linking of the construction to its environment, the value of authenticity and the rejection of imitations. This and other books were rapidly published one after another, although they did not manage to divert the attention that was paid solely to the illustrations, which were understood as being models of houses that should be followed, together with the somewhat biased reading of his intentions, these being aspects that were later recognised by Lino. The model of the Portuguese House that was illustrated in his books, shown as a picturesque single-family dwelling, was a success, and quickly became transformed into a lesson in Portugueseness and a manifesto against the modern design. After these books were published,

---

40 LINO, Raul, A nossa casa: Apontamentos sobre o bom-gosto na construção das casas simples, Lisbon, Atlântida, 1918.

LINO, Raul, Casas Portuguesas. Alguns apontamentos sobre o arquitectar das casas simples, Lisbon, Valentim de Carvalho, 1933.
everything was to be completely different, and Lino’s work no longer enjoyed its earlier pertinence.

His first works show us, in a paradigmatic form in early 20th-century domestic architecture, a way of thinking about the project and a modern sense of spatiality. As the architect of the Casa Montsalvat and the Casa do Cipreste, among others, his work was dissociated from his intervention in the stylisation and promotion of the Portuguese House and his position as a doctrinist of anti-modern culture, ignoring the inevitable march of time, already marked by the international movements for the renewal of art and technique, which had paved the way to Modern architecture.

The opposition to the exhibition, and modern architects
The exhibition of Lino’s work, in 1970, gave rise to widespread public opposition led by the small community of modern architects, for whom Lino was the father of the “Portuguese house”, against which modern architecture was engaged in battle. As we have seen, Lino’s activity and work were marked by a series of highly complex factors, which nonetheless did not prevent historical conventionalism, until the 1970s, from uniquely emphasising the association of Lino’s name with the “Portuguese house”, underlining an architectural error.

Today it can be seen, without our entering into great detail about this subject, that the debate about the “Portuguese house” cannot be restricted to the successful model imposed by the publication of Lino’s books. Recent studies have shown that the debate had common roots with the search for national expressions and the construction of their memory, but also with the desire for exoticism promoted by the imagery of travelling, which had formed an important part of European culture since the 19th century.43 For that reason, the architectural expression of this debate is symptomatic of a broader meaning, not exclusive to single-family


housing, but spreading to all types of construction, namely to collective housing, which, as we know, was to be crucial in the transformation of 20th-century architecture.

In the decades leading up to the 1970 exhibition, for those architects who defended modernity, Lino was considered to be the main obstacle to the progress of modern architecture, being the symbol of a rustic Portugal. They ignored and underestimated the theoretical foundations of his ideals, most frequently presented in writing, which was an unusual aspect in the incipient architectural debate. In reality, it was impossible to discuss Lino’s project without an alternative that presented the theoretical conceptualisation necessary for the deeper study of their practice. In this conjuncture, one notes the fragility of the process followed by Portuguese architecture during the 20th century, until the 1970s, which had already been commented upon by Pedro Vieira de Almeida or Nuno Portas and Ana Tostões, who highlighted the structural difficulty and the absence of a project, or, in other words, an instrumental ineffectiveness of the modern.

The difficulty in adopting a modern culture was due, in Portugal, to many other aspects that are now widely studied today: ranging from the social, economic and political conditions to the actual training that was given to architects, and not just this, but also including the figure of Lino, despite his contribution to the fight against modern architecture.

Can it be that this circumstance, by marking out the opposition to the exhibition of Lino’s work, expressed the architect’s own (modern) difficulty in reading History and defining the identity of Portuguese architecture until the 1970s?

**The essay by Pedro Vieira de Almeida**

Among the factors that led to the opposition shown towards the exhibition, the essay by Pedro Vieira de Almeida that was included in the catalogue may be considered of crucial importance. Its title “Raul Lino,
Modern Architect" revealed the interpretation that its author had adopted of the process of Portuguese architecture in the 20th century, an aspect that was misunderstood by those opposing the exhibition, who considered, above all, that the designation of “modern” afforded to the architect was a provocation, since he had always fought against these ideals.

The tone had been set and the controversy spread to the newspapers and magazines with the signing of two petitions repudiating the tribute being held (on the occasion of his 92nd birthday) to honour the figure of Lino with all of his social and political connotations. On almost all occasions, the architect’s work was ignored in the midst of the failure to understand the purposes of the exhibition’s organisers and of the Foundation itself.

The fact that the author of this essay was Pedro Vieira de Almeida, an architect who had formerly worked at the office of Nuno Teotónio Perneira, an erudite professional space, unquestionably modern in its references and unaligned with government policies, made it even more incomprehensible, in the eyes of his colleagues, that he should attribute the epithet of “modern” to Lino as an architect. As can be seen in the press records of that time, and as is borne out by the interviews recently conducted with some of those involved in the events of this period, the confrontation that took place in the following months with the opponents

As can be seen from the chronology of events, the date of 1970 referred to by the issue of the review Arquitectura is incorrect, so that it was quite possibly published in the following year.
46 Pedro Vieira de Almeida worked at the office of Nuno Teotónio Pereira until the mid-1960s; Nuno Portas was in contact with this office until the 1970s.
47 Those interviewed were Pedro Vieira de Almeida (Porto, 14 March 2008); Diogo Lino Pimentel (Lisbon, 20 June 2008); Nuno Portas (Porto, 9 July 2008); José-Augusto França (Lisbon, 24 November 2008); Francisco Silva Dias (Lisboa, 26 June 2009).
of the exhibition made dialogue impossible. Given the nature of the project for the interpretation of Lino’s work, clearly displayed in the exhibition and the catalogue, there was no alternative put forward by its opponents. Instead, what was to be found was a “cultural complacency” towards a history that was all clearly catalogued and safe in its definitions of “‘Raul Lino’, ‘Portuguese house’, ‘modern architecture’, ‘progressiveness’, ‘reactionariness’, ‘tradition’, ‘regionalism’, ‘nationalism’, ‘humanism’ (...”).

“Raul Lino, Modern Architect” is a fundamental essay, which paved the way for a new historiography of Portuguese architecture. In his analysis of architectural devices and his interpretation, in context, of their value in the project, Pedro Vieira de Almeida went beyond the stylistic problem (or the decorative problem, or even that of a design produced “in the style of”) of Lino’s work, which shed further light on its significance at the beginning of the 20th century.

The Survey of Portuguese Regional Architecture and the problem of the “Portuguese House”: a re-reading of the exhibition

Why was there such opposition on the part of modern architects? Why was it impossible for them to produce an architectural critique of the thesis put forward by Pedro Vieira de Almeida? Was this impossibility the nub of the problem?

I believe that the answer is not to be found in Lino but in the way that the idea of the modern was introduced into architecture in Portugal.

As we have seen, modern architecture in Portugal was not a project of either social or cultural renewal, so that it did not therefore have any ambitions to transform the way things were. Its modern design appeared as a form of eclecticism, a style among others, which responded pragmatically both to the constructive possibilities and those offered by

---

48 Ibid., p. 139.

Among those who subscribed to the opposition to the exhibition, Nuno Portas was the only one who was to reflect on the controversy that surrounded the exhibition and adopt a critical stance in relation to the positions defended in Pedro Vieira de Almeida’s article, distancing himself from the initial movement that he had subscribed to.

the workforce, but above all to the taste of the client. There was no rupture in the formal systems, nor any transformation of the technical means of production, and, when there seemed to be signs that this was beginning to happen (Capitólio, 1925; Instituto Superior Técnico, 1925; Pavilhão do Rádio, 1927; Clínica Heliântia de Francelos, 1929), such changes proved to be circumstantial. Modern architecture immediately returned to its hybrid form, coupled with traditional design, or that of the “Portuguese house”, or, later, in the 1940s, resulting in architects being called upon to produce a series of monumental works.

In the 1950s, modern architecture seemed to be generated spontaneously. It established itself with optimism, although it did not solidify its criticism of history and did not enjoy the appropriate technical and industrial conditions, so that its aesthetics “leads to what we might call a new ideology of form which, in the methodology of the project, entrusts imagination with responsibility for the mediation of the concept, where architecture cannot be anything more than the evocation of a myth materialised as an image”. These green years, as they have been called by Ana Tostões, were later to give way to disillusion, “(...) the ingenuous pride of the affirmation of modern architecture would be confronted with the harshness of a reality, where in the end very little got to be done, in the best cases only remarkable authorial works (…)”.50

By the end of the 1950s, Fernando Távora and Teotónio Pereira “were already offering the younger generation safe tips, without any archaeological commitments, but directly interpreting values of the pre-existing environment as hypotheses to be tested in the face of the new meanings”. The change that they were bringing about in the understanding of the modern had already been noted in 1947 by Fernando Távora (1923-2005) and Keil do Amaral (1910-1975) when they published the booklet O Problema da Casa Portuguesa (The Problem of the Portuguese House) and the article “Uma iniciativa

51 PORTAS, Nuno, op. cit., p. 21.
necessária” (A Necessary Initiative), respectively. In these publications, they defended the authenticity of modern architecture as a problem of interpreting its roots, the conditions of production and popular architecture. A year later, in 1948, the same architects had an “absent participation” at the 1st Conference of Architects, which must be understood as a sign of their doubts and their distancing themselves from the unconditional apology to the Modern Movement that was made there, marking out an informal platform for another understanding of what is modern in architecture.

This pertinent conjugation of meanings, also observed by José António Bandeirinha when he noted the criticism made of the orthodox Modern Movement, was to propose the need for architecture to begin once more to reflect upon the place in which it had been implanted, and upon its concrete history, in short to draw closer to man himself.

The reflection about which elements would constitute a new architectural modernity was to take place against the background of the precursory singularity of works such as Monsanto Tennis Club (Keil do Amaral, 1947-1950), Vila da Feira Market (F. Távora, 1953-1959), Quinta da Conceição Tennis Pavilion (F. Távora, 1956-1960), the Ofir house (F. Távora, 1957-1958) and the Barata dos Santos house (Teotónio Pereira, N. Portas and Pedro Vieira de Almeida, 1958-1962). These were manifestos that clearly displayed a new understanding of space, which was developed in close conjunction with the construction itself. Aspects of the tradition of vernacular architecture were recovered, and a preference was shown for its materials and processes, which, together with the new industrial products, were capable of providing both functionality and comfort. These equipments and houses maintained a dialogue with tradition and modernity that was free of the formal

52 The holding of the Survey (1955-1960) and its publication (1961) were to be the clear expression of that alternative.
BANDEIRINHA, José António, Quinas Vivas, (1993), Porto, FAUP Publicações, 1996, pp. 121-143.
53 Pedro Vieira de Almeida refers to the Casa Barata dos Santos, in Vila Viçosa, as “One of the most Raul Lino-like works undertaken since the end of the war”.
commitments of the Modern, or subject to others, foreshadowing the socio-cultural transformation brought about by the crisis of rationalism.

By reintroducing the problem of the functionality and cultural specificity of architecture, these aspects also brought back into consideration concerns that had been noted at the beginning of the 20th century by Raul Lino, in his first works. The same search for an identity could be observed, now expressed in terms of a highly questioned modernity, but also concerned with providing a pragmatic answer to problems. Running through half a century, these aspects consolidated not only the difference between the architectural processes of 1900 and 1950, but above all the dialectics between their similarities.

Between 1955 and 1960, the Survey of Portuguese Regional Architecture was conducted, being carried out by modern architects as a manifesto of the rationality of popular construction methods. The identification of this popular expression thus sought to establish modern architecture as the only legitimate architecture of its time. In this way, it sought to bring to a close the controversy surrounding the national expression of architecture, in its picturesque vision of the “Portuguese house” as a sign of Portuageseness.

Ten years after this initiative, this subject was reopened for debate with the exhibition of Raul Lino’s work, which, in 1970, once again posed the problem of the house and his work, not only questioning its modernity at the beginning of the 20th century, but also confronting contemporary architects with the meaning of being modern in the 1970s and calling for a reconsideration of the history of architecture.

At this very same time, both international and Portuguese criticism (through the writings of Zevi and Portas) questioned the orthodoxy of the Modern Movement, with greater value being given to peripheral experiences, which showed signs of new understandings of modernity.

In the 1970s, modern architects thus found themselves “under siege”, at a time when there seemed to exist the appropriate social and political

conditions in Portugal for a greater acceptance of the modern design of their works.

The criticism that was made of the exhibition and the difficulty in accepting it emerged from this context and revealed the impossibility of architects considering their activity from a historical perspective – in the sense that was given to it by T. S. Eliot (1988-1965) – as the basis of creation. The exhibition catalysed a project that was absent from the work of modern architects, who, in interpreting its history, were incapable of finding bases for their criticism of the present. As Fernando Catroga stated: “Only when there are exchanges can one think the thoughts of others; which is, however, quite different from falling into the trap of believing that one should think like others, for that would be the advent of the kingdom of indifferentiation.”

In analysing the private, political and architectural conditions of these decades, Nuno Portas stressed that “the crisis has a fulcrum, namely the question of tradition (…)”, an aspect that highlights the problem, significant and stretching over time, of the incomplete acceptance of architectural tradition by the generation of modern architects. Besides its obvious emotional and political characteristics, the cohesive opposition, noted in 1970, denoted not only the impossible relationship of architects with the figure of Raul Lino, but also their difficulty in accepting his work as part of their tradition, i.e. not only as a perception of the past, but also as a sign of its presence.

We are therefore left with the question: if the exhibition had been a different one, with an essay entitled Ventura Terra, modern architect, would the reactions still have been the same?

---

56 PORTAS, Nuno, “Arquitectura e urbanismo na década de 40”, in Fernando Azevedo (com.), José-Augusto França (prog.), *Os anos 40 na Arte Portuguesa*, vol. 6, Lisbon, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1982, p. 35.
3 Ventura Terra, a modern architect

In 1886, on a State scholarship from the Civil Architecture Section of the Porto Academy of Fine Arts, Ventura Terra arrived in Paris to study at the École Nationale et Spéciale des Beaux-Arts.58 His stay in the French capital until 1895 coincided with important changes that were taking place in the academic environment in which he studied, and, more generally, involved a redefinition of the architect’s profession. Although the training of architects continued to be based on the parameters of the academic education provided at the Paris School of Fine Arts, his ateliers – Terra joined the studio of Louis-Jules André (1819-1890) in 1887, and then shortly afterwards that of Victor Laloux (1850-1937), which Marques da Silva was also to join in 188959 – were busily working on all kinds of large-scale projects. These projects brought with them the need to review working methodologies and the way in which production was organised inside the studio; to incorporate new techniques for satisfying constructive requirements that were indispensable in the design of new large-sized spaces; to analyse the functional programme in order to deal with the scale of the projects planned for mass use; and to share a multidisciplinary view of each project with the engineers.60

At that time, and without going into great detail about these aspects, the Laloux studio was to work on the project of the Gare d’Orsay (inaugurated in 1900), which clearly demonstrated the challenges placed before architecture and engineering, at the beginning of the 20th century. Challenges that had already been visibly displayed at the Paris Universal Exposition in 1889, in the iconic works of the Eiffel Tower and the Galerie des Machines, designed by the architect Ferdinand Dutert and the engineer Victor Contamin. As Raquel Henriques da Silva mentions, great importance was given at that time to the architecture of engineers, which

---

59 For a complete contextualisation of this time, see:
CARDOSO, António, op. cit.
faced, on the one hand the disciplinary discussion of its not being considered architecture by the architects, but also, on the other hand, the pressure, brought by the works that were commissioned from them, to conquer this non-architecture for architecture itself. “In this way, a period was begun which, seeming to be a continuation of the past – marked by historicist and picturesque revivalisms – was, after all, a time of rupture and uncertainties.”61 (Fig.10)

On uncertainty

Paris, a cosmopolitan city and a benchmark of modernity at the turn of the century, was the setting for Ventura Terra’s professional training. The economic and social changes taking place at that time, backed by contemporary technical and scientific knowledge, led to processes of massification in all sectors of society, an entirely unprecedented aspect that brought new meanings for architectural production (for example, in housing, transport or leisure). The rationality of the experimental sciences was placed at the service of engineering and architecture,62 making it possible to gain new dimensions for the built space, based on the consideration that the city, the public space and urban equipments were destined to serve and affect urban life as a whole, which, for the first time, would involve questioning working conditions and the conditions of health and hygiene, housing and leisure, among the petite bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

This interpretation of science and the new spaces built in the city enable us to consider with greater circumspection the importance of the eclectic decorative systems, developed in keeping with the beaux-arts, which still continue to line the façades of those constructions. These buildings were to impose themselves on the city as symbols of a cosmopolitan urbanity, based on an idea of progress and the affirmation of a new monumentality founded on the values of technique and science.

61 SILVA, Raquel Henriques da, op. cit., p. 15.
62 Besides participating in the project of the new spaces, the engineers would also equip the city with new infrastructures. At that time, the city ended up being torn to pieces, riddled with holes and freshly re-built.
They are examples in which one can recognise the powerful influence of the Beaux-Arts method of the Paris school that trained these architects, who reformulated the city with projects of great effectiveness and continuity. Under decorative systems based on academic design concepts, functional spaces were revealed that satisfied the new systems required for transport, telecommunications, education, health service provision, infrastructures and the organisation of trade and work. These buildings, produced by the architects trained at the Academies of Fine Arts, were given responsibility for the formative genesis of modern architecture.

This was also a time of opposites, in which the old coexisted with the new, intense work with leisure, the inhuman working conditions of the proletariat with the continuous search for well-being on the part of the bourgeoisie, and industrial concentration with the degraded living conditions in the city, all of which were defined within the context of a dialectic underlying the modern project.\(^{63}\) The modern as a construction between opposites, between progress and reaction, was established in a permanent renewal of the means of production and the social contract. The uncertainty of this business dynamic, which characterised the modern condition, implied the acceptance of the modern project as a belief in progress. Or, in other words, in the possibility of solving the problems faced by society as a hypothesis for a better life. This readiness to embrace modernity can be noted in Ventura Terra, for whom the project was the possibility of transforming society, not only through the critique of tradition, but also through the new ordering of the present and of the world itself.\(^{64}\)

For Raul Lino, accepting these terms of modernity represented an unbearable loss. Because accepting the modern transformation meant breaking with a time of certainties (or a circular time), where everything could begin again; accepting the fragmentation of progress and the separation between the work and its author implied recognising the


impersonal nature of the creation. It was therefore an unacceptable condition for him, because it meant that he had to cut with tradition in regard to its most enriching and life-enhancing aspect: continuity. For Lino, creation was founded on the interpretation of the values of the past most likely to characterise the present, thereby giving continuity to the historical process, as a place of multiple times and meanings. Remaining faithful to his romantic education and background, Lino rejected the hypothesis of the massification of construction through technique and the dilution of its cultural identity, or, in other words, the uniformisation of space, which was to lead architecture towards contemporaneity.

Seen from this perspective, for Raul Lino, the problem of housing was not understood as an urban problem, but as the refounding of an idea of domestic proximity, based on his conception of the individual house.

For Ventura Terra, this typological solution was insufficient, because it did not provide for an improvement in living conditions and salubriousness in the urban environment, something that was only possible through the creation of multi-storey housing. In other words, through the technique that provided architects with new housing solutions, mass produced and built in a vertical fashion, which were capable of satisfying those who were in need of a home. For this reason, the individual house was not considered to be effective.

**The character to be given to the new constructions**

In March 1903, the newspaper *O Dia* published an interview with Ventura Terra which took place in his office in “*Largo do Quintella, above the flats where the Arcada de Londres is housed*.”

---

65 See his activity at the DGEMN:

66 Even when, later on, he was to work on the problem of economical housing, he reaffirmed the importance of the individual house.
LINO, Raul, “Casas Económicas”, Raul Lino family archives, [1935], 24 pages. [typewritten, containing some handwritten notes for the projection of images at a lecture that he gave in Brazil].

This interview, although it began by discussing the “character to be given to the new constructions” of Lisbon, made it possible, because of Ventura Terra’s eloquence, to understand his stance in relation to the architectural debate of that time. We therefore find in it the dissertation on the typification of the Portuguese house, the problem of the beautiful and the useful as the essence of art, his adherence to the thinking of Viollet-le-Duc, the importance of modern science as the justification for technical options, historical truth and the idea of progress, hygienism and the heritage value (reflected in the old quarter of Alfama, where he identified serious social problems) and the disciplinary autonomy of architecture in relation to archaeology. The intermingling of these themes during the interview leads me to transcribe some excerpts:

[Ventura Terra]
“(…) – You want to know my opinion about the character to be given to the new constructions? It’s difficult for me to answer that question. That theory, which is now fashionable, about the Portuguese house gives me the impression that it will prove to be unacceptable. For example, as a man from the Minho province, I have an excellent knowledge of the typical Minho house, but transplanting it to Lisbon, where there is such a diversity in life styles, is not only unaesthetic, but illogical. And, in architecture, we must look for the most adaptable and the most logical, because what is not so is not art.

[gives the example of the Gothic, referring to the book by Viollet-le-Duc]
(…) – All the problems are set out in that book… The resurgence of old architecture is another point that should be condemned.
(…) – Modern constructions must be in keeping not only with our present-day customs and habits, but also with modern science. The constructions built twenty years ago are uninhabitable today, so that I disapprove of their resurrection based on the sole argument of establishing a tradition, because hygiene, science and even today’s aesthetics all condemn it.

[the interviewer continues with the example]
– But there are some elements that can be made use of, thoroughly Portuguese ones, that might be used as decorative features. The roofs, for example, which were scattered all around in the 15th and 16th centuries – there is a curious detail.

[Ventura Terra answers]
– But they’re not Portuguese. There were some in France, and you can still see them today in Italy (…). We nationalised these roofs, but there’s
no doubt that the Marseille tile, against which there has been such an uproar recently, has some quite superior qualities. (...)

[the interviewer insists]
– But what character would you give to the new constructions?

[Ventura Terra answers]
(...) – Everything, except a regression… or rather archaeology, which is what it should be called. I don’t understand this campaign about the Portuguese house, and, as some of my highly-talented fellow architects persist in building it everywhere, I also persist in opposing it argument by argument. As I told you, I’m from the Minho, I know the houses of the Minho, which gain a lot of their picturesqueness from their interplay with their setting, from the primitive ingenuity of the habits of the people from that province, a house that they build by themselves, without any help from building contractors, with their own hands, depending on their immediate and progressive needs. (...)

[continues with a detailed analysis of the house as the result of a process of adaptation to needs and capable of being transformed in the light of its different problems, improving itself]

(...) but the pretext of maintaining a tradition and a character by building the Minho house in Lisbon, or in the suburbs, where life is different from in the Minho, is an inexplicable fantasy. The logic is lost, and comfort is not something you find there. An exact copy is made of these houses and, sometimes, as reeds are a proverbial feature of the Minho, for the copy to be a glaring one, they are also transplanted there, even though the owner doesn’t have any corn… to dry. They only take advantage of the detail! It’s a useless and pretentious adornment.

(...) Now imagine the Rua do Ouro filled with these simple houses, with their porchways, and see what it would look like. It would be ridiculous! (…)\footnote{Idem.}

This interview allows us to identify a clear game of rhetoric, in which Terra’s cosmopolitanism, which was sometimes belittled, comes to the fore as the key to his progressist commitment, providing him with the instruments to face up to the problems posed by contemporary life.

While, for Terra, technique and science were the key to progress, and should therefore be worked into the architectural project itself, for Lino these novelties were irrelevant, not because they might possibly bring a sense of well-being (an aspect that Lino always defended), but because architecture was not to be discussed at that level. In rejecting technique...
and science, Lino considered that the architectural debate could not be centred on *convenience and utility*, but instead on the *harmony* of all the aspects that linked the project to life itself.

As José-Augusto França stressed, for Lino, modern architecture was a question of construction and not, strictly speaking, one of architecture. “Why talk about architecture in which there is only technique and other qualities that are common to countless industries?” When technique became indispensable, due to the type, time and place of the building, one can sense in these projects of Lino’s the fragile interplay between the space produced and the constructive solution. In having to abandon the spatial devices combined with the constructive tradition of the “thick wall”, because of the technical inevitability of the “thin wall” in a tall building, he found it difficult to include the new qualities and attributes of this space in the project.

**Lisbon, Paris: paths in modern architecture in 1900**

In his study entitled *A Arquitectura Moderna* (1986), Pedro Vieira de Almeida considered Raul Lino, Ventura Terra and José Marques da Silva to be the first modern architects in Portugal, not only accepting that the genesis of modern architecture has evident lines of continuity with the 19th-century experience, but also attributing to Lino and Terra (and, with the latter, Marques da Silva, in Porto) complementary directions that, in their time, defined a founding experience: “There are therefore, both in the origin of them both and in the logic of their interventions an overlapping and complementary orientation.” This innovative reading abandoned previous reflections upon modernity in Portugal and proposed the central aspects that this essay has sought to pursue and develop further.

The radicalness that Raul Lino and Ventura Terra displayed in their distinct reflections upon modernity in the first few decades of the 20th

---


70 This example can be seen in his 4-storey urban house built at the end of the 1940s.

century shows that not only were they ready to accept the new demands of housing in their projects, but also (at least implicitly) to open up two paths that Portuguese architecture would follow in different ways, throughout the various generations of architects, until the 1970s.

The projects developed by Ventura Terra and Raul Lino, aged 34 and 21 respectively, in their tenders for the building of the Portuguese Pavilion at the Paris Universal Exposition, in 1900, are revealing about that time and make clear statements about their different interpretations. (Figs. 11 and 12)

Ventura Terra’s project was situated along a line that denoted the direct influence of French architecture, being centred on formal aspects of composition that were very much in keeping with the taste of Portuguese society at that time. Raul Lino’s work, however, was situated within the sphere of influence of his romantic training and background, seeking to find a language for those values that he identified as being national and proposing the erection of an uncommon structure, formed of complex volumes and displaying features that were connoted with the image of 16th-century architecture and a taste that was vaguely reminiscent of the Alentejo province. Nonetheless, in drawing up this original synthesis of purified constructive fragments connoted with Portuguese culture, Raul Lino, who lost the competitive tender to Terra, drew a great deal of attention to himself.

These two projects may be considered a “(...) paradigm of two phylogenetic strains that were present at that time and that still play a

72 The Portuguese participation remained somewhat on the fringes of the history of the 1900 Universal Exposition in Paris. The information available about the pavilions that were built (The Pavilion of the Colonies and the Pavilion of Woodland, Hunting and Fishing), designed by Terra, is also fairly scant and inconsistent, which underlines how badly organised the Portuguese participation was. Even in the publication Exposition Universelle de 1900. Portugal. Catalogue Officiel, there is no mention of the architecture of the pavilions. These aspects were widely criticised and satirised by Rafael Bordalo Pinheiro (A Paródia, 1900).

MANTAS, José de Quintanilha, “Noticias sobre a Exposição Universal de Paris, 1900”, in Maria Rosa Figueiredo (coord.), Portugal 1900, Lisbon, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2000, pp. 255-261.
unique role even today in the history of Portuguese architecture (...)”\textsuperscript{73}. I shall now look into these questions further.

**Composition vs. proportion**

At the beginning of the 20th century, Terra’s and Lino’s professional activities were polarised around their different conceptions of the architectural project. Such an observation makes it possible to refer to distinct paths of professional development for these two architects, with different values being given to the processes of projects, based on their separate understandings of composition and proportion.

Terra considered architecture to be a work centred upon the problem of composition. In this sense, the floor plan and cross section were seen as important instruments for determining and representing the formal compositional mechanisms in combination with the response to the functional programme. Composition was therefore the art of orchestrating space, geometry, decoration and function, in accordance with their social convenience and the principles of science and technique, which must themselves respond to the needs for comfort, efficiency and quality. If this was a lesson that was rooted in the method of the *Beaux-Arts*, it was also where one found the development of the skills that enabled architects to deal with the building techniques and interpret the new programmes of modernity. In this way, programmes that until then had been perfectly routine were analysed in order to adapt them to the new functionalities of modern life for which answers had to be found. The new urban equipment, which was to re-occupy the centres of cities, was a clear sign of this.

But this same observation is also particularly clear in housing, whether he was dealing with a large-sized bourgeois house (for example, the House of J. J. da Silva Graça, the Palacete Mendonça, etc.) or a common bourgeois house. The project for the house presented answers to new problems in its use, comfort, social convenience, building

technology and household management, always being capable of establishing typological differences and recognising the social purpose of his intervention. (Figs. 13 and 14)

In order to respond to these factors, Terra resorted to his Parisian experience, where he found new materials and a skilled workforce to install them, and came into contact with the new techniques that were appearing through the hands of engineers and specialised traders.74 Thus, he visited the capitals of Europe, where he wished to see “what has most recently been produced in terms of heating and ventilation equipment, electricity, materials for decorative revetments, etc., in order to take maximum advantage (…) of the progress that has been made in these fields in recent years.”75

The project was a reflection of the rationality, effectiveness and organisation of this work process, which was to have obvious repercussions on the organisation of his studio, reflecting the systematisation of the construction found in the project and the building work.

Yet the acceptance of technique and science as values leading to the progress of society, which was a constant feature of his discourse,76 did not cause him to forget the importance of the symbolic in the game of composition, with the effective use of decorative and monumental

74 For the house of J. J. da Silva Graça, the description of the work is accompanied by the following list of companies and artists who carried out the different specialities: basic construction work, Constructora (Porto); metal work, Jacob Lopes da Silva and others; hardware, Garnier (Paris); masonry, Montelavar e Tala, Pardal Monteiro; electricity and telephones, Hermann e Júlio Gomes Ferreira & Cª; heating, Geneste & Herscher (Paris); plastering and paintwork, Cruz & Franco; iron and oak window shutters, Jaquemet, Mesnet & C. (Paris).

75 For the Mendonça palace, the list is as follows: basic construction work, João Pedro dos Santos; glazed tile frieze, Raphael Bordalo Pinheiro; carpentry (wood originating from the island of São Tomé), José Pedro Souza; sculpture, Jorge Pereira; gilding, Manoel João Costa; masonry, José António d’Almeida and Pardal Monteiro; metal work, Jacob Lopes Silva; plastering, Cruz & Franco; heating, Jaquemet, Mesnet & C. (Paris).

76 Excerpt from the application for a 30-day leave of absence for the purposes mentioned, without loss of salary, when he was involved in the building of the Chamber of Deputies. The leave was granted.


This letter is partially transcribed in:


systems as aspects that arose from the construction work, the programme and its presence in the building of the city.

For Lino, the work of the architect was to reveal the harmonious relationship between the building tradition and life, or, in other words, to establish that proportion. Thus, his central concern was with making the projected space appropriate to a place and its inhabitants. This work required the historical understanding of the relations expressed in his projects, but also of the singular aspects of that harmonious system that he intended to build. In the proportions established between each compartment and the windows, landscape, sunlight, prevailing wind, the texture and colour of the materials, and the domestic environment that organised a certain form of everyday life, Lino constructed his architectural project as a unique response to these circumstances. Regardless of the question of its style, his architecture paid particular attention to the combinations and transitions between spaces and other elements, thus also trying to inspire in its inhabitants a way of life that was in harmony with Nature.

In his youthful works, especially in the Casa Montsalvat and the Casa do Cipreste, it would be a mistake to ignore an innovative spatial organisation, considered as a space/life, aimed towards a use that, while improving domestic architecture, responded to the needs of contemporary dwellings. The functionalism that is latent in these works brought them closer to the intentional design of the English country house, just as it is described by Julius Posener (1904-1996), for whom the roots of functionalism are to be found in England.77

For Lino, architecture was art, being the expression of each civilisation, each nation and each people. And art, by being appropriate, had to reject the immobilism of the idea of a style. This allowed Lino, at the beginning of the 20th century, to criticise revivalisms and eclecticisms, and later modern architecture itself. These were disturbing

77 For Julius Posener, it was through the work of Muthesius, publicising the English country house, that the problem of the “function” became a central element in the successive works produced by the modern movement.

exaggerations of a much desired enhancement of cultural identity, a subject that was linked to English idealism (among others that of John Ruskin, William Morris and Arthur Heygate Mackmurdo), which was to remain a concern of Lino’s throughout his life.

For Terra, architecture was also the expression of the “most adaptable and most logical, because if it is not so, it is not art.”⁷⁸ And, in order to achieve this situation, architecture had to be in agreement not only with the customs and habits of its users, but also with science, where it found the justification for its formal renewal and the solution of society’s problems. Or, if we prefer to use a modern formulation, architecture achieved its beauty as a result of the coherence with which it satisfied its utilitarian objectives. And this was what was registered in domestic architecture.

The meaning of “other house” at the beginning of the 20th century
At the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, single-family housing projects represented a common and important commission at architects’ studios.⁷⁹ For Terra, this amounted to a significant architectural experience, not only because of the quality of the spatial layout of the large bourgeois house, adapted to the desire for sumptuousness and modernity in his clients’ dwelling spaces, but also because it would enable him to explore a different conception for the house, which was generally recognised by its constructive containment and rationality. This “other house” was subject to more limited and more economical functional programmes, which also imposed new working methods, such as a recourse to standard designs, an aspect that facilitated greater rapidity, effectiveness and pragmatism in the conception and building of the house. However, this attitude that was now called for in his projects did not cause him to abandon the experience of the small palatial mansion (palacete) or the large bourgeois house. On the contrary, he would rework this into the configuration of spatial solutions adapted to the new factors that conditioned the domestic project. In this way, extensive and complex

⁷⁸ TERRA, Ventura, op. cit.
⁷⁹ RAMOS, Rui J. G., op. cit.
spatial devices, which we find in these large houses, were transposed to this smaller “other house”, generally sited on small urban plots, with all that this may have meant in terms of systematisation and synthesis.

It is also important to note that the alteration made to the type of production, which changed from being a unique monumental work to an anonymous-looking work inserted in its urban setting, marked the transformation of the profile of the architect from that of an author/artist to that of an author/technician.

At the turn of the century, this “other house” represented a significant part of the common housing production of architects’ studios and opened up the possibility of a distinct architectural rationality for the organisation of the space, ways of living and the construction work itself. Its realisation allowed the bourgeoisie an alternative to the small urban palatial mansion, which although there was no intention to replace the one with the other, was an indelible sign of its time, accompanying the alteration in the lifestyle of its inhabitants.

Together with the production of large bourgeois houses, with their eclectic and classical posture, and with an unprecedented cosmopolitan vigour and spatial sophistication, Ventura Terra projected other buildings for common housing production. Despite the extension of this production into his work, the historiography of architecture has not afforded it the importance and significance that it clearly had in the first few decades of the 20th century: the shift to a different grammar for the project.80 (Fig. 15)

**From the uniqueness of the palatial mansion to common housing production**

The Casa J. J. da Silva Graça (1905-1907) and the Palacete Mendonça (1902-1909) represent the large bourgeois house that Ventura Terra produced with great skill. Despite their different urban settings (facing the street and surrounded by a garden), these two houses were subjected

to the same organisation of the central floor plan, marked by the large space of the entrance hall as the main hub of the composition, served by a detailed spatial organisation that responded to the sophisticated requirements of the programme and the functional mechanics of the building, with the use of new equipment and new constructive solutions. These two houses resembled great housing machines, based on the use of grandeur as a strategy of social representation and on the 19th-century imperatives of hygiene and comfort – without interfering, furthermore, in the logic of the conception of the functional space, as we shall see in the following decades.

At the same time as he produced houses of this type, Ventura Terra produced a series of smaller and highly economical houses. This was a work marked by restraint in the recourse made to artistic and decorative features, showing carefully thought out aspects of systematisation for the constructive repetition of doors and windows without frames, wooden cornices and finishing work based on the use of glazed tiles, lintels with the appearance of brickwork, iron guard rails, etc. These were buildings with a simple volumetry that displayed a clear persistence of certain compositional patterns, such as the double window and the turret. The extension of the interior programme to the garden was also made possible through terraces and balconies that made use of metal structures. These were innovative aspects that, by reflecting a desire for new forms of dwelling, afforded this house a domesticity that was impossible in the palatial mansion or in the large-sized bourgeois house. Yet it was the very organisation of the house, as a spatial device, that was imposed as a result of a highly developed technique for the compartmentalisation of the space, allowing for the circulation of people and the performance of specific functions, as well as generating comfort. It was a work that required special skills and an updated knowledge of the art of projecting and constructing buildings, of which the Casa Luiz Castro (1896), Casa Júlio G. da Costa Neves (1898-1904) and Casa José Joaquim Migueis (1902-1903) were fine examples, among many others.⁸¹ (Figs. 16 and 17)

---

Faced with the cultural regrouping that marked the turn of the century, highlighting the movement from eclecticism to the picturesque, Ventura Terra was able to propose solutions that could satisfy the new housing requirements, demonstrating an openness for reflecting on the needs of modern urban life (in contrast to Raul Lino). If this vector of modernity can be recognised in the common housing production that has been analysed, it was in the proposals for houses either joined together in terraces or semi-detached (as well as collective housing, which is not dealt with in this study) that this feature was most radically revealed.

In the terraced houses of Miguel Henrique dos Santos (1900-1904) and the semi-detached houses of H. dos Santos (1904) and Cisneiros e Bello (1905), processes denoting a systematisation of the project were developed for the combination of two, three and four houses. These were already common in the international context and point to solutions that would only later be used in a more widespread form in Portugal. (Fig. 18)

Was this common housing production in Portugal the one that came closest to other contemporary productions in Europe?

Various productions can be listed to demonstrate the continuity of this research undertaken by Terra: the Group of Cottages for the Hampstead Tenants Ltd., by B. Parker and R. Unwin (Hampstead, 1911), the Siedlung Oberschönewide, by Peter Behrens (Berlin, 1915), the Siedlung Rahnitz, by Heinrich Tessenow (Dresden, 1919), the Siedlung Freidorf, by Hannes Mayer (Muttenz, Switzerland, 1919-1921), the Siedlung Eichkamp, by Bruno Taut (Berlin, 1926-1927), the Siedlung Römerstadt, by Ernest May (Frankfurt, 1927-1930), etc.

Was it the place of this architecture of common housing production in the Portuguese context to standardise and typify the first modern experiment?

Did the rationalism of design and construction also enter in this way into the production of smaller houses, which was generally ignored both in the professional curricula of architects and by the critics?
4 Between paths

In attempting to read the architecture of Terra and Lino, it is essential to look beyond the decorative design, recognising on the one hand, the advantage of eclecticism, and, on the other hand, that it is only through an architectural interpretation of the project that one is able to gain access to the innovative sense that determines its very nature.

If common housing production was a significant part of Terra’s work at the turn of the century, as an unequivocal sign of modernity, so also in the project for the palatial mansion and the large bourgeois house we find the desire to be brought up to date by the modern world, expressed in the “machineries” that sustained this luxurious programme. In both cases, Terra showed in his work a synthesis that was committed to modern culture, which should be read in the light of the contemporary international experience, albeit without any critical continuity in the Portuguese process.

When Terra designed common housing production, especially those houses that would be built in terraces, his research was concentrated on reducing the built area, on simple and effective spatial devices, which would be suitable for repetition and provide the appropriate needs and comfort. Or, in other words, he conceived of the project as a structure of highly organised relationships amounting to a demonstration of the paradigm of progress. Terra planned his buildings in accordance with a modern understanding of the situation, which implied uncertainty about a time of change and a combination between tradition and innovation.

In the course of his long life and work, Raul Lino did not investigate the problem of the alliance between tradition and innovation in any particular depth. However, the first works of his youth were marked by this problem, in which he demonstrated his reading of the Portuguese condition at the turn of the century and his interpretation of modernity. Later, Lino was isolated, unlike the various modernist movements that had served as the inspiration for his training and activity as a young

---

architect and that had found in this alliance the continuation for their reformist ideas about architecture and society. The tension between tradition and innovation, which was in itself an important topic in 20th-century architecture, was to remain a permanent feature of the work of some modern architects, such as Le Corbusier or Távora, whilst for others their only purpose was to pursue the mechanical idea of progress.

In view of the modernity of Lino’s and Terra’s proposals at the beginning of the century, and clarifying the phylogenesis that has been attributed to them in relation to 20th-century Portuguese architecture, it can be said that there was a continuity that was composed of discontinuities; or, in other words, such continuity was not grounded in the permanent succession of criticism or of a tradition that was discussed and reinvented generation after generation, thereby becoming capable of making links with a previous series of meanings, but instead in the successive development of an error that prevented the following generations from going deeper into the work that had been initiated earlier.\(^{83}\)

The reciprocity of this openness to modernity in Lino and Terra was followed by the narrowing of their visions through the growing importance that was being given to the “Portuguese House” in the discussion of culture and architecture. The possibilities for change that were contained in these experiments were therefore limited, for, by not finding their theoretical development in architectural criticism, they conditioned the modernity of the following decades as a project that arose from these same possibilities. And it was this constraint in relation to tradition and its criticism that led architects to demonstrate in 1970 against the exhibition of the work of Raul Lino, marking the end of an era and the transition to another one. The Casa Beires (1973), a work by Álvaro Siza that already showed signs of what was to come, denounced

83 This meaning is also referred to by Mattoso: "A country that is made up of various pieces that nothing succeeds in joining together. This does not only happen in socio-economic structures, but also in cultural production, whose “norm” is the “discontinuity of generational leaps” (Eduardo Lourenço, quoted by Miguel Real) [...]."

that other moment and underlined the urgent need to adopt a different look at history. (Fig. 19)

It was these circumstances that Portuguese architecture was able to assimilate and, in the end, transform into its strongest identity.
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