Eternal City to Open City: Rome's Postwar Academies as Architecture's First Global Programs

Twenty years ago, as the American Academy in Rome celebrated a triumphant centennial in 1994, architectural critic Joseph Giovannini questioned its value for architects. He asked how Rome could be "foundational" for a discipline operating within an increasingly "'groundless' and dispersed" culture. "The Eurocentric impulse on which the Academy itself is premised" violates the millennial reality of global multiculturalism, and the city's classical architectural canon "represents the official culture that dominated others."[1]

DENISE R. COSTANZO
Pennsylvania State University

His lament that Rome is a "pervasive and demanding" instead of a "transparent" presence echoes Le Corbusier's famous warning that the city will maim impressionable young architects.[2] For Giovannini, Rome violates modernist social and aesthetic ideals, as well as postmodern cultural sensibilities. To reside at an Academy—intentionally elite and exclusive, the "cancer" of French architecture to Le Corbusier—only compounds the damage.

Such critiques helped shape this session. It rightly assumes that architectural educators hope today's global programs will do more than find new "Romes" and create new "Academies." While adapting to overwhelming changes in international study's parameters, these represent the conservative, outmoded traditions against which they react. But the challenge of navigating today's complex variables might inspire a certain nostalgia: at least Rome provided an automatic answer to where architects should go, and its academies offered predetermined answers to what they should do, and why.

But that (apparent) certainty was decisively disrupted by the advent of modern architecture. After World War II, ambitious young architects had few reasons to go to Rome. Fifty years before Giovannini's critique, and two decades before North American architecture schools established their first Rome programs in the late 1960s, the American, Spanish and French Academies and the British School all faced a familiar, contemporary problem: how to serve the needs of young, modern architects through foreign study.[3]

All held off the threat of obsolescence by redefining themselves. This continued the flow of international architects to Rome, which helped the city carry on as a de facto design school to this day—for Giovannini, an unfortunate, even reactionary achievement. But Rome's postwar academies also introduced a new foreign study framework for architects in which the caput mundi become a caput mundi, one of many topoi in a fluctuating, more de-centered map of architecturally

significant locations. While each institution was primarily concerned with its own survival and relevance, their common efforts to reconcile the persistent study abroad issues of structure and flexibility, stability and mobility, security and engagement resulted in a thoroughly modern rationale for global programs in architecture—one born, ironically, at Rome's academies.

STRUCTURE VS. FLEXIBILITY

For many architects, "academic" remains a synonym for authoritative, rigid, and traditional, a legacy of Jean-Baptiste Colbert's Royal Academies for Louis XIV. This system was intended to define immutable principles of excellence for every cultural field, including architecture, the last academy established in 1671. The Académie de France à Rome was founded in 1666 as part of this larger project. While the Grand Prix de Rome in architecture was established in 1720, from the outset two architects were among the twelve artists sent each year. Besides providing up to five years of subsidized lodging, the Academy was intended to impose control over the pensionnaires anointed to lead their respective disciplines. Not everything in Rome—not even everything ancient—was considered "classical," or worthy of study and emulation.[4] More mature minds in Paris and a vigilant Directeur on site were necessary to guard against time wasted, studying inferior examples at national expense.

To that end, each year in Rome would eventually be designated for work of predetermined scale and complexity. Projects were subject to approval and each pensionnaire's progress was closely supervised. Architects spent their first three years producing measured details and partial reconstructions of structures in Rome. Only after submitting these could they begin to travel elsewhere in Italy. The fourth year reconstruction of an entire ancient building, the legendary envois, were sent to Paris as authoritative knowledge to instruct future generations. The final year was devoted to an original project for a building "worthy of France," the culmination of five years steeping in Rome.

Even with the luxury of up to five years, the French Academy optimized the architect's time overseas with urgency. It was racing to document crumbling examples of architectural excellence before they were lost to time or modern development. This was imperative to the Academy of Architecture's central mission: ensuring an elite cadre of French designers could demonstrate the nation's cultural preeminence by producing the world's best buildings, modeled on those in Rome.

The Paris-educated U.S. architect Charles Follen McKim (1847-1909), primary founder of the American Academy in 1894, agreed that young architects' elders should establish and enforce a framework structuring their time overseas. He insisted they should study in Rome "under the direction of a qualified pilot who has been over the ground and who will see to it that they spend their time on the greatest examples and are not allowed to spend their prize money over their own immature selections." The Americans emulated the French model by demanding studies of ancient monuments, original (collaborative) designs, and directing fellows' attention to the most "profitable" subjects—for McKim, "the great examples of Greece and Rome and the early Renaissance."[5] Work was supervised in Rome by a Professor of Fine Arts and the Director, then sent to the Trustees in New York for review.

But when the American Academy re-opened after the war in 1947, its new approach contradicted McKim's beliefs by providing completely unstructured,

largely unsupervised overseas study to artists and architects. This change was part of a wider abandonment of many of its "academic" practices: Rome Prizes were shortened from three years to one, with an option for renewal.[6] Applicants were no longer chosen by design competition, but instead submitted written statements describing their intentions for the fellowship. Once in Rome, however, Fellows could freely pursue or abandon their proposed projects. The Fine Arts professorship ended, so their only oversight came from the Academy's famously relaxed postwar Director, Laurance Roberts, plus occasional, collegial mentoring by senior architects in short-term residencies. The harshest sanction for unproductive fellows was refusing a second year renewal—assuming they asked.

This experiment in unstructured foreign study had mixed results. The architects appreciated their liberty to travel, read and pursue any program they chose. Even if some occasionally felt at loose ends, or were unsure how their activities might benefit their future work, none expressed regret in later decades.[7] A rare few demonstrated the maturity and determination to turn this free time into career-making, even discipline-altering results—most famously Robert Venturi, whose Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture of 1966 was the much-digested fruit of his 1954–56 fellowship.[8]

However popular with its Fellows, this approach had critics within the American Academy's leadership. Several senior trustees and alumni were alarmed by the Academy's new direction, particularly its overt acceptance of modernism. In 1953, a small but vocal group attempted to reverse the institution's postwar policy changes. They called for a return to "monumental" (translation: "traditional") styles and demanded more direct supervision of fine arts work, presumably by conservative practitioners, to correct stylistic tendencies they considered inappropriate and maintain more consistent productivity.[9]

Ultimately, this campaign did not succeed, but it reveals the approach's greatest weakness. By abandoning all structure and work expectations, the postwar Academy became vulnerable to accusations that it had become a selective artists' resort.[10] This policy did, however, have a fundamental strategic value for pro-modernist reformers like Director Roberts. Maintaining that young architects should discover their own lessons from Rome allowed the Academy to avoid overt allegiance to either side of a polarized discipline, still divided stylistically and generationally between historicists and modernists. Roberts' apparent neutrality was belied by his concerted efforts to establish ties with the emerging modernist establishment and save the Academy from architectural irrelevance. While Roberts was on the right side of design history, this shift threatened a currency crucial for any institution dependent on private support: alumni loyalty.[11]

The mid-century British School at Rome experienced the opposite problem: too much continuity. Its London-based Faculty of Architecture had little turnover during and after the Second World War, and made very few overt policy changes after the war. It continued to choose Rome Scholars via a Beaux-Arts style design competition until 1968, enforced clearly stated work expectations, and supervised activities closely throughout their one to two-year stays. The School's work requirements remained unchanged, and defined a framework for architects' productivity. After two months in Rome, architects proposed a program for their first year. Then at year's end they submitted a report on their activities, all completed work, and a plan for their second year to the Faculty. Financial support was paid in installments, and could be withheld if Scholars were not productive.

This consistency prevented the civil war experienced by the American Academy, but at a cost of British architects' diminished interest in the Rome Prize. In 1957 the Head of the School of Architecture at the Edinburgh College of Art (and the 1939 Rome Scholar, who never went because of the war) described British architecture students as "indifferent" to the award.[12] That graduates of architecture programs in Australia (1954), Northern Ireland (1956) and South Africa (1957) won for the first time also suggests reduced competition from architects in Britain. Despite the Architecture Faculty's best efforts to uphold conservative tradition, change came nonetheless. While the winning projects for 1947, 1949 and 1950 were all Beaux-Arts in style, the 1952 victor shows the first hints of modernism. From 1954 on, winning designs were visibly modernist.[13]

Postwar architecture Scholars' main challenge was defining a project that the Faculty would approve, but also advanced their own disciplinary interests. The flexible work structure was officially neutral regarding style, but the administration pushed for far more traditionalist, anachronistic subjects and methods of study than most Rome Scholars wanted. The Faculty complained about receiving photograph and text-heavy meditations on hill towns and piazze, instead of the measured drawings of historic buildings they considered more worthwhile. They also resisted requests to study contemporary Italian architecture. In 1958, one architecture Scholar abandoned the School in his second year to work in Geneva, convinced that the architect "returns after two years [at the British School] rather out of the stream and possibly permanently maladjusted." He (rather audaciously) asked for continued financial support, but was cut off for refusing to return to Rome.[14]

This conflict would have never arisen at the Spanish Academy, which established a balance between productivity-ensuring structure and professional relevance for its architects. Spain's borsistas had to submit regular reports on their activities, and receive the Director's approval for the projects they pursued. But this was much easier to obtain than at the British School. Approved work included major design competitions and Spanish pavilions at international events like the 1958 World's Fair in Brussels—projects of immediate professional value for young architects. Even more unexpected is the flexibility at the French Academy, where a series of policy modifications had incrementally loosened its structure since the 1860s. The fellowship period was shortened to four years in 1863 (eliminating the fifth-year project), then to three years and four months in 1921. By 1935 its work requirements gave French architecte-pensionnaires far more freedom than their British counterparts.

The academies' looser postwar structures were consistent with their support of postgraduate architects, whose maturity meant they could be expected to devote their time abroad to independent projects with a minimal supervisory framework. They also reflected widespread uncertainty about what sort of meaningful work architects should do in Italy; the days of ink washes of Ionic volutes had clearly ended. But the Spanish architects' competition work, however helpful for their careers, could have been carried out anywhere. Postwar academies' greater flexibility made Rome a more appealing destination for modern architects, but it also undermined the rationale for preferring this storied location to any other.

HERE VS. ANYWHERE

Giovannini's preference that architects go someplace more "transparent" than Rome offers a vague, if vividly modernist, ideal. Location strongly determines the

range of lessons that are readily learned, and what kind of differences will define an architect's overseas experience. Like the tension between structure and freedom, both too little unfamiliarity or too much can result in a less effective or meaningful program. Today, a reflexive respect for student diversity, which includes a wide range of preparation for international experiences, is one complicating factor in designing a beneficial and challenging program.

What made Rome the *sine qua non* of architectural travel for centuries was the opposite view. The city defined architectural excellence, so to be an excellent architect, you must go there. If you were uncomfortable in Rome, the problem was you, not Rome. Of course, this view was never held by all Western architects; it represented one particularly powerful cult which asserted primacy over a far broader world of building design and production. The assumption that any great architect must know and venerate Rome is just as tyrannical as the political forces—Imperial, Papal, or Fascist—that produced its grandeur.

Rome was dethroned by the fall of Beaux-Arts regimes dominating European and North American architecture establishments into the early twentieth century. After World War II, architecture's geography of prestige shifted to new epicenters in New York and Chicago. But Rome's academies were inextricably tied to their impressive facilities in some of the city's most prestigious areas. Both practically and symbolically, this real estate was too valuable to abandon. In early 1946 the French Academy reclaimed the Villa Medici, their home since 1803, as soon as they could evict their own military. When its director arrived in January, the Académie des Beaux-Arts' general secretary wrote from Paris that he was "deeply moved to know you are finally back in your House, in this Palace that has seen centuries and kings," calling the Villa Medici a "sanctuary of art and glory."[15] Modernity notwithstanding, France had no thought of renouncing its centuries-old stake in Rome.

A change of location was equally inconceivable for the British School. It was largely run by its classicists, who had clear reasons to stay put, plus an Architecture Faculty staunchly loyal to Rome and tradition. But the American Academy had an internal debate about its future in 1945, which even considered whether it should still send artists and architects to Rome. The alternative would have been to turn over its vast Janiculum campus to the School of Classical Studies, one half of a bifurcated institution, and use the Fine Arts' endowment for artistic fellowships elsewhere. But the Beaux-Arts architects who had dominated the Academy since McKim were as devoted to Rome as their British counterparts. They insisted that American architects should still go there. They did, however—reluctantly—stop telling them what the city meant.

The prewar Academies had defined certain locations or layers of Rome's history as orthodox "classics" while prohibiting others. Postwar architects' freedom of inquiry opened up study of suppressed periods, overlooked sites, the city's multilayered structure as a transhistorical phenomenon. A modernist perspective privileged discoveries of the new: uncovering other Romes, or constructing newly relevant re-readings of its monuments. Approaching the city as a conflicted, inconsistent multiplicity rather than a coherent unity fundamentally altered its meaning. An academically-sanctioned canon ceded to a vision of the city more like Le Corbusier's: one that points ahead instead of back, and challenges architects to see through distracting surfaces and discover design lessons that contest its authorized histories.

Furthermore, freedom to design an independent project entailed freedom of movement. Postwar architects had considerable control over how much time they spent in the Eternal City. The Americans' only limit was their stipend; Venturi made it to Egypt and Sweden. Spanish borsistas were expected to travel extensively, and might reside in northern Europe or Britain during their second year. Even the British School's architects could go anywhere the Faculty approved; many traveled quite widely across the Continent.

Despite its eagerness to reclaim its seat in Rome, and a history of tight travel limits, the French Academy had the most expansive map of all. The range of acceptable destinations and subject matter expanded during the nineteenth century to include ancient monuments in Sicily and Greece in 1846, then the Renaissance and medieval architecture throughout Italy in 1871. By 1891, pensionnaires could officially go anywhere in the world outside France with the Director's approval. In 1948, the Director supported two architects' request to visit the U.S., and projects were approved in Mexico (1939) and Vietnam (1959). The French Prix de Rome had become a truly global program.

It seems counterintuitive for a Rome Prize to support travel to the U.S. or Sweden. But this helped reconcile the academies' rootedness in Rome with postwar architects' ambivalence about the city. They provided a home base from which architects could explore, and to which they would (usually) return when ready—or out of funds. It was a practical solution to the persistent foreign study question of whether to visit a large number of sites more briefly, or get to know one place deeply and intimately. Paradoxically, however, the stable centers that promoted architects' familiarity with a new location could also impede connection to their foreign context.

INSIDE VS. OUTSIDE

During the winter of 1955–56 Ian Lacey, an architect at the British School, spent part of his second year working at the renowned firm of BBPR in Milan. He did so with support from the School's Director, who reminded the skeptical Faculty that Italy's winter weather made it difficult to travel and measure buildings. Lacey describes his few months living and working in Milan in enthusiastic and telling terms: "for the first time, I felt that I was living in Italy!"[16] Robert Venturi's letters describe his forays into central Rome, which he relished, as a distinct departure from the cloistered, hilltop American Academy.[17] Unlike his future partner Denise Scott Brown, who lived in central Rome and worked for Giuseppe Vaccaro during this same period, he had to cross a physical and cultural boundary to experience the "real" city.[18]

The academies' imposing headquarters on Rome's verdant edges posed a challenge shared by many foreign study centers: as satellites of the home country, they insulate their inhabitants from the very location they traveled far to absorb and learn from. Activities are usually conducted in the home language, and managed housing and bilingual staff buffer residents' interactions with local reality. Such a filter can easily diminish how directly and thoroughly residents experience the reality of their overseas location.

This is another recent type of concern. The French colonized Rome in the seventeenth century because they believed the city's patrimony was too valuable to be entrusted to the Italians. Modern Rome was something to be brushed aside during academic investigation of a transcendent cultural tradition. Over the following centuries, the Grand Tour tradition conjoined a broad spectrum of Italian cultural experiences—both cultivated and common—into a shared

knowledge base for aristocrats and artists. But the academies' mission was still to distill Rome's universal significance from its everyday, evolving context. Their high walls, imposing gates, and lofty locations on the Pincian and Janiculum hills reflected a continuing mission to stand above and apart from the quotidian city.[19]

Architects at Rome's academies after World War II pursued topics that tended to be more grounded in messy, everyday reality. Many studied the city as a complex formal and sociological phenomenon: organic hill towns, Baroque squares and street patterns, how coherent urban spaces could result out of structures from multiple centuries, and how Italian architects confronted their complex reality. In general, local universities or professional offices within the city proper offer more convenient bases for pursuing socially engaged, contemporary subjects than an isolated, peripheral academy. A good number of academies' postwar architects did visit the offices of such prominent figures as Pier Luigi Nervi, Carlo Aymonino, Italo Insolera and Ludovico Quaroni, and some made efforts to learn Italian so they could interact more productively. A few whose language skills became strong enough attended university lectures. But those who worked extensively with Italian architects, or carried out projects that required them to interact with locals beyond a touristic level, were the exception rather than the rule; many stayed within the academies' cloistered enclaves and well-trod travel itineraries.[20]

Yet an insular center can encourage architects to cross other boundaries; interdisciplinary residential academies were always meant to promote artistic interaction across media. The British, American, and Spanish academies house humanities researchers along with artists, although overcoming the distance between circles centered on the studio and the library could be challenging. American Academy field trips, for example, were usually segregated in response to artists' and scholars' different interests and preparation.[21] But many of the architects at postwar academies who interacted across disciplines reported that living and traveling with novelists, art historians, composers and archaeologists was the most rewarding part of their Rome experience. While overseas study in a sheltered enclave carries the risk of isolation from the foreign context, an interdisciplinary environment can also push young architects to forge horizon-expanding connections beyond their own field.

OPEN CITY, OPEN DOORS

What constitutes a meaningful global study program for young architects in a modern, fast-evolving cultural context remains an open question. Rome's national academies faced this problem during the postwar years, acutely burdened by association with a discredited artistic model, and outlined a basic framework for meaningful, modern, architectural study abroad: bring them to a rich, fragmented and evolving location that is neither too alienating nor overly familiar; embrace an expanding range of inspiring places, periods and people; let them absorb a foreign environment thoroughly, and also journey beyond their existing cultural and disciplinary limits; and give them as much responsibility as possible for their own creative development while overseas. By the 1940s, the idea that one enduring, authoritative place or group determined what architects needed to learn from the world had vanished. The Eternal City became an open city, even—in some cases, especially—at its traditional acolytes, the academies.

Only a relatively small number of postwar architects experienced Rome this way; thirty-nine American Academy fellows (1947-65), twenty-three pensionnaires at Villa Medici (1946-65), sixteen British School Scholars (1947-62), and five borsistas

ENDNOTES

1. Joseph Giovannini, "The Academy," Progressive Architecture 75, 10 (Oct. 1994): 45-46.

2. Le Corbusier's original verb in Vers une Architecture (Paris: Editions Crès, 1923) is "meurtrir." Etchells translates this "cripple" in his 1927 edition, while Goodman's more recent translation uses "wound" (Los Angeles: Getty, 2007), 212. The word's literal meaning is "scar" or "maim," to wound in a way that leaves a permanent mark.

3. The first North American architecture programs in Rome were Temple University (est. 1968), the University of Notre Dame (1969), and the University of Washington (1970). See Gabriele De Giorgi, Alessandra Muntoni, and Marcello Pazzaglini, eds., "Roma e le scuole di architettura americane," Metamorfosi: Quaderni di architettura no. 24 (1994).

4. This view is articulated in the Academy's criticism of work sent from Rome date 12 June 1786; see Pierre Pinon et François-Xavier Amprimoz, Les Envois de Rome (1778-1968): Architecture et archéologie (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1988), 26-27. This discussion does not pretend to exhaust this 350-year old institution's complex early history, the subject of a vast scholarly subfield. The extent to which the goals and structures outlined herein were implemented could vary considerably, particularly during the eighteenth century. My intent is to present overarching themes that influenced the broad means and goals of foreign study for architects through the early twentieth century.

5. Mary N. Woods, "Charles F. McKim and the Foundation of the American Academy in Rome," in H. Hager and S. Scott Munshower, eds., Light on the Eternal City: Observations and Discoveries in the Art and Architecture of Rome, Papers in Art History from The Pennsylvania State University II (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, 1987), 309.

6. In 1931, fellowships had already been shortened from three to two years in various fields because of both finances and declining interest. See Alan and Lucia Valentine, The American Academy in Rome, 1894-1969 (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1973) 95.

7. Interviews by Sylvia Wright in "Rome's Most Favored Tourists," The Reporter, (July 12, 1956): 40-42, and Russell Lynes, in "After Hours: The Academy that Overlooks Rome," Harper's Magazine (May 1, 1969): 28, cite statements by artists at the Academy expressing mixed feelings about their time in Rome.

8. Denise R. Costanzo, "The Lessons of Rome: Architects at the American Academy, 1947–1966" (Ph.D disseration, The Pennsylvania State University, 2009) and Martino Stierli, "In the Academy's Garden: Robert Venturi, the Grand Tour and the Revision of Modern Architecture," AA Files 56 (2007): 41-62.

9. Minutes, "Rump Session at Century Club," 9 April 1953, and Michael Rapuano to J.K. Smith, 28 May 1953, American Academy in Rome Records, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. See also Costanzo, "Lessons of Rome," 186-192.

at the Spanish Academy (1947-65).[22] The influence of some is clear: to the famous cases of Venturi and Michael Graves, an American Academy fellow from 1960-62, we can add Rafael Moneo, a Spanish Academy borsista from 1963-65, and Quinlan Terry, who held a six-month Webb studentship at the British School in 1966.

Some influence has been less visible but equally important: the University of Washington's Rome Center, the city's third, was founded in 1970 by Astra Zarina, the first woman to win a Rome Prize in architecture at the American Academy in 1960. Many other postwar alumni became architecture faculty around the world and shaped institutional and student decisions about where to go, and why, into the present. The idea of Rome as a starting point, not the culmination, for the young architect's ideal journey of discovery is a direct reflection of their collective experiences and influence. As Alberti asked from his base in Rome, "quid tum?"—where next?

The radical, problematic openness of the postwar American Academy reflected the inspired vision of its unusual director. Roberts took a long view, and averred that the chief benefits of foreign study will only emerge years later, after a long incubation period. Such serene passivity can conflict with institutional calls for immediate and quantifiable success. But as educators, our responsibility is to think about the long term: how can next year's study abroad experience provide decades' worth of creative, professional, and personal benefits for the young architects we help design? As usual, Rome helps clarify how we arrived where we are, and reminds us to consider how our actions will resonate across time.

10. The Classical Studies half of the Academy did not suffer from the same concerns. Besides the continuation of a Professor-in-Charge to manage ongoing excavations at Cosa, Classical Studies Fellows were highly motivated scholars conducting dissertation or post-doctoral research.

11. Unlike its government-funded counterparts in Rome, the American Academy has always been funded entirely through private support.

12. Ralph Cowan to W. D. Sturch, 20 Nov. 1957, British School at Rome Archives, Rome (hereafter "BSR Archives"). Cowan's advice that the award be fundamentally altered to regain relevance was ignored. An endowed six-month studentship for Architectural Association graduates had few applicants. In contrast, the American Academy's number of applicants in architecture grew steadily in the 1950s.

13. The Faculty awarded no Rome Scholarships for 1948, 1951 and 1953. While this happened a few times before World War II, the shift in the style of winning projects during this period suggests they were reluctantly conceding to the ubiquity of modernist work among the Commonwealth's strongest architecture graduates.

14. Kevin P. Campbell to W.D. Sturch, 23 April and 20 May 1958, and Sturch to Campbell, 14 May 1958, BSR Archives.

15. The full citation reads: "...je suis profondément ému de vous savoir enfin revenu dans votre Maison, dans ce Palais qu'ont fait les siècles et les rois, et qui est digne de vous et de votre valeur. Je sens, de plus en plus combien je serai fier d'être votre collaborateur, dans ce sanctuaire d'art et de gloire." Translation by author. Raoul Villedieu to Jacques Ibert, 23 January 1946, Archives de l'Académie de France à Rome, Rome.

16. Ian Lacey, Final report for 1955–56, BSR Archives.

17. Over fifty letters from Robert Venturi to his parents are held in the Venturi Scott Brown and Associates Collection, Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania.

18. The two would not meet until 1960, when both were at the University of Pennsylvania. See L. Minnite, "Chronology" in D. Brownlee, D. DeLong, and K. Hiesinger, Out of the Ordinary: Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown and Associates: Architecture, Urbanism, Design (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001).

19. The French Academy's home in the Villa Medici, just off the Piazza Trinità dei Monti, is by far the most integrated into Rome's fabric. The Spanish, American, Finnish and Norwegian academies are up on the Janiculum, above and beyond Trastevere, while the British School and a bevy of other academies and institutes (Romanian, Austrian, Belgian, Swedish, Danish, Hungarian, Netherlandish, Japanese, and Egyptian) are at Valle Giulia, north of the Borghese Gardens. The German Academy, which did not reopen until 1956, stands alone on city's the northeastern district in the Villa Massimo.

20. American Academy Fellow Theodore Liebman (1964-66) worked in the studio of Carlo Aymonino during his first year.

21. Classicist Katherine Geffken (FAAR 1954-56) recalls that Classical School field trips were often conducted in Italian, which the archaeologists were assumed to know but many artists did not. Conversation with author, August 2013.

22. These numbers only include official fellowship winners. The American Academy hosted architects holding other scholarships, and the British School total only includes Scholars and those awarded "Special Scholarships" for one year.