

TECTONICS AS A POLITICAL ACT

ARRIÈRE-GARDE OR AVANT-GARDE?

DOMINIQUE BONNAMOUR-LLOYD
AND HARRIS DIMITROPOULOS

Georgia Tech

244

Tectonic theory proposes a solution to the problems of meaning and significance in architecture. This paper investigates a two-fold question: Is current tectonic theory politically motivated and, if so, what are its political affiliations and is it connected to the Avant-garde or to the Arrière-Garde? There are many reasons why these two questions are connected. Suffice it to mention that the major proponent of tectonic theory, Kenneth Frampton, has invoked directly and indirectly both the issue of politics and the issue of the Avant-Garde.¹ The answer to these questions is complicated by the fact that tectonic theory appears as a self-referential discourse. It tends to confine meaning to the architectural act per se, to the medium itself.

The methodology followed here is a combination of empiricism and eidetic reduction. We chose this as the framework that would allow two voices to interact and to organize data and observations. Eidetic reduction, rooted in phenomenology, allows us to engage tectonics from within. It belongs to the larger intellectual framework preferred by tectonics. By using eidetic reduction, for instance, one can determine the proper use of different materials and one can gain insight in the forces operating in a joint.

Our treatment of this topic is fueled by a desire to make a positive contribution. To use the Kuhnian "paradigm," if we consider tectonic theory the current architectural paradigm, one of us seeks to refine it, while the other seeks to problematize it.²

Readings of tectonics

Tectonic theorists articulate divergent viewpoints. Frampton investigates significant examples of architecture that manifest tectonic attributes.³ Sekler distinguishes between structure, construction, and tectonics and extracts three main qualities of tectonic artifacts: 1) construction as implementation of structure; 2) expression of the play of forces and arrangement of parts; and 3) poetry.⁴ Frascari emphasizes the act of construction, crystallized by the joint, essential manifestation of the making of the artifact.⁵ Others link aesthetic expressions to technological behaviors.

These definitions, nonetheless, suggest common assumptions: 1) revealing, expressing, or suggesting the act of making a building in the architectural form is tectonic architecture; 2) the expressiveness of structure

need to be more than a purely rational phenomenon, but one imbued with poetry; 3) tectonic buildings offer coherence between the whole and the parts which manifests the integration of the art and the science of building; 4) the theory offers a mean of resistance to scenographic architecture and foregrounds the phenomenological attributes of architectural spaces; and 5) tectonic manifestations reclaim the authenticity and hence the significance of the discipline of architecture lost with consumerist simulation and easy *commodity-signs*.

The last point, the resistance to manifestations of capitalism, calls into question the political agenda of the theory. Specifically, in his *Rappel à l'Ordre* Frampton states that the tectonic is meant to resist the manifestations of late capitalism.⁶ Modernist rejection of bourgeois seduction for fake appearances and the Marxist tone of rejection of the dominant class immediately comes to mind.⁷ Historically it has been the role of the architectural and artistic Avant-Garde to challenge capitalist institutions and to confront the dominant class. In that sense, tectonic theory seems to relate to the historical Avant-garde. Yet, defining the identity of the architectural artifact by its elements (structure, joint, material, stereotomic or tectonic assembly) and their constructional logic appears self-referential, apolitical. This focus on the medium of architecture could be construed as neutral. Conversely, references to the origin of the act and to the notion of craft can be construed as Arrière-Garde for they carry a nostalgic tone, one that looks at the past. This act of "resistance to capitalism" will be examined in conjunction with the other attributes of a tectonic object, and in light of the theories of the avant-garde.

Readings of Avant-garde and Arrière-Garde

The transformation of the Avant-Garde through time has resulted in three identifiable stages. The historical Avant-Garde, the Neo-Avant-Garde and the second Neo-Avant-Garde.

The historical Avant-Garde is characterized by the following: Tendency for radical breaks with tradition and with the past, confrontation of all norms, historical exclusivity, ideology of progress, agonism, faith in new technologies, in the future and in utopia.⁸

The Neo-Avant-Garde focuses mostly on the

elimination of distinction between the producer of art and the recipient of art, on chance, allegory and montage. It upholds most of the tenets of the historical avant-garde.⁹

What Hal Foster has named “second Neo-Avant-Garde” is yet another transformation, succumbing this time more to the constraints of the times. Grand oppositions to institutions and to politics give way to subtle displacements. This is the Post-Historical form of the Avant-Garde.¹⁰

If disruption and discontinuity are characteristics of the Avant-Garde, the notion of Arrière-Garde could be framed as the propensity to follow the values of the past and of tradition.

I. THE POLITICS OF TECTONICS Tectonics, politics and the Avant-Garde

The grounding of tectonic theory speaks more of its connections to tradition and less of a confrontational political attitude. Yet the issues of righting the wrongs of our culture and of resisting the globalization inherent in late capitalism, are among its most powerful motivations.

The question of the avant-garde and its connection to tectonics and politics, has been central to the development to Frampton's theory. The ambivalence in defining a position that is both political and Avant-Gard; the attempt to reconcile some apparently irreconcilable differences leads to a very peculiar framework.

We are to understand that correct tectonic behavior is tantamount to Avant-Gardist resistance to the dominant economic and political climate. There is a weakness to this insofar as it ignores the issue of agency. Just consider the predicament of architects to depend on the capitalist system for their fees and for the implementation of their designs. It is one thing for an artist to produce the nonconsumable object outside the circle of capitalist production, legitimation and consumption. This is a completely different proposition for an architect for whom such a critical move usually has to reside in paper form, in a manifestation that stands in direct contradiction with the tenets of tectonics.¹¹

In cultural/semantic terms, one has to assume that the “the public” is able to discern the subversive and critical dimensions of the tectonic move. Tectonic theory does not address another issue which is the question of recipient. “Who is the intended addressee?” To put this in a different terminology: Do we have any assurance that tectonic moves are part of the current Symbolic Order?

The notion of agency is also absent. In fact, it becomes apparent that the unaddressed source of power enabling the production of the tectonic project is the very capitalist system and bourgeois culture which the theory criticizes in the first place.

Avant-Garde: The Challenge of Capitalist Institutions

While avant-garde art critiques the institutions of conventional medium, tectonic theory focuses on critiques of main stream practices. Foster specifies that “convention and institution cannot be separated but neither are they identical.”¹² Specifically directed against post-modernist architecture which is viewed as a reduction to signs

without content, tectonic theory reaffirms the role of architecture as a means of cultural expression that finds meaning outside textual and/or symbolic *appliques*. This suggests not so much a revolutionary attitude against institutions but against manifestations of late-capitalism.

This may not reflect an Arrière-Garde attitude as much as the shift from an economy of production to one of consumption. Sociologist Manuel Castell advances the position that governments no longer have control over the dominant culture of a global economy.¹³ Hence, the institution, rather than being identified with specific public representatives has shifted towards an intangible mode of power that takes all the faceless properties of intangible networks. With irony, Castell refers to the “good old day of [workers'] exploitation,” when the enemy was clearly identified. We are now in a world of exclusion. Those who do not participate in the global economy are marginalized and become erring bodies with no relevance to society. This condition transforms the game of resistance drastically and is different protest than that of historical Avant-Gardists. This suggest that current resistance is Neo-Avant-Gardist.

Capitalism has followed a trajectory from an early form, where production was predominant, to a late form which privileges consumption, to new forms of globalization. Frampton is aware of this evolution. He acknowledges the lack of autonomy of the architectural artifact, the social nature of architecture, and deplors the current privatization of society that deprives architecture from expressing a public realm that no longer exists.¹⁴ He concludes by stating that in the current chaos and confusion, the purpose of architecture is to create stability and tranquillity. These comments suggest that Frampton is conscious of the socio-economic position of the discipline. His affiliation with the Frankfurt school indicates a conviction that there are no “innocent” political acts. Tectonic theory thus, appears to be a negative means of resistance, an act of abstention rather than one of engagement and in that sense relates to negative Avant-Garde.

Meaning in the Medium: High Culture and Low Culture

What impact then might tectonic theory have? Burger takes on the romantic rhetoric of the Avant-Garde of rupture and revolution. “For Burger, the aim of the avant-garde is to destroy the institution of autonomous art in order to reconnect art and life.”¹⁵ Tectonic theory wishes to break the increasing tendencies for scenographic effects. In doing so, it does not so much reconnect art and surrounding life as it attempts to link the art of architecture to a phenomenological, more interior life. The dictate is one of silence, of realness. Materiality speaks of substance. In their presence or absence, materials have the power to communicate to human beings. This phenomenological approach is hard to debate since it invokes subjectivity. In this attempt, tectonic theory recalls the historical Avant-garde, whose “most important function” according to Greenberg “was not to experiment, but to find a path along which it would be possible to keep current culture moving in the midst of ideological confusion and violence.”¹⁶ To seek meaning in the medium is to advance

the *high art* nature of architecture and its cultural role. Because it resists kitsch, it seems elitist. As such, it is subject to the same criticism as Avant-garde art and architecture, deemed elitist in their abstraction and absence of literal representation. Its primary aim though is to keep culture moving.

Purity of the medium

Tectonic theory metonymically exchanges the notion of purity for truth. Ruskin considered truth in the use of materials a virtue.¹⁷ Heidegger refers to truth as “unconcealment” and this definition alone influences tectonics significantly.¹⁸ Le Corbusier upholds purity in the Purist Manifesto.¹⁹

Frampton, the most prolific voice in the field, repeatedly refers to Clement Greenberg and to Giorgio Grassi. Greenberg, the art critic, in his 1939 essay “Avant-Garde and Kitsch” introduced the notions of “High-Art,” intended for the intellectual elite and Kitsch, which was the art preferred by the masses.²⁰ His idea of purity of the medium, is a combination of Russian Formalism, poetic use of language proper without the overt intervention of thematic content,²¹ and German Romanticism, which proclaimed the definite boundaries of each artistic medium.²² Grassi’s essay “Avant-Garde and Continuity” advocates a return to a path followed by architecture from the ages past, in which architecture becomes the object of its own contemplation.²³

Both texts invoke the timeless in art that could be captured only if one stayed within the field. This stance preserves the quality of art and architecture for both, but leads to a political paradox. Greenberg, motivated by the confrontational potential of the avant-garde against the bourgeoisie, ends up concluding that it’s only possible ally is the wealthy upper class. This alignment is essentially an attribute of the Arrière-Garde. Grassi proposes that architecture should enter into a conflict with the dominant superstructure. This would be accomplished by clarity and didacticism, which, as will be shown later, are closer to conservative thought.

II. ARRIERE GARDE VS AVANTGARDE? Arrière-Garde: Myths of Origin - Authenticity

One can, reductively, distinguish two ways of positing tectonic theory. The first, presented by Frascari and Sekler, is grounded more on a diachronic evolution and does not make any avant-garde claims. It falls mostly under the ideas of self-referentiality. The second way, proposed by Frampton, is the one that invokes the avant-garde and the notion of a grounding.

It is based on Semper’s four mythified categories, the skeleton, the mound, the hearth and the skin, considered pivotal in the conception and the execution of architecture. Frampton assimilates Semper’s postulation as a mythical origin and proclaims the joint to be the most important part of a building. In fact he proposes that the joint is more than a mere connection and that it holds the essence of the building, spiritual value and that it becomes the point of ontological condensation.²⁴

The critical myth of the tectonic joint points to just

this timeless, time-bound moment, excised from the continuity of time”²⁵

The resurrection of mythology today, in our post-historical times, is quite problematic. Historical knowledge is considered to be the end of mythology.²⁶ Myths of origin, in order to function in this environment, rely on their potential to invoke a quasi-religious/aural state for the subject as well as for the object.

The joint is deemed the origin of the building by the use of synecdoche and eidetic reduction. Synecdoche, permits, rhetorically, the connection of part to whole. Eidetic reduction, a phenomenological operation, permits us to consider the joint as the primal architectonic act. Since architecture, according to tectonics, has to be about material and construction, two distinct objects coming together are the beginning of architecture. They manifest architectural intentionality and authenticity.

These references to mythological truth are quite telling when it comes to the assessment of the political/Avant-Garde facets of tectonics. The avant-garde would be more concerned with demythification rather than remythification.

Political implications of revealing the joint

Seeking the origin of the search of origin is using the very tools that it criticizes amongst the tenants of tectonic theory. While it attempts to uncover some of the premises of the theory, it focuses on the form rather than the substance. The quest for truth in a society that surrounds us with perverted interpretations of truth might be particularly difficult. The quest for ethic in a world regulated by economic principles deprived of morality might also seem naïve. Should they be negated on the sole basis of their impracticality? May be it requires the *courage* that Greenberg mentions, because now as for the historical avant-garde, the “emigration from bourgeoisie to bohemia meant an emigration from the markets of capitalism.”²⁸

May be one needs to introduce praxis into this theoretical debate to confront tectonics to current reality. Revealing the Act of making brings up the question of *craft vs. manufacturing*. Industrialization might be viewed as the cause for the commodification of artifacts. Both Frascari and Frampton invoke craft; they focus on the semantic role of the joint for its original and essential capacity to symbolize the act of making. Discussing textile arts, Semper emphasized the role of the joint 150 years ago. In textile or tensile structures, the joint is indeed the condition of revelation of the play of forces. One could argue that it is as significant in tectonic frames or stereotomic construction. Nonetheless, Frampton and Frascari celebrate the joint exemplified in the work of Carlo Scarpa in its *phenomenological intensity*. While Scarpa’s work demonstrates tectonic authenticity, it serves as a critique of technological utopia. Ensuring a seamless flow between the act of drafting and the act of making, rejecting any systematization associated with modernist functionalism and production, Scarpa relies on local craft, on luxurious custom solutions. His “enchanted disenchantment” towards the contemporary world also contributes to a nostalgic position of tectonic theory

within architectural culture.

These celebrated constructive processes require an amount of craft and of labor that is no longer realistic. As such, it is not tailored nor accessible to middle class users. By denying the conditions of constructibility and professional practice common to the Western world, tectonic theory puts itself in a marginal position of exclusion, as did the tenants of Avant-garde when emigrating to bohemia.

Arrière-Garde: Paleonymics-Authenticity

Vico's use of etymology as a means for grounding finds its way into tectonic theory as well. Meagher and Frascari also use paleonymics for their arguments.²⁸ It is mostly used as a means of reinforcing the aural state of the object. For instance, in reference to the "The Origin of the Work of Art," Frampton writes:

This essay contains further insights that are pertinent to the tectonic. The first turns on the related Greek verb tikto, meaning to produce. ... It also implies knowledge in the sense of revealing what is latent within a work; that is to say it implies althaea or knowing in the sense of an ontological revealing.²⁹

It is quite necessary to point out herethat the etymology of the two words is somewhat skewed. Frampton uses paleonymic supplementarity—in other words, he expands by virtue of poetic license the definition of these words. There is nothing inherently wrong with this; in fact it produces a seductive text but it does not constitute proof.³⁰ Furthermore, the cited passage invokes the aural; what Theodor Adorno describes as the "Jargon of Authenticity."

Expressions and situations, drawn from a no longer existent daily life, are forever blown up as if they were empowered and guaranteed by some absolute which is kept silent out of reverence.³¹

Once again, tectonic theory seems to be indebted more to conservative traditionalist thinking and less to the radical ruptures inherent in the Avant-Garde.

Authenticity and Avant-garde dogma

Constructive propositions inherently contain a reductive process, open to criticism. Articulating choices infer exclusion, and articulating them clearly may lead to simplification. Seeking the fundamentals of architecture participates of such phenomenon. While speculative devices used to build an argument should be presented as such, the use of axioms need not be abandoned entirely because there is no single cannon of truth. In fact, a diverse world forces to define terms clearly, provided one attempts to communicate. The rejection of clarity common to some post-modernists is no less elitist than the search for authenticity. The search for "some higher absolute" would be politically dangerous if it were meant to be dogmatic. However, Sekler reminds us that tectonic theory is meant to be analytical, not dogmatic. Reading these texts as manifestoes is instilling them with intentions

that were never claimed. In fact, the absence of dogma might be the very reason why we find such discrepancies among the tenants of tectonics. The search for authenticity itself may seem too naïve or utopian. Modernists have been heavily criticized for this. It is helpful though to remember that the hardest criticisms have targeted the development of the International Movement, the interpretation of which the original founders of Modernism could not predict.

Ideology of technical progress

Professor Ali Mazrui identified three cultural attitudes towards time.³² The first, *Anticipation*, looks at the future. It is ready to sacrifice the present for future benefits; it underscores Christian ethics for instance where redemption justifies present suffering, but also the historical Avant-Garde, grounded in futuristic and utopian anticipation. The second, *Presentism*, gives into present pressures and immediate gratification; it is support current economy operations. The third, *Nostalgia*, looks as the past, ancestors and traditions as a means to establish historical continuity.

One can construe the absence of faith in technological progress underlying tectonic theory as *Nostalgia*. Another approach to this technological skepticism would be to affirm that it is placed within post-modernist discourses. To the Vitruvian trilogy firmity-commodity-delight, the Modernists at the instigation of Gropius, substituted a functional trilogy firmity (i.e. construction) + commodity (i.e. function) = delight (i.e. form). In antithesis to this equation, Venturi proposed ambiguity. Sekler seems to recognize Venturi's perspective, yet without giving in *Presentism's* pressures for absence of substance. When he argues that *poetry* distinguishes tectonic buildings from mere buildings, he recognizes the limits of pure constructive logic and transcends rational deduction. It suggests a radical departure from Corbusier's ideology that technology would bring happiness to human kind.

Sekler's claim for the theory to serve as analytical rather than dogmatic tool also refutes accusations of Arrière-Guardism. Sekler acknowledges three strategies for tectonic manifestation: 1) expression; 2) negation; 3) overstatement.³³ In doing so, he places the theory within a contemporary critical discourse that recognizes ambiguity and complexity rather than endorses a rationality derived from the Enlightenment. The shift towards poetics is not exclusive, it is non-reductive. In Sekler's case, it is not prescriptive either. This absence of dogma places the theory within the present condition and appears neutral rather than politically charged.

CONCLUSION

Tectonic as Neo-Avant-Garde Theory

This critical dissection of tectonic theory is not meant to destroy the message nor to minimize its impact (at least for this author). In fact, it is currently the only voice of resistance to seductive images and easy scenographic games that reduce architecture to a mere play of facades and decorated sheds. This courageous search for authenticity might seem unattainable to some in a post-industrial society consumed by visual effects and the power of images and appearances. Even though they

may be subject to criticism, substance and materiality are still worth seeking, as they were for Avant-Gardists. Difficult as it may, the search for authenticity is probably no harder today than yesterday.

The complexity of engaging an effective resistance that challenges institutions today has been underscored: the *system* has no face, late-capitalism is about consumerism, and architects' position is more tenuous than ever. Avant-Gardists were facing other violence and challenges. Tectonic theorists as did Avant-Gardists adopt a critical position. While circumstances differ, the attempt at maintaining a high culture is similar. This paper underscores some paradoxes of tectonics theory with the ambition of uncovering its aim. A better awareness of the underlying assumptions and of the political implications of this theory may allow architects and students in particular to confront the discipline's *presentist* challenges. It proposes a Neo-Avant-Garde attitude of negation towards capitalism and the price to pay for such a position might well be bohemia.

On the other hand, Ed Ford (who does not claim to be one of the tenants of tectonic theory), conducts thorough and serious analyses of equally significant examples to those shown by Frampton, that are posited within the current reality of production.³⁴ As such, his message, however humbler, may lead to more intrinsic reconsideration of the value of tectonic theory within praxis and the production of significant architectural objects. This suggests that tectonic theory holds enough substance and intentions that it can be carried through various political avenues.

Tectonic as Arrière-Garde theory

There is no doubt that tectonic theory is based on a critical stance relative to the current artistic and political climate. This is the only part of the theory which justifies any connection with the Avant-Garde. Otherwise it is essentially non-transgressive, in fact it affirms the framework which it starts out to criticize. Even the most tempered, current, realistic, iteration of the Avant-Garde, maintains a transgressive program.

*...not as a rupture produced by a heroic avant-garde outside the symbolic order but as a fracture traced by a strategic avant-garde within the order.*³⁵

The difficulty in maintaining an avant-garde posture is compounded by the absence of agency and by the failure to describe the recipient of the architectural act. In other words it is inherently difficult to maintain an avant-garde position if one does not define how the change is to be effectuated and if one does not answer the question "Who is it for?" with a degree of specificity. The Arrière-Garde on the other hand does not have to raise these questions since they are either irrelevant or their answer is considered to be satisfactorily met in the past.

Tectonic theory presents itself as conducive to the architecturally and culturally meaningful act, one which signifies as well. On the contrary, the work of the avant-garde is characterized by traumatic events which, at first, fail to signify.³⁶

Habermas distinguishes between the "young" and

the "old" conservatives. The former evoke notions of "*Being or the Dionysiac force of the poetical*" while the latter recommend a position anterior to modernity.³⁷ The invocation of the poetic in the articulation and appreciation of the instrumentality of the joint, as well as the propensity to look at the past place tectonic theory in the Arrière-Garde, in the realm of the conservative.

NOTES

- ¹ Kenneth Frampton, "Rappel à l'Ordre: The Case for the Tectonic" *Architectural Design* V60 #3-4 (New York: St Martin's, 1990) p. 19. "The reaction arises in response to ... that all too prevalent syndrome in which shelter is packaged like a giant commodity" and "Towards a Critical Regionalism," in "The Anti-Aesthetic" edited by Hal Foster (Port Townsend: Washington Bay Press, 1983) p. 20.
- ² Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1962).
- ³ Frampton, Kenneth. *Studies in Tectonic Culture: The Poetics of Construction in 19th and 20th Century Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995).
- ⁴ Eduard F. Sekler, "Structure, Construction, Tectonics", in Gyorgy Kepes, Ed. *Structure in Art and in Science* (New York: Braziller, 1965), pp. 89-95.
- ⁵ Marco Frascari, "The tell the tale detail", *VIA 7: The Building of Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984).
- ⁶ Kenneth Frampton (St Martin's: New York, 1990).
- ⁷ as in for instance Adolf Loos's "Ornament and Crime" 1908 manifesto. Ulrich Conrad, *Programs and Manifestoes of the 20th Century Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT, 1994), p. 19.
- ⁸ Renato Poggioli, *The Theory of Avant-Garde*, Gerald Fitzgerald, Trans. (Cambridge, Mass: The Berknap Press of Harvard UP, 1968).
- ⁹ Peter Burger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, Michael Shaw, Trans. (Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1984).
- ¹⁰ Hal Foster, *The Return of the Real* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).
- ¹¹ Piranesi's critique of upper class Rome in the eighteenth century comes to mind since it has now been assimilated as a critical avant-garde response. Manfredo Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987) pp. 45-47.
- ¹² Foster. 1996, p. 17.
- ¹³ Manuel Castell lecture given AT IASTE 5th International Conference (UC, Berkeley, December 1996).
- ¹⁴ Kenneth Frampton, "Reflections on the Autonomy of Architecture: A Critique of Contemporary Production" in Ed. Diane Girhardo, *Out of site* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1991).
- ¹⁵ Foster. 1996, p. 15.
- ¹⁶ John O'Brian, Ed. *Clement Greenberg, The Collected Essays* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1955), p. 8.
- ¹⁷ John Ruskin, *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, 1880 Ed. (Mineola: reprinted by Dover, 1989), passim and especially p. 35.
- ¹⁸ Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, Ralph Manheim, Trans. (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1959), p. 190.
- ¹⁹ Le Corbusier and Ozeanfant, "Purism", *Modern Artists on Art: Ten Unabridged Essays*, edited by Robert L. Herbert, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964), pp. 58-73.
- ²⁰ John O'Brian, Ed. *Clement Greenberg, The Collected Essays*. (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1955), pp. 3-22.
- ²¹ Fredric Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language, A Critical*

Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972), p. 43. "The unique claim of Russian Formalists is their stubborn attachment to the intrinsically literary...the isolation of the intrinsic self... the disentanglement of their specific object of study from those of other disciplines"

- ²² Lessing's "Laocoon" is Greenberg's inspiration. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, "An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry", *Laocoon*, Ellen Frothingham, transl. (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1877).
- ²³ Giorgio Grassi, "Avant-Garde and Continuity," Stephen Sartarelli, Trans. *Oppositions # 21* (Cambridge: MIT Press, Summer 1980), p. 30.
- ²⁴ Frampton. 1990, p. 22.
- ²⁵ Ibid. p. 25.
- ²⁶ Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, Willard R. Trask, Trans. (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 111.
- ²⁷ John O'Brian, Ed. *Clement Greenberg, The Collected Essays*. (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1955), p. 7.
- ²⁸ Maegher, "Techne" *Perspecta # 24*, (1988), pp. 158-165.
- ²⁹ Frampton. 1995, p. 23.
- ³⁰ To quote Mircea Eliade: "'Living" a myth, then, implies a genuinely "religious" experience since it differs from the experience of everyday life.....one ceases to exist in the everyday world and enters a transfigured, auroral world..." Ibid. p.19. Note that the use of paleonymics is based more on the diachronic and less on the synchronic deployment and evolution of meaning.
- ³¹ Theodor Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity*, Knut Tarnowski et al., Transl. (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1973), p. 11.
- ³² lecture given at IASTE 5th International Conference (UC Berkeley, December 1996).
- ³³ Sekler (Braziller, 1965) .
- ³⁴ Edward Ford, *The Details of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).
- ³⁵ Foster. 1996, p. 157.
- ³⁶ Ibid. p. 29.
- ³⁷ Jurgen Habermas, "Modernity: an Incomplete Project," *The Anti-Aesthetic*, edited by Hal Foster (Port Townsend: Washington Bay Press, 1983), p. 14.