The choice of the Teatro Carlo Felice in Genoa as a research topic is due to a recurring peculiarity: almost always the same words, the same texts, explained the project. A paper, *Il Teatro Carlo Felice. Storia e Progetti*, told the history of the theater from the design by Carlo Barabino to the outcome of the competition in 1984. It was therefore possible to extend the period of historical research also to the final design and the construction site. But there were other important issues. The authors of the catalogue ended their essay mentioning Marc Bloch and his *Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien*, claiming to want to "understand" rather than "evaluate", freeing the historical research of "the mass of resolutions and polemics "and entrusting the project to the" voices of the designers themselves. " A matter of point of view: this choice of method meant for them to work as an historian rather than an architecture critic.
Is really the task of architecture historian to separate the architectural work from its historical time and to choose between all of the sources only those produced by the designers? Does not this choice involve perhaps the reduction of the complexity of architecture, operating then an impairment of the effort to understand, the same effort that according to Marc Bloch founded the legitimacy of historical science? Could the historical research use the words of the designers without analysing them, without recognising their value of intellectual property's claim inwards a process of negotiation between social actors? To see the architect as the one and only author interpreter, isn't it a proof of the writer's affinity more to art criticism than historian? These are the questions that lie at the basis of this work. In addition, there are also questions of historiographical convictions behind it: “to write, to design and to build are three stages of organization and representation of reality, whose contiguity appears increasingly fragile, however, and to prove it every time.”. One often uses the script to explain the project, which in turn foreshadows the building. The preponderance of the iconography, the architect's sketches, intended as a vehicle of the attribution and interpretation of architecture, is definitely reconsidered in this work, preferring instead to an analysis that draws attention to some fundamental aspects related to the conception of a public building is able to realize: the complex attribution of authorship, conflicts within the administrative division of a state that one would like monolithic, the legitimacy of practices through formal bureaucratic procedures and actions of the actors, public and private stakeholders in the process.

These choices have led to a peculiar division of the thesis. Each chapter is linked to the production of documents in a single repository to highlight as both sources and archives are always constructed, because the production and storage of documents
are intentional processes. However, a so strict choice did not result in the waiver of the connections between the documents of various archives.

The non-naturalistic approach to historical sources made it possible to subtract architecture and its explanation to the rhetoric of self-representation of the architect and his work, trying to show the "scale" of the various interpretations, created within the different documentary productions, that cover architecture.
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