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ABSTRACT
Incorporating architectural records into thematic archival institutions has been a common practice since the 1970s, a trend that has recently accelerated in the Portuguese context. The uniqueness of certain architectural records and collections has been an archival challenge, reflected by the several attempts to standardize their description in an ongoing process since the 1980s. While acknowledging the crucial work done by these institutions in preserving documents, there is also a tendency to focus on preserving fragments of an information system, which can have pernicious effects on understanding archives. In an attempt to understand the composition and organization of archives in the field of landscape architecture and how they can restrict or distort archival classification and knowledge, a brief comparative analysis is conducted on the corpus of documentation of three archives under the custody of thematic institutions. For enhanced understanding, a concise overview of the discipline of landscape architecture and the roles played by its practitioners is provided. This comparative analysis attempts to demonstrate how a thematic approach,
breaking organic ties, even if indelible, or underestimating lesser-known contexts or producer activities, can restrict or distort archival classification and knowledge. The focus on Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles’s archive and its ongoing organization, along with the analysis of a drawing from this archive, aims to demonstrate the need for a transition, especially in specialized or thematic institutions, from the construction of professional collections or archives to a focus on personal archives, which are organic aggregations of individuals who, during their lifetimes, also bequeathed records related to landscape architecture.
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**RESUMO**
A incorporação de documentos de arquitetura em instituições de arquivos temáticos tem sido uma prática comum desde os anos 70 do século XX, recentemente acelerada no contexto português. A singularidade de certos documentos de arquitetura e coleções tem sido encarado como um desafio arquivístico, desde os anos 80, espelhada pelas tentativas de normalização da descrição de documentos técnicos. Apesar do reconhecido esforço desenvolvido por estas instituições na preservação de documentos, denota-se uma tendência para o enfoque em fragmentos de um sistema de informação, facto que pode ter efeitos perniciosos na compreensão dos arquivos.

Numa tentativa de intelecção da composição e organização de arquivos no âmbito da arquitetura paisagista, e como estas podem restringir ou distorcer a classificação arquivística, faz-se uma breve análise comparativa do corpus documental de três arquivos sob custódia de instituições especializadas. Para uma melhor compreensão, dá-se uma visão sumária da disciplina da arquitetura paisagista e do papel dos que nela trabalham. Da análise comparativa, tenta-se demonstrar como uma abordagem temática, com quebra de vínculos orgânicos, mesmo que de forma indelével, ou subestimando contextos ou atividades menos conhecidas de um produtor, pode restringir ou distorcer a classificação arquivística e o saber.

O enfoque no arquivo de Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles, na sua organização em curso e com análise de um desenho deste arquivo, tenta-se mostrar a necessidade de uma transição, da construção de coleções ou arquivos profissionais para um foco em arquivos pessoais, agregações orgânicas de indivíduos que, durante as suas vidas, legaram documentos relacionados com a arquitetura paisagista.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Arquivos pessoais; Arquivo Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles; arquivos de arquitetura paisagista.
Introduction

Incorporating architectural records in thematic archival institutions has been a common practice since the 1970s (Zardini, 2021, p. 11) and has recently been enhanced in the Portuguese context (Pereira, 2018, p. 267). Simultaneously, the uniqueness of architectural records and collections has posed an archiving challenge, explicit by the several standardization attempts since the 1980s (Armstrong, 2006, p. 12). Therefore, despite the crucial work done on preserving architectural records and the publication of essential guides to standardize this information, focusing solely on fragments of information systems may have a pernicious effect on understanding these archives. Zélia Pereira (2018) also emphasizes the harmful consequences in the evaluation process from the lack of a structured acquisition policy, leading to a distortion in the interpretation in the genesic contexts. Consequences can be caused either by fragmented evaluation parameters or by the evaluation carried out on a case-by-case basis for institutional and thematic purposes. It is noteworthy to state that there is a potential tendency for a pernicious classification of thematic archives and that a sectoral view can lead to breaking links or misrepresenting knowledge.

Regarding architectural documents, as Alfred Willis (1996, p. 192) states, while architectural drawings are not synonymous with architectural archives, they still represent a significant part of this documentation. Particularly noteworthy are the working drawings, as they enable distinct narratives on architectural history. Nonetheless, some of the archivists’ challenges arise from dealing with the variety of informational data beyond the physical characteristics of these documents.

According to these premises, this chapter begins by analyzing the composition of two landscape architects’ archives – one English (Sir Geoffrey

---

1 Zélia Pereira (2018, p. 365), mapping the personal archives by professional areas, states that architecture is the most well-represented professional group in national archival institutions. More recently (Pereira 2021, p. 159) keeps architecture in the preferentially valued areas.

2 The Architectural Drawings Advisory Group (ADAG) was established in 1983, and the Foundation for Documents in Architecture (FDA) was established in 1986. These groups collaboratively published the Guide to the Description of Architectural Drawings, which defines principles and guidelines for documenting architectural drawings. In 2000 the Committee on Architectural Records (later known as the Provisional Group on Architectural Records) was established at The International Council on Archives (ICA). The most recent contribution, A Guide to the Archival Care of Architectural Records, 19th-20th Centuries, published in 2000 by the Committee on Architectural Records of the International Council on Archives (ICA), widens the spectrum of action by adding access, dissemination, and preservation dimensions to its archival description recommendations.
Alan Jellicoe) and the other Canadian (Cornelia Hahn Oberlander) – justifying their choice and explaining their main differences. In the second part, as archiving must reflect the subject behind the archive, I will delve into the landscape architecture discipline and how it structures thought and action, with brief reflections on approaching these archives. The emphasis here is on understanding the uniqueness of the creator and how designing a singular and nuclear structure is a core principle for organizing all the information. In the third part, I address the case study – Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles’ archive – sharing some of the inferences already generally discussed and grounded on the experience through this archive. In a general description of how the composition of this archive changed from the first (2006) to the second accession (2022), I point out some pertinent aspects resulting therefrom and how they may more effectively contribute to the construction of our social memory. As a subsection to highlight these disparities, I present an analysis of a drawing incorporated in 2006 and how its interpretation may vary when framed within a systemic model. The main objective of this analysis is to identify deviant interpretations when dealing with an isolated record (architectural drawing) and to bring out possible transformations when broadly framed or within a personal archival perspective. Finally, it ends with preliminary conclusions consolidated upon the case study, aiming to contribute to the debate on personal archives. Despite being extended, the study still has several premises to be clarified and standardized.

1. Archives of landscape architects: the cases of Sir Geoffrey Alan Jellicoe and Cornelia Hahn Oberlander

In this section, I will delve into the archival processes of two esteemed landscape architects, Sir Geoffrey Alan Jellicoe and Cornelia Hahn Oberlander, before focusing on the Ribeiro Telles’ archive. Throughout history, a discernible bias has favored the incorporation of drawings or professional documents, often reflecting the creator’s viewpoint. To address this bias and gain comprehensive insights into landscape architecture history, I have selected two notable figures from the 20th century. This choice arises from the importance of mapping the existing situations, which are rare in the landscape architects’ archives compared to those of architects, thus making it vital to explore the decisions made by both the landscape architects and the archival institutions regarding the preservation of their legacies. Furthermore, investigating these archives provides valuable insights into the diverse methodologies employed
by archival institutions, influencing the narrative of landscape architecture history. The cases of Sir Geoffrey Alan Jellicoe and Cornelia Hahn Oberlander offer distinct perspectives, with Jellicoe exemplifying a European-centered approach and Oberlander shedding light on the perspective of a Canadian institution. To enhance this comparative study, I have chosen the Centre of Canadian Architecture, acclaimed within the architectural archives community, and focused on Hahn Oberlander’s archive, representing the first archive of a female landscape architect acquired by the institution in 1997.

Focusing on Sir Geoffrey Alan Jellicoe (1900-1996), a polymath in architecture, town planning, landscape architecture, and writing, and notably one of the founding members of the Landscape Institute in 1929 and the International Federation of Landscape Architects in 1948\(^3\), left behind a complex array of documents distributed across various institutions. When exploring The National Archives (the UK Government’s official archive), it immediately led to the creator’s documents, although their custody was linked to information in other institutions. For example, at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), there is a collection of 56 original drawings by John C. Shepherd and Geoffrey Alan Jellicoe, created for their book “Italian Gardens of the Renaissance” (Shepherd and Jellicoe 1925). The Tate Gallery Archive (Jellicoe, 1960-1973) houses a collection of “Correspondence between Geoffrey Jellicoe and Ben Nicholson and Felicitas Vogler”, containing letters sent and received from Jellicoe’s friends Ben Nicholson and Nicholson’s third wife, photographer Dr. Felicitas Vogler. Geoffrey Jellicoe donated these documents in 1991. Additionally, the Surrey History Centre possesses a collection of 24 plans and five models produced between 1980 and 1985, organized in two series, including the plans of landscape and garden designs at Sutton Place for art collector Stanley J. Seeger (1930-2011) (Jellicoe, 1742-1985). Jellicoe’s personal archive is housed at the Museum of English Rural Life (Jellicoe, 1960s-1990s). According to the institutional description, it contains 349 items, dating from the 1960s to 1990s, including drawings primarily from 1970-1995 and highlighting his significant projects. The fonds (AR JEL) is organized into three parts: Drawings, Photographic, and Social and personal material. The first part (AR JEL DO1), arranged in 57 series, constitutes a donation by the creator to the Landscape Institute, predominantly comprising documents from 1970 to 1995. The second part (AR JEL

\(^3\) The creation of the International Federation led to the establishment of the designation “Landscape Architecture” internationally after some debates at national levels (see Dümpelmann, 2014; Antunes, 2019).
PH), arranged into four series, comprises project-organized photographs, garden slides, and a VHS video. The third part, “Social and personal material” (AR JEL SP), encompasses records related to Jellicoe’s professional activity, potentially including his wife’s photograph (AR JEL SP4/3) as they often collaborated throughout their lives.

The Cornelia Hahn Oberlander fonds (1921-2021), named after the acclaimed landscape architect (International Federation of Landscape Architects 2015, 49) known for merging naturalistic designs with modernist ideals (Green 2021), offers a lens into North America’s landscape architecture. Acquired by the Centre for Canadian Architecture in 1997 and transferred in multiple phases between 1996 and 2019, with a final addition in 2021 on her behalf. The fonds was organized and described under the guidance of one same archivist, Catherine Jacob, in various phases (between 2002 and 2021). It is arranged in four series: Landscape architecture projects (AP075.S1), Exhibitions (AP075.S2), Professional activities and office records (AP075.S3), and Reference and research material (AP075.S4). This initial description indicates a primarily professional document-centric archive featuring an impressive array of over 9,000 drawings, 11,772 photographic materials, 7,266 digital files (41 GB), and 22.99 linear meters of textual records, artifacts, sound recordings, and graphic material. A detailed analysis of the records within the first series reveals differences with Jellicoe’s archive, particularly in the presence of textual documents. Of the 254 projects, only 53 lack materials beyond drawings, indicating that most projects (39) are from the first decade (the 1950s), which means before she moved to Vancouver in 1953 (Charles A. Birnbaum, Fox & Oberlander 2009, p. 21). Notably, other 39 projects consist solely of textual documents, showcasing the creator’s attention to this documentary typology in informing the entire process. Examining specific examples, while each project has a general description, the only digitized “textual document” is a site plan (Oberlander, p. 1977), forming part of a textual record. This suggests that the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) may not attribute the same significance to textual records as to drawings or photographs. While not delving as deeply into the other three series, valuable insights into Oberlander’s professional work, purpose, and goals can be gleaned. The sub-series “Administrative records and promotional material” within the records series contains professional correspondence files, agendas, planners, message books, and notebooks, among other records. Equally noteworthy, the “Reference, research material and student work” series encompasses documents Oberlander collected to inspire or inform herself regarding new practices and landscape architecture concepts.
By comparing the organizational structures and general contents of these two archives, we unearth glimpses of Geoffrey Jellicoe’s professional journey, while Oberlander’s archival approach serves as a compelling model for contextualizing the design process through textual records. From these two cases, a pivotal realization emerges: the necessity for comprehensive documentation extends beyond mere drawings as the intrinsic role of landscape architects, much like architects “serves as the formative link between the needs of the client (design) and the technology of the builder or manufacturer (construction)” (Shoskes, 1989, as cited in Lowell, 2015, p. 29). To fully comprehend the contextual landscape of their creations, access to diverse documents is indispensable, encompassing drawings, texts or other sources, and materials stemming from both private and institutional relationships. Notably, Oberlander’s archive embarks on untangling these connections, providing an invaluable precedent for understanding the intricate influences shaping landscape architecture and the unicity of each project. As we explore the biographical aspects of Oberlander, it also becomes evident that numerous facets of her character, or private decisions, precede her projects. These facets manifest as private decisions rooted in familial aspects, exerting influence over choices ranging from the scale and type of project she executed to her approach in managing both work and projects within her self-described “boutique” setting (Birnbaum, Fox & Oberlander 2009, pp. 24-25).

Being able to comprehend the essence of an individual or the specific personal factors that may underlie their decisions can prove crucial in understanding a landscape architect. Such comprehension represents an effective contribution to the discipline’s historical narrative. These insights lay the groundwork for a deeper exploration of the archive of Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles and the need for a holistic understanding of the figure in itself, which will be undertaken in section 3.

2. Landscape architecture and landscape architect: “We Are What We Keep; We Keep What We Are”

Recalling and pluralizing Terry Cook’s (2011) title, “We Are What We Keep; We Keep What We Are”, from the cartography of records, we may need to take a step back to understand what we are archiving. In this context, serving as a preface to the archive and the potential content within architectural drawings, is a brief overview of landscape architecture and its practice. By venturing into some degree of risk-taking, I consider landscape architecture,
similar to Marc Bloch’s (1992, [1954], p. 39) definition of history as a “science of men in time”. As Sonja Dümpelmann (2014, p. 223) concludes in her article on proper nomenclature for landscape architecture: “[t]o understand the relationship between the theory and practice in the field requires a complex of histories that deal with the in-between on multiple scales”. Landscape architecture addresses and intervenes in the complex landscape system, approaching it through a continuous transition of space and time scales. From the past to the present, from the dynamics of microorganisms to telluric transformations, echoing the spirit of the *Annales* school or what Marc Bloch (1992 [1954]) called the “micro- and macro-history”. That is to say, with individual and collective perspectives in dialogue, connecting close-ups and extreme long shots, offering analyses from various scale perspectives – the fringe and the center, the ordinary and the extraordinary.

Through one of the first attempts by Francisco Caldeira Cabral (1943) to define the profession, we can already comprehend this notion of the individual’s transient logic in the face of cultural construction. He begins by stating the difficulty in defining a disciplinary field with diffuse and dynamic limits. Still, I highlight one of those premises that seems very important, given an awareness of an ephemeral practice in space and time, operating as a contribution to a dynamic and complex system evolving beyond one’s time. In Caldeira Cabral (1943, p. 6) words:

(...) we have a differentiating element in landscape architecture – the conception of a work in space and time. And one of the great difficulties of this art is that the artist can rarely see the work; I mean something other than finished because it will never be finished but not even fully developed. Let us think about the time it takes a tree to grow, and we will soon see that a man’s life, and much more his adult life, is manifestly insufficient to be able to see the work he has conceived fully realized.

More so when (Ibid, 1943, p. 11) notes that:

(...) our work does not entirely belong to us. We can only guide a natural evolution in one direction or another. The remaining will inevitably

---

4 Translated by the author from: “[…] temos um elemento diferencial próprio da arquitectura paisagista – a concepção de uma obra no espaço e no tempo. E uma das grandes dificuldades desta arte é que quase nunca o artista pode ver a obra, não digo já terminada porque não o estará nunca, mas nem mesmo em pleno desenvolvimento. Pensemos no tempo que uma árvore leva a crescer e logo veremos que a vida de um homem, e muito mais a sua vida adulta, é manifestamente insuficiente para poder ver plenamente realizada a obra que concebeu”. 
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follow without us (…) Even the men who will follow us will influence our work according to the direction we will have been able to instill\(^5\).

With these last words, Caldeira Cabral outlines a set of skills\(^6\) necessary for interpreting the context/the landscape (the permanent laws of man and nature, in Caldeira Cabral’s words) and being able to engage in a multiplicity of non-verbal interactions. Thus, landscape architecture training is structured to read and interpret the whole through traces (on land or other supports like social habitus, oral histories, or written documents), internalizing knowledge as tacit knowledge. The intentions (actions) are then expressed in projects and plans, commonly including visual language in drawings or sketches.

Now, to understand “what we are” and have an idea of “what we keep”, it is necessary to know the creators/authors (their minds) to recognize their actions. As in Bloch’s (1992 [1954], p. 22) interpretation of history, “[b]ehind the features of landscape, behind tools or machinery, behind what appear to be the most formalized written documents, and behind institutions, which seem almost entirely detached from their founders, there are men, and it is men that history seeks to grasp”. To help historians understand the creator – what has been internalized through education, training, or continued action (tacit knowledge) – information beyond the records (like the drawings) is required. Just as in many other areas, becoming familiar with the mind behind the work is crucial to be able “inserting it into a chronological series or a synchronous whole” (Bloch, 1992 [1954], p. 92).

Terry Cook (1996, p. 136), when claiming a transition from traditional archivists to appraisal theorists, likewise reflects on what failed “[i]n concentrating their appraisal activities on the end-product—the actual record—and the potential for research possibly evident in it, (…) Not surprisingly, they became “too closely tied to the … academic marketplace”. As a result, “archival holdings too often reflected narrow research interests rather than the broad spectrum of human experience”. Focusing on this human experience, Catherine Hobbs (2001, p. 129) goes further, criticizing Cook’s “macro-appraisal” pro-

---

\(^5\) Translated by the author from: “[…] a nossa obra não nos pertence inteiramente. Nós apenas podemos guiar uma evolução natural num ou outro sentido. O resto terá de fatalmente seguir sem nós. (…) Até os homens que depois de nós vierem hão de (sic) influenciar a nossa obra conforme o sentido que tivermos sabido imprimir.

\(^6\) Cabral (1943, pp. 112, 13) mentions the need for an interdisciplinary approach by complementing the artistic training with fields of knowledge necessary for landscape architecture, specifically: botany, phytosociology, pedology, the general economics of water, climatology, cultivation techniques, horticulture, arboriculture, general agriculture, hydraulics, forestry and sociology.
positional based on a public transactional focus, which may be insufficient to understand aspects of the creator’s personal, private and inner life. People’s private lives are not entirely planned or governed by rules, and personal records can reveal how that person positions themselves in society at large. Examples of useful documents are personal notes, diaries, lists and other documental typologies, often “weeding out these notes as un-archival” (2001, p. 130). Moreover, these notes and documents may have, very often, the explanation of an “event”. Recognizing the relevance of these other documents, it is also worth noting their partiality as mere traces amidst a complex continuity and with silenced information to be caught in the undertones.

In archiving this documentation, the archivist must also be guided by and responsive to the structure of thought preceding the document in constructing and formulating it, as outlined by the interrelational thinking of landscape construction. Similarly, Catherine Hobbs concluded from her experience with the Carol Shields’ archive that archivists “must respond to the literary mind behind the literary fonds” (Hobbs 2014, p. 278). On the other hand, as historian John Dean Davis (2021, p. 83) states, approaching archival records requires prior knowledge of how to read “evidence not simply as a string of simple decisions but a pathway through a complex world of attitudes and dispositions created by a multitude of contexts that prominently include school and professional practice” proposing the possibility of an empathetic analysis. In the field of archival science and the archivist role, it shares Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor’s (2016, p. 33) proposal to an “affective responsibility toward radical empathy” that archivists should adopt in its fourfold expression – with the record creator, the record subject, the user and larger communities.

In summary, according to the previous theories and considering both perspectives – from the historian and the archivist – an empathic approach is more effectively achieved when dealing with personal archives rather than professional records. Moreover, while some professional records beyond the drawings can provide a more straightforward narrative of the drawing itself, a personal archive can also offer valuable information about the professional role. In some cases, it might even entirely alter the course of history. Although not seeking to change historical paths, showing empathy toward the creator could readjust the understanding of each record or the intentions of its creator. Drawing from an experience of working in an apparently “chaotic” archive, I recognize the significance of understanding contexts – many of which are shaped by biographical and functional aspects. Sometimes, it is necessary to backtrack to the original organization, and specific contex-
tual changes can lead to a revised interpretation of a record, as will be exemplified in section 3.1.

Expanding on this premise and aligning with Terry Cook’s (1998) standpoint that archivists should prioritize considering their role as active promoters of social memory and focusing on document creation processes, I will now direct my attention to the case study, namely, the Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles’ archive. The materiality of any archive and the “information” it holds influence the process of crafting history. In a personal archive, we gain insight into how creators perceive their environment through cultural, ideological, or biological lenses, impacting their decision-making. With additional knowledge or exploration, certain gaps or details extending beyond human circumstances might emerge, unveiling a more comprehensive understanding of the network’s dynamics (including biotic and abiotic, cultural, social, and political aspects). This comprehension is pivotal in navigating the complexities of landscape dynamics and recording its history.

3. Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles’ Archive

I begin this part by briefly contextualizing the Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles archive and how it changed, concluding with an example of how it changes...
by moving the focus from collecting and archiving professional documents toward documenting a person’s life.

The current archive was received in two accessions: the first in 2006 (by the creator’s will) and the second in 2022 (following Telles’ passing); the first consisted solely of landscape architectural drawings. The first accession, the creator’s responsibility, was handed over by Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles, aligning perhaps more closely with the contemporaneous perspective and resembling Jellicoe’s archive than to the Cornelia Hahn Oberlander fonds, despite the fact that both incorporations were prior to the GRT’s. This first accession comprises 2,801 drawings from projects authored or co-authored by Gonçalo Ribeiro and others today under state custody designated as the “Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles: Archive”. The loan agreement between Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles and the Directorate-General for National Buildings and Monuments was formalized in a public ceremony on January 25th 2006. Following Ribeiro Telles’ passing in February 2021, the records in his home office were appraised and selected for inclusion in the collection of drawings. This second accession, managed by his heirs, was held in February 2022.

While this corpus of documentation is currently being described and organized, it comprises a variety of personal, institutional, and professional

Governments, he was elected to the Assembly of the Republic, representing the PPM. In the VIII Constitutional Government, he held the position of Minister of State for Quality of Life. At the local level, he contested the mayoralty of Lisbon in the 1985 and 1989 elections. In 1993, he did so under the banner of The Party of the Earth Movement, which he established that year. In 1985, he served as an independent deputy in the parliamentary group of the Socialist Party.

His dedication to politics did not diminish his commitment to landscape architecture, as he continued to engage in impactful projects.

In the academic realm, he established the Biophysical Planning degree in 1975, as well as both the Landscape Architecture and Biophysical Engineering degrees in 1981, all at the University of Évora, where he served as a professor. He retired in 1992, subsequently receiving an honorary doctorate in 1994 and being granted the title of professor emeritus in 1998. He also assumed the role of coordinating professor of the Landscape Architecture Section at the Higher Institute of Agronomy of the Technical University of Lisbon from 1988 to 1991. Throughout his lifetime, he lectured at various other universities.

Throughout his life, Telles adeptly balanced his roles as a landscape architect, academic, and politician, actively engaging in numerous activities, causes, and projects. His ongoing influence within these fields was acknowledged through numerous awards, including the prestigious landscape architecture award Sir Geoffrey Jellicoe Award in 2013.

Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles passed away on November 11th, 2020, leaving a legacy defined by his contributions to landscape architecture, academia, and his country’s political and social transformation.

8 Following the demise of DGMEN (Decree-law 223/2007, May 30th), the archive became under the custody of the Housing and Urban Rehabilitation Institute (IHRU). In 2015 (Decree-law 102/2015, June 5th), the Information System for Architectural Heritage (SIPA) was transferred from IHRU to the Directorate General of Cultural Heritage (DGPC).
documents that encompass his roles as a landscape architect, educator, academic, and politician. He was actively involved in numerous activities, causes, and projects.

According to Armando Malheiro da Silva’s (1999; 2004) systemic approach, and in order to organize and understand documentation, an inquiry was first conducted on the creator’s biographical aspects, existing documentation, and the context of creation. This helped in grasping the general trajectory of his life and systematizing it into the organic functional classification/framework (Figure 1). Today, this feature enables a comprehensive view of the creator’s areas of action, social and professional relationships, and extensive production in each of these spheres, as well as external recognition. It is also dynamic and therefore susceptible to structural changes whenever previously unknown information is found or when a hitherto unnoticed document, when in context, provides new information.

One of the most immediate conclusions drawn from systematizing the creator’s competencies and roles is that they all contribute to the same personality and actions, making it impossible to understand the landscape architect in isolation from his other roles. As referred to above, GRT was involved in different roles simultaneously and all these spheres of action are part of the indivisible person and, by consequence, of an archive, which is never less than personal. Moreover, approaching this complex system of records certainly upholds the relevance of the documents produced in the scope of professional practice.

Rather than conducting a detailed analysis of the archive, which is beyond the scope of this chapter, I can advance that from the classification of the 2,801 drawings, they all relate to GRT adult phase, specifically as a student of the Higher Institute of Agronomy (SSSC 01.02.01), as a landscape architect at the Lisbon city council (SSSSC 01.02.04.01), the majority of them as a freelancer (SSSSC 01.02.04.02), some from the period with Francisco Manuel Caldeira Cabral’s office (SSSSSC 01.02.04.02.01) and produced for the Green Infrastructure in Lisbon and Metropolitan Area (SSSSC 01.02.04.07). A few were produced as Director of the Biophysical Planning and Green Spaces sector of the Housing Promotion Fund (FFH) (SSSSC 01.02.04.04).

---

9 Regarding small details Catherine Hobbs (2001) refers to, I recently described a press proof of an interview with GRT, in which he overwrote the “Arch” acronym preceding his name in every page’s header.
Figure 1: Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles archive: Functional-Organic Chart.
In order to justify the emphasis on this approach, simultaneously showing how perilous the interpretation of records can be, in this case, the landscape architecture drawings individually, I will focus on a drawing to analyze what can be revealed when records are interrelated.

3.1. Decoding a project drawing: insights into content

I examine architectural drawings and their most common association with architectural practice in this section. I aim to critically assess the ‘old diplomatic’ differentiation by record typology. In personal archives, we encounter documents created out of functional or utilitarian necessity. However, it is also important to note that documental typology may not necessarily determine the function behind its production. The particular case analyzed is that of the drawing “Integração do Parque de Monsanto na cidade” [Integration of Monsanto Park into the city] (PT GRT-02-0436 DES.002130) (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: “Integração do Parque de Monsanto na cidade” [Integration of Monsanto Park into the city] (PT GRT-02-0436 DES.002130). Source: SIPA/DGPC.
This undated drawing was handed over by Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles to the DGEMN in the first accession (in 2005 and formalized by contract in 2006). In research to date documents and from interviews conducted to understand the origin of the documents (Fonseca, 2021), we can confirm Rua Filipe Folque as its place of origin. To frame the situation, this group of documents entering the Forte de Sacavém had two physical origins: Rua Filipe Folque atelier and Rua Bernardo de Lima (where the documents produced in the Rua do Comércio\textsuperscript{10} office were temporarily stored).

\textsuperscript{10} Office where GRT coordinated the team in charge of the Green Infrastructure in Lisbon and Metropolitan Area projects (1996-2002), under protocol with Lisbon City Council. Due to a quick eviction action, documents had to be quickly removed when Pedro Santana Lopes assumed the City Council presidency in January 2002.

Figure 3: Frames from the interview. Source: RTP Arquivo.
Its provenance and document type (DIN A1 format drawing, in nanquim ink on tracing paper) immediately suggest it resulted from his landscape architectural practice, especially as it was stored in his office. However, when attempting to restore its production context, the first question is why it was not found in the Rua do Comércio office where GRT developed, from the 1990s, the Monsanto green corridor project (Castro, 2013, p. 213). In this reconstitution attempt, despite recent references that it was idealized in 1976 (Borges, 2012) or that it was already foreseen in 1976’s “Municipal Master Plan” (Castro, 2013, p. 213)\textsuperscript{11}, I find the first (visual) reference to the proposal on July 23rd, 1977, in an interview with Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles conducted by Fernando Pessa (1977) (see Figure 3). Then, from the so far examined and dated sources, one can find references in two of the GRT’s articles published in “A Capital” (Telles, 1979; 1981), the newspaper where he regularly wrote about the city of Lisbon. In the 1985 municipal elections (December 15th), Telles was the Popular Monarchist Party candidate for Lisbon City Council (SSSSSC 01.02.06.05.02). In this candidacy, he presented, among others, the Parque Eduardo VII – Monsanto Green Corridor and the Peripheral Park proposals (Telles, 1985). In the electoral result, GRT got a seat in the Municipal Assembly as an alderman. During the Nuno Krus Abecasis presidency, however, he was unable to get any of his proposals approved.

To summarize the ambiguity of contextualizing a singular drawing, the proposal has a high political slant, yet it is also the practical application of landscape architecture principles, the learnings that Francisco Caldeira Cabral (1980) summarizes as the “Continuum naturale” (including the cultural continuum) or GRT in the concept of “Paisagem global” [Global landscape] (Telles, 1992; 1996). The previously mentioned proposal was later developed and built during his activity as the coordinator responsible for the Office of Green Structures of Lisbon and the Metropolitan Area (SSSSC 01.02.04.07).

In this example, it is prominent how distorting the separation of documentation sets and/or their partial or thematic analysis can be and how it can pervert an understanding of a coherent, persevering and transdisciplinary attitude Ribeiro Telles maintained in the exercise of the various functions. Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles was associated with creative exercise, political decision-making, and academic functions (among other roles). This fact puts effort

\textsuperscript{11} I do not entirely agree, as the Lisbon General Urbanization Plan (PGUCL) (Meyer-Heine Plan, 1967–77), foresaw a green corridor along proposed wide roadways. This differs from the “Monsanto Green Corridor” proposal, mainly because these road infrastructure constructions were among Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles’ criticisms (Pessa, 1977).
into the archiving process and the definition of the classification plan, often with vague boundaries, but which must be considered on its uniqueness. During this phase of work, doubts remain as to whether it is plausible to differentiate in which context many documents were produced or, in some cases, if we can separate private from public or individual from institutional initiatives. This is a common challenge in personal archives, particularly in individuals with artistic creations, as reflected in the question posed by Heloísa Bellotto (1998, p. 21) in the debate with Terry Cook and Ariane Ducrot. With no absolute solutions, she wonders if, in the time of “total archives”, we should keep discussing records’ classification by typologies, considering the problems it can cause. The point is particularly important when dealing with records of artistic expression or documents not necessarily created for utilitarian or functional reasons. In light of these genesic issues, it seems more important to accept that these documents echo the intertwining trajectory of GRT, i.e., that is grounded on the individual’s very own singularity (Cook, 1997, p. 34).

4. Conclusion

While not seeking absolute conclusions, this study aims to share research inquiries derived from ongoing practical experiences that can enrich the discourse on personal archives. The generic tenet to consider is that history, like landscape, is a continuous process; thus, we can only take traces of evidence from the archives. Thereupon, these records prompt us to inquire about what should constitute a documental corpus and what will be materialized in the process of memory construction.

Upon analyzing the contrast between the prevalent practice of collecting archives of landscape architects, which may also be analogous to other disciplinary fields, discernible differences emerge. These differences range from archives primarily composed of project drawings (as seen in the collections of Geoffrey Jellicoe or the initial accession of documents from Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles) to more extensively documented archives (as exemplified by the Cornelia Hahn Oberlander’s archive). Such variations can be attributed to both the tradition of archival institutions and the enduring “custodial” tradition still rooted in certain institutions and minds – with the tendency to focus on the static dimension of the documents, accepting fragments of archives and practices of preservation rooted in predetermined potential use – but also shaped by the donors’ perspectives. A preliminary
conclusion that can be drawn is that a transition towards personal archives, centered on the individual as a unified entity, promises a more comprehensive collective memory for the future.

Based on Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles’ archive and the methodological approaches in use, it becomes apparent that when contemplating an individual’s archive, it is vital not to assume the necessity of actively creating landscape architecture archives. Instead, emphasis should be placed on the archives of professionals who have bequeathed documents related to landscape architecture during their lifetimes. However, this assertion does not diminish the fact that there exist documents with their specificities (such as drawings, blueprints, descriptive memories, correspondence with clients, suppliers or colleagues, news clippings, and biophysical studies, among others) and the added challenges in archiving these documents to enable and share all the information they incorporate. Instead, it tries to find a more cohesive method of providing as much information as possible, not circumscribing it to a sectarian view of the project.

In the Gonçalo Ribeiro Telles archive, the idiosyncratic nature of its creator’s life and work, coupled with the composition of the archive’s documentary corpus, identifying it as a “landscape architect’s archive” would compromise access to information only in favor of a specialized audience oriented to a specific subject. Questions about the past, present and future may constantly arise in history. The case study of the drawing explored in 3.1 has tried to exemplify that even if not ultimately aimed at garnering factual answers to all of them; archives may be prepared to keep traces to stimulate intellectual curiosity and provide more informed responses upon each activation. In this sense, it also seems crucial to adopt two additional imperatives: approach archives from a transdisciplinary perspective and underscore the representation of individuals’ information and the organic-functional contexts of the archives, both in archiving and research. This approach diverges from a selection and evaluation process based on the cultural value of a personal archive.

Lastly, when considering the organic characteristics of these archives, they should be treated in alignment with personal archival principles, reflecting the unique nature of the creator and the information they contain. This involves exploring the interactions between the individual and the events of their life – both professionally and personally – and the manner in which they documented these interactions (Hobbs, 2001, p. 127), rather than being primarily based on the cultural value of a personal archive and from a patrimonialist, historicist perspective.
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