

ISUF - HISPANIC (ISUF-H). ARCHITECTS, URBANISTS AND STUDIES ON URBAN FORM

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to explore the pertinence of having an additional regional network such as the International Seminar on Urban Form-Hispanic (ISUF-H) and to reflect on the diversity of approaches in the context of the research carried out in the International Seminar on Urban Form (ISUF).

ISUF-H is a branch of ISUF, established as one of the Regional Networks for the Spanish-speaking world. In general, the diversity and vitality of Spanish-language research is confirmed by the emergence and renewal of themes and methodologies of analysis and eclectic approaches - with architects and urban planners dominating over geographers and specialists from other disciplines.

Relations with other European schools and traditions of urban form studies are considered. It also reflects on the interest and usefulness of this and other regional networks. Recent research presented at the ISUF-H conferences shows that barriers in multidisciplinary dialogue remain and continue to be a major challenge. Overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers is the other major challenge in this regard.

The article refers to the latent controversies between an “Anglophone squint” and a “Hispanic self-absorption” since the creation of the ISUF-H, underlining the specificities of each context on the one hand, and the common goals on the other.

Javier Monclús

Department of Architecture, School of Engineering and Architecture
(EINA), University of Zaragoza, Spain
jmonclus@unizar.es

Carmen Diez-Medina

Department of Architecture, School of Engineering and Architecture,
(EINA), University of Zaragoza, Spain
cdiezme@unizar.es

KEY WORDS

REGIONAL NETWORKS
LINGUISTIC BARRIERS
DISCIPLINARY BARRIERS
REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES
URBAN PLANNING PERSPECTIVE
ISUF-H

INTRODUCTION. ISUF-H AS REGIONAL NETWORK OR ‘BRANCH’ OF ISUF

The International Seminar on Urban Form - Hispanic (ISUF-H) was created in 2015 as a regional network of International Seminar on Urban Form (ISUF) for Spanish-speaking countries, in order to fill the lack of a common forum in Spanish for students and university professors, researchers, professionals, institutions and companies related to urban morphology. The study of urban forms in this linguistic and cultural area has been developed within the framework of different disciplinary traditions, from geography to urban history, architecture or urban planning, which makes it difficult to have a global vision of the contributions made in each of these disciplines. On the other hand, the diversity of historical, urban and academic contexts in each of these countries makes a review of the activities and publications in the broad field of urban morphology almost impossible. Therefore, the article focuses on the Spanish field, with some specific references to contributions in Latin America from a fundamentally urban planning perspective. It starts with the different traditions of urban morphology studies and then goes on to comment on the Spanish contributions to the ISUF-H congresses, as well as the common challenges facing both ISUF and ISUF-H.¹

1. ISUF-H: LANGUAGE AND DISCIPLINARY BARRIERS

As a preliminary question, it would be necessary to consider the different schools of morphology well established in the ISUF field, in order to verify the parallels and specificities in the studies on urban forms that are developed in the ISUF-H field. The self-critical view of Jeremy Whitehand, one of the fathers of contemporary morphology in the Anglo-Saxon sphere. Whitehand highlights the fundamental problems that, in his opinion, urban studies generally face, especially those approached from a morphological perspective. His main thesis was that, despite the obvious growth in studies on urban forms, some barriers between geographical areas and disciplines remain, and that, despite the use of English as a “lingua franca”, linguistic and cultural barriers are still more important than geographical and discipline-related barriers.

This is a controversial thesis, since present-day urban form researchers and scholars have easier access than ever (certainly, in terms of before and after the development of the Internet) to works produced anywhere in the world; not just to the significant part of studies that are published in English, but also to material produced in non-anglophone countries. Whitehand and other authors have encouraged what is now an increasingly wider and more mature field of study, after the founding, at the end of the 1990s, of the journal *Urban Morphology*, and after ISUF conferences began to be held, thus demonstrating the global potential of this field of study. However, the prevalence of publications in English seemed to worry Whitehand more and more, as he saw a connection with the problem of ‘anglophone squint’.² The dominance of English-language literature in an otherwise excellent although outdated compilation available on the ISUF website under the title “Consolidated Urban Morphology Reading

List” is indicative, and a similar situation occurs with the Glossary, ‘a basic glossary of technical terms common principally in English-language studies’.³ Therefore, the Anglo-Saxon bias in relation to urban morphology studies seems clear. On the other hand, just as there are important differences in the understanding of the concepts of ‘urban planning’ and ‘urbanism’, so too, the concept of ‘urban morphology’ has given rise to different interpretations in different linguistic spheres.

However, the issue is not only about linguistic barriers, but also about disciplinary ones. number of scholars have attempted to overcome these barriers from a variety of approaches. These include looking at urban forms through planning history. Although ‘few would think of Jeremy Whitehand as a planning historian’, this is the case of Jeremy Whitehand, who, although known as one of the fathers of urban morphology studies, also approached the knowledge of urban phenomena from the perspective of planning history.⁴

Language and disciplinary barriers are almost indissociable. A clear example is that differences in the understanding of the nature of ‘Urban Planning’, the term by which ‘Urbanism’ is usually translated, persist in English and Spanish (and in other languages such as French and Italian).⁵ The research and publications produced in the ISUF-H show interesting exchanges between morphologists and urban planners. Indeed, this approach has been and continues being dominant in the study of urban forms in Spanish language research over the last decades.

2. ISUF-H IN THE CONTEXT OF DIFFERENT SCHOOLS AND TRADITIONS

The convergence at the ISUF of two major schools of contemporary urban morphology, the British Conzenian school and the Italian Muratorian school, awakens interest.⁶ Despite their different origins and natures, this meeting favoured the discovery of some significant convergences, which made it possible to enhance both approaches based on well-established disciplinary traditions. In particular, the historical-geographical approaches of the British school that started with M.R.G. Conzen (or Anglo-German school, as its roots lay in the works of German-speaking geographers),⁷ continued and led by Whitehand, ‘shook hands’ with the typo-morphological and architectural Italian approaches of Saverio Muratori, which were updated and systematised by Giuseppe Caniggia.⁸ Therefore, this was a meeting of two national and disciplinary traditions: geography and architecture. In this regard, the role played by certain actors is essential in this type of confluences. Ivor Samuels himself acknowledges this when he recalls that:

while working as an architect in Milan, became aware of other approaches to urban form being formulated by Italian architects who were systematically investigating urban form in a way which was very different from the Townscape School’s neglect of underlying structures such as plot systems or street networks.⁹

These two schools, however, also coexisted with the emergence of other studies on urban forms in different countries that played a key role in various disciplines. Anne Vernez Moudon identified a third school of urban morphology: the French school of Versailles.¹⁰ In reality, this school included some concepts from the Italian school, which made it, to a certain extent, a replacement and development of said school from the 1970s onwards. However, this school, which emerged at the School of Architecture of Versailles and was led by the architects Philippe Panerai and Jean Castex and the anthropologist Jean Charles Depaule, turned out to be significantly more diverse and multifaceted thanks to the contributions of Jean-Luc Pinol, Bruno Fortier and many other architects and urban planners, and which made some question the existence of an actual French school of urban morphology.¹¹ In addition to the works of architects, the refreshing studies of urban historians and geographers, such as Marcel Roncayolo, appeared in these same years and their influence on the ‘interpretation of cities’ went beyond those traditional disciplinary spheres, leading to a significant renewal of urban history.¹² The third ISUF conference was held in Versailles in 1998 (after those in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1996 and Birmingham, U.K., in 1997). However, the legacy of this conference and French studies on urban morphology did not translate into relevant contributions with the appropriate quantitative influence in the context of the International Seminar of Urban Form. In addition, despite the considerable renewal of research papers published in French in the 1970s and 1980s, these were not accessible in English until over 20 years later, as was the case with the influential book by Philippe Panerai, Jean Castex and Jean-Charles Depaule, *Formes urbaines: de l’îlot à la barre* (original published in French, 1977; Spanish version, 1986), which attempted to link morphological analysis with the recovery of traditional urban forms. The book was translated 27 years later into English (2004) with a more deliberate title: *Urban Forms: the Death and Life of the Urban Block* with additional material by Ivor Samuels.¹³

It is also worth noting the important Dutch tradition, which developed urban morphology studies by combining Italian approaches and enriching them with the *Stadsanalyse* tradition, and which was associated with urban renewal processes in cities in the Netherlands. In that case, the availability of the German edition of the book by Aldo Rossi (*Die Architektur der Stadt*, 1972) or the Dutch version of the aforementioned book by Panerai, Castex and Depaule (1984) resulted in a close connection between the studies of urban morphologists and urban planners.¹⁴ Again, the availability of the publications in different languages could explain the specificity of the regional schools. Therefore, there were innovative works on urban morphology as noteworthy as those that dealt with the Dutch urban block, including the important *Atlas of The Dutch Urban Block*, and other works interested in the updating potential and capacity of traditional urban forms.¹⁵ After a first meeting at the ISUF conference in Groningen in 2000, the growth of this school paved the way for other studies and for a second larger meeting at the Delft University of Technology in 2012. In this case, the dominant role of architects’ and urban

planners's interests was obvious, to the extent that some authors expressed their doubts about the drifting of the focus on urban morphology towards the field of urban planning and practice.¹⁶ However, some of the most innovative contributions were generated precisely in 'research by design', a method traditionally used in international urban planning and design culture.¹⁷

The identification of the different schools of urban morphology or, more specifically, the traditions of the study of urban form, actually depends on the disciplinary and its spatio-temporal particularities. Thus, it is obvious that, if studied in relation to the historiography of geography, the German tradition comes first, followed by the British, the Italian, the French, the American or the Dutch ones.¹⁸ All these schools and traditions have been of great importance in studying urban form in Spain, with the Italian school in particular having had a significant impact on studying urban form in Spain since the 1970s.¹⁹

3, ISUF-H AND THE SPANISH STUDIES ON URBAN FORM

In the Spanish context, it is interesting to consider a process that, to some extent, was similar to the French and Dutch cases and even more to the Italian approaches, regarding the role of architects and urbanists in the new generation of urban morphology studies from the 1970s onwards. However, studies on urban form have their roots in several disciplinary traditions, such as Anglo-Saxon urban geography, French geography and urban sociology, urban and architectural history and the morphological approaches of Italian architects. The first studies on urban form were actually connected to the emergence of modern urban planning at the turn of the 20th century. As in other countries, architects and urban planners interpreted cities from a morphological approach, following the pioneering work of the German architect Oskar Jürgens, *Ciudades Españolas: su desarrollo y configuración urbanística*.²⁰

The field of study on urban form represents an important development in the sphere of geography. Several works on cities and neighbourhoods following morphological approaches—clearly influenced by the German and French schools of geography—appeared in the middle of the 20th century, such as the articles published in the journal *Estudios Geográficos* from the 1950s onwards or other monographs such as the influential work on Granada by Joaquín Bosque.²¹ In the 1970s and 1980s, more specific works on urban forms were published, paying special attention to the processes driven by various urban agents (owners and developers, the impact of urban planning designs and projects, etc.), such as those by Rafael Mas on the *Ensanche* (city extension) of Madrid.²² From this point on, it could be said that morphological studies in the field of urban geography were consolidated during the 1980s and 1990s, and that this phenomenon shaped the development of journals such as *Historia Urbana*, where a first article by Whitehand was published in Spanish.²³

Studies addressing urban form were also developed in the field of history of urban planning, which is only partially connected to urban history, to art history and architecture. In this respect, the work by Fernando Terán on the recent history of urban planning in Spain is relevant;²⁴ it was a milestone in the field with considerable domestic impact but, as it was not translated into English, little international resonance. Some initiatives at the beginning of the 1980s attempted to promote common ground between urban planners and historians, with renewed attention on urban forms. One example would be urban planning and history symposiums, such as the one held under this title in Madrid in 1982 that brought together an elite group of scholars in order to support interdisciplinary convergence.²⁵

In the 1970s, and again in the field of architects and urban planners, renewed approaches to the study of urban forms emerged. This was, in part, a reaction to the dominant concepts of functionalist urban planning, through the absorption of morphological approaches into Italian architectural and urban planning culture, which, in turn, led to new variations of ‘morphological urban planning’.²⁶ In a second phase, there were new dialogues with the approaches of the French school, and more original contributions appeared closely linked to new urban designs.²⁷ It is therefore possible to recognise the mutual influences and the similarities of morphological approaches and ‘urban project urbanism’ (*urbanismo urbano*), especially through the Laboratorio de Urbanismo de Barcelona (LUB), founded in 1969 and led by Manuel de Solà-Morales.²⁸ Studies on ‘forms of urban growth’, the *Ensanche* of Barcelona, housing estates and informal settlement forms were important and refreshing contributions in the 1970s that were extended in later studies with broader morphological perspectives. There was also a certain closeness to the French school of Versailles, through the Spanish edition of the book *Formas Urbanas* (1986) that spread the approach of French authors. However, although theories about urban forms clearly began at the School of Architecture of Barcelona, it was in Madrid that the adoption of the morphological perspective had an important impact, with the exceptional work on the morphology of residential peripheries and the new urban plan for Madrid, which was approved in 1985.²⁹ This would be an exceptional example in which the morphological perspective was closely linked to the conception and definition of urban planning. A connection which can also be recognised in other recent publications.³⁰

Even if this is not the focus of this paper, it is important to note that regarding the contributions from Latin American countries, there was a significant shift from the final decades of the 20th century onwards, especially in the field of geography and urban history, but also in the field of architecture and urban planning. In this sense, it is not easy to distinguish the approaches in Portuguese (Portugal and Brazil)³¹ from those produced by Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America.³² Perhaps it is in the field of urban cultural history where works with a panoramic Latin American perspective, such as those by Adrian

Gorelik³³ or Arturo Almandoz,³⁴ are most thought-provoking and innovative for understanding the processes and urban forms in different cultural contexts. The latter, however, show very striking similarities in terms of the forms of modernisation that explain the change from post-colonial cities to modern metropolitan cities. In any case, lack of spaces precludes our reviewing here some important works on urban morphology publications in Latin America. As it has already announced, this paper mainly focuses on some Spanish urban morphology contributions.

In conclusion, as Vilagrasa said in his essay from 1998, urban morphology in Spain, which is also applicable to Latin America, ‘is nowhere but also everywhere’,³⁵ that is, it does not constitute a specific field, although it is present in various fields and publications in several disciplines. The question is whether a convergence between these traditions is taking place and whether multidisciplinary or transdisciplinary views in the study of urban forms are advancing. A review of the ISUF-H congresses – Toledo (2016), Zaragoza (2018), Guadalajara-Mexico (2019), Barcelona (2020), San José-Costa Rica (2021) and Madrid (2022) – shows that the views of architects and urban planners dominate, including those of historians of architecture and urbanism.

4. ISUF-H AND ISUF REGIONAL NETWORKS

Based on Whitehand’s diagnosis of the need to overcome linguistic barriers, he considered it unlikely that the creation of national or regional networks could provide clear solutions, and yet he supported the creation of regional networks.³⁶ Despite Whitehand’s prediction, a few years after his article on the ‘anglophone quint’ appeared in 2005, ‘regional networks’ started to be founded, generally, but not always, based in ‘regions’ or countries that more or less coincide with linguistic areas. The Nordic Network of Urban Morphology was established in 2006, followed, in 2007, by the Italian Network of Urban Morphology (ISUF Italy). Other networks emerged later, such as the Chinese Network of Urban Morphology (CNUM), the Cypriot Network of Urban Morphology (CyNUM), or the Polish Network of Urban Morphology (ISUFPolska), amongst others.³⁷ Some of these networks went beyond the national scope and extended to a larger linguistic and cultural area and, therefore, shared certain similarities with what had happened in the anglophone world. This was the case of the Portuguese-Language Network of Urban Morphology (PNUM), which was founded in 2010 and which covered the lusophone area, that is, basically, Portugal and Brazil.³⁸ Similarly, this was also the case with the Hispanic International Seminar on Urban Form (ISUF-H), a platform founded in 2015 for the study of urban morphology and dialogue between Spanish-speaking countries, that is to say, practically the rest of Latin America. Therefore, there is no “Iberian school” beyond possible collaborations and meetings between both networks, as was the case between ISUF Italy and ISUF-H,³⁹ and recently PNUM and ISUF-H.⁴⁰ Again, in both cases with an almost absolute dominance

of architects and urban planners. Both networks share the goal of promoting urban form studies in their respective linguistic fields, while contributing to the further internationalism of the ISUF.

The creation of ISUF-H, aimed at providing a platform for everyone interested in urban forms with a broad and eclectic morphological perspective, should be understood in this context.⁴¹ Paradoxically, the specificity of the visions of architects and urban planners is not at odds with an eclecticism in the approach to urban morphology. This could be explained by the diverse nature of urban morphological approaches in planning practice everywhere.⁴² As is the case across the general field of studies included in the ISUF's work, a wide diversity of approaches and themes is covered. It is possible to interpret and systematise lines of research in order to "map" them, as has been done by various authors from different national and cultural contexts. In the Spanish case, the lines identified for Spain by Joan Vilagrasa through the analysis of the ISUF-H conferences could be updated.⁴³ This classification could be complementary to others based on certain themes and morphological components in which excessive differences are not observed between the Spanish contributions with respect to those from other countries.⁴⁴

A review of the lines of research emerging from the ISUF-H conferences held to date reveals some thematic blocks. The most recurrent ones include contributions regarding urban processes from a historical perspective, generally from the discipline of contemporary history and art history and architecture.⁴⁵ Other more specific lines of research focus on the transformations of urban forms, considering the agents and urban policies.⁴⁶ There are also important works that deal with the architectural aspect of the city, with special attention to morpho-typological processes, but also including innovative contributions about land use, a standard field in the works of architects and urban planners. The social dimension of urban forms, that is, those that deal with socio-spatial segregation, urban vulnerability and inequality between central and peripheral areas, urban regeneration strategies, is also a common line of research, being the case of Latin American cities, the analysis of informal urbanisation phenomena particularly relevant. There is also interest in the study of urban management systems by analysing the role of urban plans and projects, and also the legislation and the determining factors of urban and regional structures connected to the increasingly complex functional and socio-economic determining factors. An emergent field of research would encompass topics related to sustainability, urban metabolism, compact cities, new suburbs and peri-urbanisation, changes to the land and the landscape, with a special focus on metropolitan phenomena, natural systems and hybridisation between urban systems and open spaces, etc. Finally, explorations using new analysis tools, in keeping with digital disruption, with advanced mapping and big data are increasing in the last years, among them configurational approaches, for example using Space Syntax as a key concept in the analysis of accessibility and other components of urban structures as well as many other 'big data

applications' that enable the qualitative and quantitative characterisation of urban structures and forms in truly innovative ways.⁴⁷

In general, with the emergence and renewal of themes and methodologies of analysis, this review confirms the diversity and vitality of research in Spanish. However, as Michael Barke stated regarding the ISUF Conference 2017 held in Valencia,⁴⁸ it is true that many contributions 'were concerned with very general morphological topics rather than with the detailed analysis of morphological components'.⁴⁹ But looking at the different ways in which the papers deal with urban forms, it is clear that a kind of planning perspective tends to dominate. Back to Barke's points, 'practical results of urban morphological research, using urban morphology as a "tool" rather than an end in itself' arouse considerable interest, and the question is whether this is a problem. On the contrary, we think it is very promising. Indeed, an enriching conceptual and methodological eclecticism, based on the use of urban morphology as a 'tool', is evident in the papers presented at successive ISUF-H conferences. No wonder, then, that the approaches of architects and town planners are more dominant than those of geographers and other professionals. Therefore, a distinctive feature of the papers at the ISUF-H conferences is their demonstration that an 'eclectic urban morphology' can be an enrichment to the field of urban morphology studies.⁵⁰

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Some conclusions can be drawn from all that has been said:

- Challenges remain in overcoming language barriers, particularly between Spanish and English research. Whitehand, who was keen to make urban morphology studies more interdisciplinary and international, said: 'Attempts to rectify Anglophone squint require efforts by both anglophones and non-anglophones'.⁵¹ This would mean avoiding both "'Hispanic self-centeredness' and 'English-speaking squint'. It seems to make sense to have a forum that facilitates communication in the same language other than English. The study of urban form is a flourishing field of convergence and multidisciplinary dialogue, but it still needs to overcome the barriers that exist. The development of ISUF and ISUF-H could and should help to intensify the dialogue between urban planners and urban form researchers in both English and Spanish speaking countries. The condition is that this dialogue takes place simultaneously in both languages. Nevertheless, it is recognised that the 'global conversation' will logically be in English.
- In the case of ISUF-H, the cultural and linguistic domains cover a very large geographical area (Spain and Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America), as in the case of PNUM for the Lusophone network (Portugal and Brazil). If in the ISUF domain, as Barke says, 'urban morphology means different things to different people',⁵² this diversity is multiplied

in the ISUF-H domain, which is a language area comprising more than twenty countries with different cultural and disciplinary traditions.

– The regional perspective has gained ground in various fields, both in architectural historiography (Kenneth Frampton) and in planning history (Stephen Ward), against the universalism of modernist urbanism. Of course, this perspective runs the risk of ‘isolation or self-absorption’.⁵³ The paradox is that while some, such as Barke, believe that studies on urban form in Spain have suffered from a certain ‘isolation’, others, such as Samuels, have spoken of ‘transatlantic myopia’, referring to the lack of knowledge of British contributions in the US.⁵⁴

– Once the interest of a particular non-English regional perspective has been recognised, the other major challenge for both the ISUF and the regional networks is to manage the convergence of the disciplines involved in the study of urban forms with a truly international perspective.⁵⁵ This is already the case in some of the recent ISUF and ISUF-H conferences, which are a direct reflection of both the increasing presence of advanced analytical tools and the growing awareness of environmental and social challenges. The 28th International Seminar on Urban Form, recently held in Glasgow (June 2021), with the general theme “Urban Form and the Sustainable Prosperous City”, is a clear example of this. An analogous example would be a recent publication by the ISUF-H network entitled “Urban Form and Sustainable Development Goals”.⁵⁶

– The need to develop the relationship between research and practice in urban morphology has been emphasised by several authors.⁵⁷ One of the recommendations of the ISUF Task Force, chaired by Ivor Samuels, was that “the most valuable contribution urban morphology can make is to an objective understanding of urban form and how it has evolved”.⁵⁸ Further interdisciplinary convergence may be encouraged by this characteristic approach of many morphological studies in the ISUF-H.

Even if there is no consolidated school with a tradition of the study of urban forms in the Spanish-speaking world, the morphological perspective has been a constant since the very beginning of ‘urbanism’ as a discipline. As in the field of urban planning, urban morphology could be seen as a kind of ‘urban knowledge’, which, as Bernardo Secchi said, is ‘probably less elegant than a science’, but perhaps more effective and realistic. In any case, as Larkham says ‘Urban morphology as a “discipline” will have to change in the “post-Whitehand era”, and in the near future, or it will stagnate, lose its relevance, wither and die’.⁵⁹ Ultimately, Lewis Mumford’s ambiguous yet useful ‘urban perspective’ might be a good way to address this need for change in the study of urban form.

NOTES

1. This paper builds on some of the arguments set out in a previous article: Monclús, Javier, “The Hispanic International Seminar on Urban Form (ISUF-H). A Platform for Dialogue between Urban Planners and Urban Form Researchers in Spanish-Speaking Countries,” *Planning Perspectives* Volume 37, Issue 3 (2022).
2. Jeremy W. R. Whitehand, “The Problem of Anglophone Squint,” *Area* 37 (2005): 228–230. María Dolors García-Ramón, “The Differences that Place Makes. A Critical View on Anglo-American Hegemony in Geography,” *Documents d’Analisi Geogràfica* 58 (no. 2) (2012): 307–319.
3. As the author, Peter Larkham, acknowledges, it ‘focuses particularly—although not exclusively—on English-language literature and on the Conzenian tradition’. *Consolidated Urban Morphology Reading List*. <http://www.urbanform.org/bibliography.html> (1990) (accessed on 03.12.2022).
4. Peter Larkham, “Planning History and Everyday Urban Change: An Appreciation of J.W.R. Whitehand (1938–2021),” *Planning Perspectives* 37 (no. 1) (2022): 205–209.
5. Hebbert, “Town Planning versus Urbanismo”; Monclús and Díez-Medina, “Urbanisme, Urbanismo, Urbanistica: Latin European Urbanism”.
6. As Giancarlo Cataldi said on the coincidence with Whitehand priorities in urban morphology research which “spurred representatives of the Conzenian geographical and Muratorian/ Caniggian architectural schools to pursue experiments involving their respective methodologies”. See Cataldi, “Translating ‘Alnwick’ into Italian: a tribute to M. R. G. Conzen”.
7. An historico-geographical research tradition that is distinguishable from the design-focused architectural and urban design traditions of other ‘schools’.
8. Regarding the “Italian school”, although the influence of the line of analysis on urban fabrics is unarguable, the wide array of approaches by architects and historians such as A. Rossi and C. Aymonino, among others, are also worth noting. Marzot, “The Study of Urban Form in Italy”.
9. “These included Saverio Muratori in Venice and Pier Luigi Cervellati in Bologna and such eminent practitioners as Ernesto N. Rogers and Aldo Rossi. They were part of a general questioning of the tenets of Modernism and the rediscovery of the virtues of inherited urban forms. It was at the Joint Centre for Urban Design (JCUD) at Oxford Polytechnic, working with Latin American postgraduates whose linguistic skills also enabled them to refer to Italian sources, that a geographer colleague pointed out a similar approach was being led by Jeremy Whitehand in the School of Geography at the University of Birmingham. Contact was made and he organised a seminar in Birmingham in 1982 which for the first time brought together the work of the Italian and British schools of urban morphology. Around the same time Gianfranco Caniggia made a great impact when he spent a month in Oxford in the same year that he went to Seattle, invited by Anne Vernez Moudon. See Ivor Samuels, “Towards an Eclectic Urban Morphology,” in *Morphological Research in Planning, Urban Design and Architecture*, ed. Vitor Oliveira (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021), 71–96.
10. Anne Vernez Moudon, “Urban Morphology as an Emerging Interdisciplinary Field,” *Urban Morphology* 1 (no. 1) (1997): 3–10.
11. Michaël Darin, “The Study of Urban Form in France,” *Urban Morphology* 2 (no. 2) (1998): 63–76.
12. His ideas on forms, functions and times of the city are of particular interest: ‘...

- elles ne procèdent pas de la fonction : formes et fonctions ont une autonomie relative* (forms do not come from functions: forms and functions own relative autonomy). Isabelle Chesneau (interviewer) and Marcel Roncayolo, *L'abécédaire de Marcel Roncayolo: Entretiens* (Paris: Infolio, 2011). See also: Marcel Roncayolo, *Lectures de villes. Formes et temps* (Marseille: Editions Parenthèses, 2002).
13. Philippe Panerai, Jean Castex and Jean-Charles Depaule, *Formes Urbaines: de l'îlot à la barre* (Paris: Dunod, 1977). Spanish edition: *Formas urbanas. De la manzana al bloque* (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1986). English edition and additional material by Ivor Samuels: *Urban Forms: the Death and Life of the Urban Block*. (London: Routledge, 2004). See also Javier Monclús, "De la 'ciudad de bloques' a la recuperación de la manzana. Formas urbanas. De la manzana al bloque, revisitado (From the "city of blocks" to the recovery of the urban block). (Formes urbaines. De l'îlot a la barre revisited)," *Actas IV Congreso ISUF-H: 2020* (Barcelona: DUOT, 2020). For a more general overview of the issue see: Carmen Díez Medina and Javier Monclús, *Ciudad de bloques: Reflexiones retrospectivas y prospectivas sobre los polígonos de vivienda 'modernos'* (Madrid: Abada, 2020). (book review in *Planning Perspectives*, 36 21 4 2021).
 14. Nicola Marzot, Roberto Cavallo and Susanne Komossa, "The Study of Urban Form in the Netherlands," *Urban Morphology* 20 (no. 1) (2016): 35–43.
 15. Susanne Komossa, ed., *Atlas of The Dutch Urban Block* (Bussum: Thooth, 2005).
 16. "Disappointingly, much of the conference dialogue drifted away from a focus on urban morphology and more directly into the realms of urban design and practice". Wendy R. McClure, "Nineteenth International Seminar on Urban Form, Delft, The Netherlands," *Urban Morphology* 17, no. 1 (2013): 35–44.
 17. Paola Viganò, *The Territories of Urbanism. The Project as Knowledge Producer* (Lausanne: EPFL Press, 2016).
 18. According to Horacio Capel, *Morfología de las Ciudades* (vol. I) (Barcelona: Ediciones del Serbal 2002), 23-30.
 19. Nicola Marzot, "The Study of Urban Form in Italy," *Urban Morphology* 6 (no. 2) (2002): 59–73.
 20. Jürgens, *Ciudades Españolas: su Desarrollo y Configuración Urbanística*. (first published in German: *Spanische Stadte: Ihre Bauliche Entwicklung Und Ausgestaltung*, 1926).
 21. Joaquín Bosque, *Geografía Urbana de Granada* (Zaragoza: CSIC, 1962).
 22. Rafael Mas, *El Barrio de Salamanca: planeamiento y propiedad inmobiliaria en el ensanche de Madrid* (Madrid: IEAL, 1982).
 23. Joan Vilgrasa, "The Study of Urban Form in Spain," *Urban Morphology* 2, no. 1 (1998): 35–44. Joan Vilgrasa, "Interview to Whitehand," *Revista Catalana de Geografia* (no 8) (1989): 21 -28. See also Jeremy Whitehand, "Formas de renovación urbana en Gran Bretaña. Una perspectiva históricogeográfica," *Historia Urbana* 2 (1993): 59–68.
 24. Fernando Terán, *Planeamiento Urbano en la España Contemporánea* (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1978).

25. Antonio Bonet, ed., *Urbanismo e Historia Urbana en el Mundo Hispano* (Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1982/1985).
26. Victoriano Sainz, *El Proyecto Urbano en España: Génesis y Desarrollo de un Urbanismo de los Arquitectos* (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2006).
27. José Ignacio Linazasoro Rodríguez, *Permanencias y arquitectura urbana: las ciudades vascas de la época romana a la Ilustración* (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1978).
28. Manuel De Solà-Morales, *De Solà-Morales, Manuel, Las Formas de Crecimiento Urbano*, (Barcelona: ETSAB, 1974, new ed. 1997). Manuel De Solà-Morales, *Miradas sobre la ciudad*, edited by Oriol Clos (Madrid: Acantilado, 2021). See also, Javier Monclús, “Manuel de Solà-Morales y el urbanismo proyectual de los años ochenta,” in *La cultura arquitectónica en la España de la Transición*, ed. Carlos Sambricio (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2021), 315-330. María Rubert, “Un laboratorio urbano: investigaciones, experimentos y ensayos. LUB 1970-1980,” in *La cultura arquitectónica en la España de la Transición*, ed. Carlos Sambricio (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2021), 299-314.
29. Juan Carlos García Pablos, “Morfología Urbana (o la Ordenación de la Ciudad),” in *El Urbanismo de la Transición. El Plan General de Ordenación Urbana de Madrid de 1985*, eds. C. Sambricio and P. Ramos (Madrid: Ayuntamiento de Madrid, 2019), 180–208. See also: Laboratorio de Urbanismo de Barcelona, *Readings on Cerdà and the Extension Plan of Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona* (Madrid: MOPU, 1992).
30. María José Rodríguez Tarduchy, *Forma y ciudad: en los límites de la arquitectura y el urbanismo* (Madrid: Cinter, 2011).
31. Vítor Oliveira, ed., *Diferentes abordagens em morfologia urbana. Contributos luso brasileiros* (2018). vitoroliveira.fe.up.pt/uf books (accessed on 03.12.2022).
32. As can be seen, for example, in the networks led by Horacio Capel, including contributions from both sides of the Atlantic. *Geo Crítica* (1976-1994): <https://raco.cat/index.php/GeoCritica/issue/archive>. *Biblio3W Revista Bibliográfica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales* (2007-2021) (accessed on 03.12.2022).
33. Adrian Gorelik, *La ciudad latinoamericana. Una figura de la imaginación social del siglo XX* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editora Iberoamericana, 2022).
34. Arturo Almandoz, *Modernización Urbana en América Latina* (Santiago de Chile: Instituto de Estudios Urbanos y Territoriales, 2013). See also Arturo Almandoz, ed., *Planning Latin America's Capital Cities 1850-1950* (London: Routledge, 2002).
35. Vilagrassa, “The Study of Urban Form in Spain”.
36. “A major part of the solution is unlikely to be provided by nationally-based organizations and their journals, controlled as they are by members and interest groups from their respective countries”. Whitehand, “The Problem of Anglophone Squint”. Whitehand, *Urban morphology: how interdisciplinary? how international?* At the same time, he supported independent forums of conventional organisations (such as the International Geographical Union), which would promote the more or less spontaneous development of international groups of researchers and professionals, founding the Birmingham’s Urban Morphology Research Group (UMRG).
37. <http://www.urbanform.org/regional.html> (accessed on 03.12.2022).
38. Vítor Oliveira et al., “The Study of Urban Form in Portugal,” *Urban Morphology* (2011) 15(1), 55-66, International Seminar on Urban Form, 2011.

39. A Conference was organized in Artimino (Florence, Italy) in 2016. See Paolo Carloti, Alessandro Camiz, and Carmen Díez Medina (eds.), *Urban Morphology and Design Joint research perspectives and methodological comparison: Italy, Spain* (Rome: U+D edition, 2016).
40. See Carles Llop Torné, ed., *Las ciudades y sus tesis 1970-2020* (vol. 1) (Valencia: Universitat Politècnica de Valencia, 2023).
41. The term 'Hispanic', according to the Oxford Dictionary, means "'Relating to Spain or to Spanish-speaking countries. Belonging to or relating to Spain and Spanish-speaking countries and cultures, especially those of Central and South America'. However, according to the Real Academia Española, it means 'Belonging to or relating to ancient Hispania or the peoples who were part of it. Belonging to or relating to Spain and Spanish-speaking countries and cultures'.
42. Ivor Samuels, "Towards an Eclectic Morphology".
43. Using this method, large thematic blocks may appear covering approaches as varying as those included by Pierre Gauthier and Jason Gilliland in an original mapping project that distinguishes between 'cognitive' and 'normative' studies, and also between those that consider the urban form as a "product" or as an 'independent variable'. See Pierre Gauthier, and Jason Gulliland, "Mapping Urban Morphology: A Classification Scheme for Interpreting Contributions to the Study of Urban Form," *Urban Morphology* 10 (no. 1) (2006): 41–50.
44. Michael Barke, "An End to Spain's Urban Morphological Isolation?," *Urban Morphology* 23 (no. 1) (2019): 45–57.
45. This block appears in ISUF-H conferences under the name "History of urban form", although it is often linked to the theories and the history of urban planning.
46. This confirms the relevance of urban geography perspectives, although historical geography tends to converge and be confused with urban history.
47. See Mar Santamaría-Varas, Pablo Martínez-Díez, Sergio García-Pérez, eds., *ZARCH, Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Architecture and Urban Form* 19. Forma y comportamiento: modelar la urbanidad, 2023.
48. The proceedings of four of the conferences held (Toledo 2016; ISUF-H Zaragoza 2018; ISUF-H Guadalajara 2019; ISUF-H Barcelona 2020) are available at the ISUF-H website: <https://isufh.org/>. Reports on the conferences can be found in *Urban Morphology* 2017 21.1; 2019 23.1; 2021 25.2.
49. Barke, "An End to Spain's Urban Morphological Isolation?". The practical applications of urban morphological research and using urban morphology as a 'tool' rather than as an end in itself, as it was dominant at that time Michael Barke, "Forward," in *Morphological Research In Planning, Urban Design And Architecture*, edited by Vitor Oliveira (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021).
50. Samuels, "Towards an Eclectic Urban Morphology".
51. Whitehand, The problem of Anglophone Squint".
52. Barke, Michael, "Why Study Urban Morphology? The View of ISUF Members," *Urban Morphology* 23 (no. 2) (2019): 105–114.
53. Barke, "An End to Spain's Urban Morphological Isolation?"
54. See also: Samuels, "Anglophone squint and transatlantic myopia",

-
55. Jeremy W. R. Whitehand, “Urban Morphology: How Interdisciplinary? How International?,” *Urban Morphology* 22 (no. 1) (2018): 3–4.
 56. Monclús and Ruíz-Apilánez, eds., “Forma urbana y objetivos de desarrollo sostenible”, Editorial comment in *Ciudad y Territorio.Estudios Territoriales*, 54 M (2022).
 57. Oliveira, *Morphological Research in Planning, Urban Design and Architecture*
 58. Ivor Samuels, “ISUF Task Force on Research and Practice in Urban Morphology: An Interim Report,” *Urban Morphology* 17 (no. 1) (2013): 40–43.
 59. Peter Larkham, “The need for change in the study of urban form,” Editorial comment in *Urban Morphology* (2022) 26(1), 3–4.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research has been conducted within the context of R&D&I titled Strategic Peri-Urban Areas in Transformation. Eco-Cultural Challenges in Urban Regeneration Processes in Spanish Cities (PER-START), code: PI D2020-116893RB-I00, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation. This project is connected with research group Urban Landscapes and Contemporary Project (Paisajes Urbanos y Proyecto Contemporáneo, PUPC), T44_23R (pupc.unizar.es), financed by the Diputación General de Aragón.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almandoz, Arturo. *Modernización Urbana en América Latina*. Santiago de Chile: Instituto de Estudios Urbanos y Territoriales, 2013.
- Almandoz, Arturo, ed. *Planning Latin America's Capital Cities 1850-1950*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Barke, Michael. "An End to Spain's Urban Morphological Isolation?." *Urban Morphology* 23, no. 1 (2019): 45–57.
- Barke, Michael. "Forward." In *Morphological Research In Planning, Urban Design And Architecture*, edited by Vítor Oliveira. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021.
- Barke, Michael. "Why Study Urban Morphology? The View of ISUF Members." *Urban Morphology* 23, no. 2(2019): 105–114.
- Bonet, Antonio, ed. *Urbanismo e Historia Urbana en el Mundo Hispano*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1982/1985.
- Bosque, Joaquín. *Geografía Urbana de Granada*. Zaragoza: CSIC, 1962.
- Capel, Horacio. *La Morfología de las Ciudades*. Barcelona: Ediciones del Serbal, Vol. I, II, III. 2002, 2005, 2013.
- Carlotti, Paolo, Alessandro Camiz and Carmen Díez Medina, eds. *Urban Morphology and Design Joint research perspectives and methodological comparison: Italy, Spain*. Rome: U+D edition, 2016.
- Chesneau, Isabelle, and Marcel Roncayolo. *L'abécédaire de Marcel Roncayolo. Introduction à une lecture de la ville: Entretiens*. Paris: Infolio, 2011.
- Darin, Michaël, "The Study of Urban Form in France." *Urban Morphology* 2, no. 2 (1998): 63–76.
- De Solà-Morales, Manuel. *Las Formas de Crecimiento Urbano*. Barcelona: ETSAB, 1974. (new ed. 1997).
- De Solà-Morales, Manuel. *Miradas sobre la Ciudad*, ed. Oriol Clos. Madrid: Acantilado, 2021.
- Díez Medina, Carmen and Javier Monclús. *Ciudad de bloques: Reflexiones retrospectivas y prospectivas sobre los polígonos de vivienda 'modernos'*. Madrid: Abada, 2020.
- García, Pablos and Juan Carlos, "Morfología Urbana (o la Ordenación de la Ciudad)," in *El Urbanismo de la Transición. El Plan General de Ordenación Urbana de Madrid de 1985*, edited by C. Sambricio and P. Ramos, 180-208. Madrid: Ayuntamiento de Madrid, 2019.
- García-Ramón, María Dolores. "The Differences that Place Makes. A Critical View on Anglo-American Hegemony in Geography." *Documents d'Anàlisi Geografica* 58, no. 2 (2012): 307–319.

- Gauthier, Pierre and Jason Gulliland. "Mapping Urban Morphology: A Classification Scheme for Interpreting Contributions to the Study of Urban Form." *Urban Morphology* 10, no. 1 (2006): 41–50.
- Gorelik, Adrian. *La ciudad latinoamericana. Una figura de la imaginación social del siglo XX*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editora Iberoamericana, 2022.
- Komossa, Susanne, ed. *Atlas of The Dutch Urban Block*. Bussum: Thooth, 2005.
- Laboratorio de Urbanismo de Barcelona, *Readings on Cerdà and the Extension Plan of Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona*, Madrid: MOPU, 1992.
- Larkham, Peter. "Planning History and Everyday Urban Change: An Appreciation of J.W.R. Whitehand (1938–2021)." *Planning Perspectives* 37, no. 1 (2022): 205–209.
- Larkham, Peter. "The need for change in the study of urban form." Editorial comment in *Urban Morphology* (2022) 26(1), 3–4.
- Linazasoro Rodríguez and José Ignacio. *Permanencias y arquitectura urbana: las ciudades vascas de la época romana a la Ilustración*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1978.
- Marzot, Nicola. "The Study of Urban Form in Italy." *Urban Morphology* 6, no. 2 (2002): 59–73.
- Marzot, Nicola, Roberto Cavallo and Susanne Komossa. "The Study of Urban Form in the Netherlands." *Urban Morphology* 20, no. 1 (2016): 35–43.
- Mas, Rafael. *El barrio de Salamanca: planeamiento y propiedad inmobiliaria en el ensanche de Madrid*. Madrid: IEAL, 1982.
- McClure, Wendy R. "Nineteenth International Seminar on Urban Form, Delft, The Netherlands." *Urban Morphology* 17, no. 1 (2013): 35–44.
- Monclús, Javier. "De la 'ciudad de bloques' a la recuperación de la manzana. Formas urbanas. De la manzana al bloque, revisitado (From the "city of blocks" to the recovery of the urban block). (Formes urbaines. De l'illot a la barre revisited)." *Actas IV Congreso ISUF-H: 2020*. Barcelona: DUOT, 2020.
- Monclús, Javier and Carmen Díez-Medina. "Urbanisme, Urbanismo, Urbanistica: Latin European Urbanism." In *The Routledge Handbook of Planning History*, edited by Carola Hein, 147–160. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Monclús, Javier and Borja Ruiz-Apilánez. "Forma urbana y objetivos de desarrollo sostenible." Editorial comment in *Ciudad y Territorio. Estudios Territoriales*, 54 M (2022).
- Monclús, Javier. "Manuel de Solà-Morales y el urbanismo proyectual de los años ochenta." In *La cultura arquitectónica en la España de la Transición*, edited by Carlos Sambricio, 315–330. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2021.
- Moudon, Anne Vernez. "Urban Morphology as an Emerging Interdisciplinary Field." *Urban Morphology* 1, no. 1 (1997): 3–10.
- Oliveira, Vítor, et al. "The Study of Urban Form in Portugal." *Urban Morphology* (2011) 15(1), 55–66, International Seminar on Urban Form, 2011.

- Oliveira, Vítor. *Morphological Research in Planning, Urban Design and Architecture*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- Oliveira, Vítor, ed. *Diferentes abordagens em morfologia urbana. Contributos luso brasileiros*. 2018. vitoroliveira.fe.up.pt/ufbooks (accessed on 03.12.2022).
- Panerai, Philippe, Jean Castex and Jean-Charles Depaule. *Formes Urbaines: de l'ilot à la barre*. Paris: Dunod, 1977. Spanish edition: *Formas urbanas. De la manzana al bloque*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1986. English edition and additional material by Ivor Samuels: *Urban Forms: the Death and Life of the Urban Block*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Rodríguez Tarduchy, María José. *Forma y ciudad: en los límites de la arquitectura y el urbanismo*. Madrid: Cinter, 2011.
- Roncayolo, Marcel. *Lectures de villes. Formes et temps*. Marseille: Editions Parenthèses, 2002.
- Rubert, María. "Un laboratorio urbano: investigaciones, experimentos y ensayos. LUB 1970-1980." In *La cultura arquitectónica en la España de la Transición*, edited by Carlos Sambricio, 299-314. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2021.
- Sainz, Victoriano. *El Proyecto Urbano en España. Génesis y Desarrollo de un Urbanismo de los Arquitectos*. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2006.
- Samuels, Ivor. "Anglophone Squint and Transatlantic Myopia." *Urban Morphology* 16, no. 1 (2012): 76–86.
- Samuels, Ivor. "ISUF Task Force on Research and Practice in Urban Morphology: An Interim Report." *Urban Morphology* 17, no. 1 (2013): 40–43.
- Samuels, Ivor. "Towards an Eclectic Urban Morphology." In *Morphological Research in Planning, Urban Design and Architecture*, edited by Vítor Oliveira, 71-96. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- Santamaria-Varas, Mar, Pablo Martínez-Díez, Sergio García-Pérez, eds. *ZARCH, Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Architecture and Urban Form* 19. Forma y comportamiento: modelar la urbanidad, 2023.
- Terán, Fernando. *Planeamiento Urbano en la España Contemporánea*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1978.
- Viganò, Paola. *The Territories of Urbanism. The Project as Knowledge Producer*. Lausanne: EPFL Press, 2016.
- Vilagrasa, Joan. "Jeremy Whitehand parla a la Revista Catalana de Geografia." *Revista Catalana de Geografia* 8 (1989): 21–28.
- Vilagrasa, Joan. "The Study of Urban Form in Spain." *Urban Morphology* 2, no. 1 (1998): 35–44.
- Whitehand, Jeremy W. R. "Formas de renovación urbana en Gran Bretaña. Una perspectiva históricogeográfica." *Historia Urbana* 2 (1993): 59–68.
- Whitehand, Jeremy W. R., "Urban Morphology: How Interdisciplinary? How International?," *Urban Morphology* 22, no. 1 (2018): 3–4.