

this. No single person created it. Each contributor built on previous achievements, discovering problems and solving them through the steady expansion of the common syntax."<sup>8</sup> Architectural types, from the Greek temple to the Charleston "Single" to the Las Vegas casino, offer a parallel tradition in another medium.

By embracing traditional architectural types and inflecting them with new programmatic needs and new materials, designers honor past generations, with whom we partner to make cities. "The dead and the unborn are as much members of society as the living. To dishonor the dead is to reject the relation on which society is built—the relation of obligation between generations. Those who have lost respect for their dead have ceased to be trustees of their inheritance. Inevitably, therefore, they lose the sense of obligation to future generations. The web of obligations sinks to the present tense."<sup>9</sup> The architecture of the "now generation," with its difficulty in deferring gratification and its reluctance to make long-term commitments, has weakened if not broken this chain of caring. By working with inherited architectural types—however freely and imaginatively—the chain is repaired and strengthened. The sudden quantum jumps that chaos theory describes as necessary to evolution may be liberative and necessary from time to time, but most change is incremental and evolutionary, not cataclysmic.

Embracing the benefits of typology does not mean the end of functionalism per se. Obviously, buildings must continue to function operationally and economically. But not at all costs and not at the loss of urban decorum. In recent decades, function as a design methodology and as the sole or primary organizing device for building plans and sections has fortunately given up much of its preeminence to contextualism and typology (and, alas, to formalism). Typology *functions* better in urbanistic terms by better addressing the architectural needs of the mixed-use city and sustaining a degree of continuity and tradition in architecture. It is the link between architecture and urbanism, between the past and the present, that was missing in Modernism.

*Architectural types are to urban designers what walls, doors, windows, and columns are to architects. Typology is the vocabulary for the language of urban form. Without a typological language, designing cities in coherent, predictable, and collaborative ways over time becomes impossible. If urban design is too big to be mastered by a single professional and therefore requires teamwork, there needs to be a design language for intra- and inter-professional*

communication. And if urban design is correctly defined by urbanists Alan Simpson and David Lewis as "three dimensional policy," a common language of form is needed for communication between design professionals on the urban design team and elected officials, community leaders, citizens, etc. As urbanist Jonathan Barnett points out, without the ability to approximate the footprint, height, and bulk of buildings before they are designed and built by others, the urban designer is rendered helpless and toothless in proposing urban design plans and guidelines. When architects base their work, however loosely, on known architectural types, the urban designer can roughly anticipate how development will take shape, without unduly restricting the design freedom of the architect in shaping individual buildings. Architects, in turn, can more effectively and intelligently interpret urban design plans and guidelines if they speak the same typological language. There is room for invention of new or radically altered types, but when invention of both building and architectural types is rife or the norm, as it has become with some architects, urban design becomes difficult if not futile.

Getting the types right for a given street, neighborhood, or community is usually more important than the architectural brilliance of individual buildings. A collection of beautifully designed buildings does not a city make. Witness a World's Fair with many pavilions designed by their country's star architects. They don't necessarily add up to a sense of place or community. Columbus, Indiana, has individual masterpieces by many of the nation's most distinguished and talented architects. But a trophy collection does not necessarily confer coherence on a town or city (which is why it is good that this enlightened town has more recently commissioned leading architects to do both smaller and more background architectural types and building types). At the moment, most American cities suffer more from typological confusion than architectural mediocrity. However, the right architectural typology alone cannot provide for a good built environment. It takes both good design and the right types to imbue the built environment with the splendid magic and power of which architecture and urbanism are capable.

Is our individualistic architecture beginning to abate in favor of a less atomistic architecture and urbanism? For no other reason than the arithmetic pressure of population growth, has the fulcrum slowly but inexorably begun to shift from rugged individualism to urbanity? The promising return of residents to