




The Architecture of the Illusive Distance

Amir H. Ameri

The Architecture of the Illusive Distance

Amir H. Ameri



ASHGATE

© Amir H. Ameri 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Amir H. Ameri has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Wey Court East
Union Road
Farnham
Surrey, GU9 7PT
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
110 Cherry Street
Suite 3-1
Burlington, VT 05401-3818
USA

www.ashgate.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-4724-3318-3 (HBK)
978-1-4724-3319-0 (EBK)
978-1-4724-3320-6 (EPUB)

The Library of Congress has cataloged the printed edition as follows:

Ameri, Amir H.

The architecture of the illusive distance / By Amir H. Ameri.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4724-3318-3 (hardback) -- ISBN 978-1-4724-3319-0 (ebook) --
ISBN 978-1-4724-3320-6 (epub) 1. Architecture and society. 2. Space (Architecture) 3.
Library architecture. 4. Museum architecture. 5. Theater architecture. I. Title.

NA2543.S6A437 2015

727--dc23

2014037651



Printed in the United Kingdom by Henry Ling Limited,
at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, DT1 1HD

THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE ILLUSIVE DISTANCE

*With love and gratitude this work is dedicated to the memory of
Ezat and Jalal Ardeshir-Rokni.*

Acknowledgments

This work would not have been if all those many years ago the late Robert D. MacDougall had not given me the chance to look at architecture through his keen and penetrating lens. To his memory, I remain grateful for the opportunity.

This work could not have been if during those same years James T. Siegel had not caringly taught me to look at the world from an analytically different vantage point. To him I owe an indelible intellectual debt that can only be acknowledged with much gratitude and never repaid.

Over the years, I have benefited immensely from the dedication and contribution of numerous students who affectionately shared my questions, dilemmas, and concerns about architecture. This work is, in no small measure, the fruit of their dedication.

Yassaman Ameri has embodied for me the creative commitment and intellectual care I have aspired to my entire life. Without her, I would have not been. For the gratitude I feel, no word suffices.

Sussan Ameri is the reason for all that I have done my entire adult life. She has inspired and supported me emotionally and intellectually in ways I can never recount or hope to match.

Over the years I have benefited immensely from the friendship, the intellectual support, and the ceaseless encouragement of David Cronrath and Mehrdad Hadighi. I cannot imagine my academic life without their presence and contributions.

I am grateful to the following individuals for their kind and generous permission to reproduce their photographs in this volume: Yassaman Ameri, Patricia Badolato, Karen Blaha, Rob Deutscher, Mario Roberto Duran Ortiz, Michal Osmenda, Susan Poague, Jacqueline Poggi, Pablo Sanchez, and Jason Whittaker. I also wish to thank Solmaz M. Kive for her invaluable help in the preparation of this manuscript.

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>List of Figures</i> | <i>vii</i> |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | <i>xi</i> |
| Introduction | 1 |
| PART I THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE ILLUSIVE PRESENCE | |
| 1 Architecture, In Theory | 13 |
| The Theory | 13 |
| The Beautiful | 18 |
| The Remedy | 23 |
| The Text | 26 |
| Notes | 29 |
| 2 On the Border of the Beautiful | 31 |
| The Transgression | 31 |
| The Assimilation | 37 |
| The Insertion | 49 |
| Notes | 51 |
| PART II THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE ILLUSIVE DISTANCE | |
| 3 The Logic of Encampment | 55 |
| The Library | 55 |
| The Pharmacy | 84 |
| The Campus | 87 |
| Notes | 89 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4 | The Spatial Dialectics of Authenticity | 91 |
| | The Collection | 91 |
| | The Debate | 98 |
| | The Dispersion | 107 |
| | The Catharsis | 121 |
| | Notes | 134 |
| 5 | The Architecture of the Illusive Distance | 137 |
| | The More is Less | 137 |
| | The Borrowed Spaces | 139 |
| | The Place Elsewhere | 144 |
| | The Imaginary Places | 153 |
| | The Imagined Places | 163 |
| | The Unimagined Imaginary | 178 |
| | Notes | 181 |
| 6 | The Epilogue | 183 |
| | <i>Bibliography</i> | 185 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 195 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 3.1 | Antonello da Messina, <i>St Jerome in his Study</i> , 46 × 36 cm, oil on panel, c.1460, National Gallery, London Image source: Art Resource, NY | 56 |
| Figure 3.2 | Albrecht Dürer, <i>Adam and Eve</i> , 25 × 20 cm, engraving on laid paper, 1504, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Image source: Art Resource, NY | 58 |
| Figure 3.3 | <i>Ezra writing the law</i> , Frontispiece to the <i>codex Amiatinus</i> , 35 × 25 cm, parchment, sixth century, Laurentian Library, Florence Photo credit: Scala/Art Resource, NY | 60 |
| Figure 3.4 | Domenico Fontana, <i>The Sistine Hall of the Vatican Library</i> , Vatican, sixteenth century Photo credit: Left to right (3.5a) Michal Osmenda, (3.5b) John Willis Clark | 61 |
| Figure 3.5 | Paul Lacroix, <i>Library of the University of Leyden</i> , engraving, London, 1870 Photo credit: HIP/Art Resource, NY | 62 |
| Figure 3.6 | <i>Chapter Library</i> , Hereford Photo credit: John Willis Clark | 63 |
| Figure 3.7 | Michelangelo, <i>The Ricetto of the Laurentian Library</i> , Florence, 1523–71 Photo credit: Alinari/Art Resource, NY | 64 |
| Figure 3.8 | Michelangelo, <i>The Laurentian Library</i> , Florence, 1523–71 Photo credit: top—Scala/Art Resource, NY, bottom—John Willis Clark | 65 |
| Figure 3.9 | Christopher Wren, <i>Trinity College library</i> , Cambridge, c.1870, album of 58 Cambridge University photographs, New Boston Fine and Rare Books | 66 |
| Figure 3.10 | Lelio Buzzi, <i>Biblioteca Ambrosiana</i> , Milan, 1603–9 Photo credit: John Willis Clark | 67 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 3.11 | Étienne-Louis Boullée, <i>Bibliothèque Nationale</i> , 1785, Bibliothèque nationale de France | 68 |
| Figure 3.12 | Henri Labrouste, <i>Exterior Facade of Bibliothèque Sainte-Genève</i> , 1855–96, Boston Public Library, Print Department, Boston | 69 |
| Figure 3.13 | Henri Labrouste, interior of Bibliothèque Sainte-Genève, 1855–96 Photo credit: Clockwise from top 3.13a—Stéphanie Benjamin, 3.13b—Marie-Lan Nguyen, 3.13c—Jason Whittaker (bit.ly/jasongenev) | 70 |
| Figure 3.14 | Sydney Smirke, <i>Reading Room</i> , British Museum, London, 1856 Photo credit: British Library | 71 |
| Figure 3.15 | Louis I. Kahn, <i>Phillips Exeter Library</i> , New Hampshire, 1972 Photo credit: Clockwise from left 3.15a—Pablo Sanchez, 3.15b and 3.15c—Jacqueline Poggi | 73 |
| Figure 3.16 | Dominique Perrault, <i>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</i> , 1989–95 Photo credit: Mirco Giglioli | 75 |
| Figure 3.17 | Ren Koolhaas, <i>Très Grande Bibliothèque project</i> , Bibliothèque nationale de France competition entry, 1989 Photo credit: Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Heer Bokelweg 149, 3032 AD Rotterdam, Netherlands, www.oma.eu | 79 |
| Figure 3.18 | Ren Koolhaas, <i>Seattle Central Library</i> , 2004 Photo credit: Author | 82 |
| Figure 3.19 | Thomas Jefferson, <i>University of Virginia</i> , Charlottesville, 1819 Photo credit: Karen Blaha | 88 |
| Figure 4.1 | Engraving of the Francesco Calzolari's Cabinet of Curiosities, Musaeum Calceolarium, Verona, 1622 | 94 |
| Figure 4.2 | Giovanni Paolo Pannini, <i>Interior of a Picture Gallery with the Collection of Cardinal Silvio Valenti Gonzaga</i> , 195 × 264 cm, oil on canvas, 1740, Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art, Hartford, CT Photo credit: Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art/Art Resource, NY | 97 |
| Figure 4.3 | Jean-Nicolas-Louis Durand, <i>Design for a Museum</i> , Précis des leçons d'architecture données à l'École royale polytechnique, Paris: Chez l'auteur, à l'École polytechnique, 1809 | 99 |
| Figure 4.4 | Karl Friedrich Schinkel, <i>Altes Museum</i> , Berlin, 1828 Photo credit: From top, 4.4a—Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, LC-DIG-ppmsca-00338, 4.4b— Photographische Gesellschaft Berlin am Dönhoffplatz | 102 |
| Figure 4.5 | Karl Friedrich Schinkel, <i>Ground Floor Plan, Altes Museum</i> , Berlin, 1828 Photo credit: bpk/Berlin/Kupferstichkabinett/Staatliche Museen zu Berlin/Art Resource, NY | 103 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Figure 4.6 | Karl Friedrich Schinkel, <i>Plaza Studies</i> , <i>Altes Museum</i> , Berlin, 1828 Photo credit: bpk/Berlin/Kupferstichkabinett/Staatliche Museen zu Berlin/Art Resource, NY | 105 |
| Figure 4.7 | Karl Friedrich Schinkel, <i>Elevation Studies</i> , <i>Altes Museum</i> , Berlin, 1828 Photo credit: bpk/Berlin/Kupferstichkabinett/Staatliche Museen zu Berlin/Art Resource, NY | 106 |
| Figure 4.8 | Traumbauer, Borie, and Zatzinger, <i>Philadelphia Museum of Art</i> , 1911–28 Photo credit: From top, 4.8a—Library of Congress, The Historic American Buildings Survey, HAER PA,51–PHILA, 328–5, 4.8b—United States Geological Survey | 109 |
| Figure 4.9 | Marcel Breuer, <i>Whitney Museum</i> , New York, 1966 Photo credit: Author | 112 |
| Figure 4.10 | Tod Williams & Billie Tsien Architects, <i>The Barnes Foundation</i> , Philadelphia, 2012 Photo credit: Robert Rife | 114 |
| Figure 4.11 | Clockwise from top, 4.11a—I.M. Pei, <i>The Louvre</i> , Paris, 1989; 4.11b—James Stirling, <i>Neue Staatsgalerie</i> , Stuttgart, 1984; 4.11c—Richard Meier, <i>High Museum of Art</i> , Atlanta, 1981; 4.11d—Frank Gehry, <i>Guggenheim Museum</i> , Bilbao, 1997; 4.11e—Richard Meier, <i>Getty Museum</i> , Los Angeles, 1997 Photo credit: From top clockwise 4.11a—Author; 4.11b—Rob Deutscher; 4.11c—Susan Poague; 4.11d—Mario Roberto Duran Ortiz; 4.11e—United States Geological Survey | 115 |
| Figure 4.12 | Frank Lloyd Wright, <i>Guggenheim Museum</i> , New York, 1959 Photo credit: Author | 117 |
| Figure 4.13 | McKim, Mead and White, <i>Brooklyn Museum</i> , Brooklyn, 1893–1907 Photo credit: 4.13a—Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, LC-DIG-det-4a23706; 4.13b—Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, LC-DIG-det-4a18164; 4.13c—Patricia Badolato | 118 |
| Figure 4.14 | Frank Lloyd Wright, <i>Guggenheim Museum</i> , New York, 1959 Photo credit: Author | 120 |
| Figure 4.15 | Benoît Suvée Joseph, <i>Invention of the Art of Drawing</i> , 267 × 132 cm, oil on canvas, 1791, Groeningemuseum, Bruges Photo credit: Hugo Maertens, Lukas—Art in Flanders VZW | 122 |
| Figure 4.16 | Giuseppe Castiglione, <i>View of the Grand Salon Carré in the Louvre</i> , 69 × 103 cm, oil on canvas, Louvre Museum Photo credit: Erich Lessing, Art Resource, NY | 131 |
| Figure 5.1 | <i>Holland Brothers' Kinetoscope Parlor</i> , 1894 Photo credit: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Edison National Historic Site | 140 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Figure 5.2 | Lyman H. Howe's Animotoscope exhibition poster, 1897 Photo credit: From the collections of the Luzerne County Historical Society | 141 |
| Figure 5.3 | <i>Theatorium postcard</i> , c.1912, Gotham Book Mart Collection, University of Pennsylvania Library | 146 |
| Figure 5.4 | <i>Sheldon Theatre</i> , Chicago, c.1909 Photo credit: Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, LC-USZ62-92105 | 148 |
| Figure 5.5 | <i>Normal Theatre</i> , Chicago, c.1909 Photo Credit: Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, LC-USZ62-92107 | 151 |
| Figure 5.6 | Rubush & Hunter architects, <i>Indiana Theatre</i> , Indianapolis, 1927 Photo Credit: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, HABS IND, 49-IND, 29-25 | 156 |
| Figure 5.7 | Thomas W. Lamb, <i>Fox Theatre</i> , San Francisco, CA 1929 Photo credit: Motion Picture News 40 | 157 |
| Figure 5.8 | Thomas W. Lamb, <i>Loew's Ohio Theatre</i> , Columbus, OH, 1928 Photo credit: Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, HABS OHIO, 25-COLB, 4-24 | 159 |
| Figure 5.9 | John Ebersson, Top: <i>Loew's Theatre</i> , Louisville, KY, 1928; Bottom: <i>Avalon Theatre</i> , Chicago, 1927 Photo credit: Top, Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, HABS KY, 56-LOUVI, 17-47; Bottom, Motion Picture News 36 | 161 |
| Figure 5.10 | John Ebersson, <i>Grand Riviera Theatre</i> , Detroit, 1925 Photo credit: Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, HABS MICH, 82-DETRO, 16-11 | 162 |
| Figure 5.11 | Benjamin Schlanger, <i>Thalia Theatre</i> , New York, NY, 1932 Photo credit: Keystone-Underwood, <i>Architectural Record</i> 71 | 164 |
| Figure 5.12 | George & W. C. Rapp, <i>Rhodes Theatre</i> , Chicago, IL, 1937 Photo credit: Hedrich-Blessing, <i>Architectural Record</i> 84 | 173 |
| Figure 5.13 | William Riseman Associates, <i>Wareham Theatre</i> , Wareham, MA, 1948 Photo credit: George M. Cushing, <i>Architectural Record</i> 104 | 173 |
| Figure 5.14 | William Riseman Associates, <i>Strand Theatre</i> , Hartford, CT, 1948 Photo credit: George M. Cushing, <i>Architectural Record</i> 104 | 174 |
| Figure 5.15 | Goodwin and Stone Architects, <i>Modern Museum of Art Movie Theatre</i> , New York, NY, 1948 Photo credit: <i>Architectural Record</i> 104 | 176 |
| Figure 5.16 | Raymond F. Smith, <i>Delman Theater</i> , Dallas, TX, 1949 Photo credit: <i>Architectural Record</i> 105 | 178 |

Introduction

In the abstract, architecture is an insuperable task. Faced with multiple possibilities, the architect has no ground for the delimitation of his or her many options to the ultimate one.¹ Broadly, the functions of an edifice suggest no one form and much less a direction. In deference to biological needs, function is nebulous and multi-directional. However, function assumes a trajectory and becomes highly prescriptive once it is appropriated by culture and transformed into a ritual. Sleeping for instance suggests little by way of an appropriate setting. Appropriated, however, as an instrument for the communication and enforcement of, for instance, a culture's sexual mores and taboos, and transformed into a ritual, it becomes highly prescriptive. Though by no means singular, a ritual is distinct and unidirectional. It has unique spatial requirements. It demands a specific setting. It is this and similar prescriptive cultural appropriations that make architecture possible.

In relating the advent of architecture to culture, we may appear to be traversing a well-trodden path. At least since the early 1960s, scholars of architecture have assumed the connection between architecture and culture as often as they have envisaged and presented it as a monologic relationship.² Architecture is recurrently purveyed to embody, represent, mirror and/or reflect a culture, its values, and ideals. In this pervasive vision, culture is assumed to precede the architecture that follows and re-present it. The relationship between culture and architecture is, however, considerably more complex. The assumed contingency of architecture on culture is at best a restrictive and partial view. If architecture represents culture, that is, if architecture is a cultural statement or utterance, it is not merely a constative, but as well a performative utterance in the sense first introduced by Austin and specifically as the concept is deployed in Cultural Studies (*How to Do Things*).³

Whereas a constative statement is meant, Austin tells us, "to 'describe' some state of affairs, or to 'state some fact', which it must do either truly or falsely," a performative statement is one "in which to say something is to do something; or in which by saying or in saying something we are doing something" (*How to Do Things* 1–2).⁴ For instance, "as official acts, a judge's ruling makes law; a jury's finding

makes a convicted felon," and so on (154). In each of these and other performative utterances, the described condition does not precede nor does it exist independent of the utterance. To the contrary, the utterance creates the very condition it depicts. As a variation on the theme, Judith Butler describes the performative with a nuance that shall prove important to our understanding of architecture as a performative act.

"Performative acts are," Butler tells us, "forms of authoritative speech: most performatives, for instance, are statements that, in the uttering, also perform a certain action and exercise a binding power. Implicated in a network of authorization and punishment, performatives tend to include legal sentences, baptisms, inaugurations, declarations of ownership, statements which not only perform an action, but confer a binding power on the action performed. If the power of discourse to produce that which it names is linked with the question of performativity, then the performative is one domain in which power acts as discourse" (171). For instance, "the judge who authorizes and installs the situation he names invariably cites the law that he applies, and it is the power of this citation that gives the performative its binding or conferring power" (171).

For a simple example of the "binding or conferring power" of architecture as a performative act, we may turn to Paul Radin's account of Oglala Indians as retold by Clifford Geertz: "The Oglala believe the circle to be sacred because the great spirit caused everything in nature to be round except stone. Stone is the implement of destruction. The sun and the sky, the earth and the moon are round like a shield, though the sky is deep like a bowl. Everything that breathes is round like the stem of a plant" (128). The circle is "also the symbol of the year. The day, the night, and the moon go in a circle above the sky. Therefore the circle is a symbol of these divisions of time and hence the symbol of all time" (128). It follows that "for these reasons the Oglala make their tipis circular, their camp-circle circular, and sit in a circle at all ceremonies. The circle is also the symbol of the tipi and of shelter" (128).

One may readily assume, following a familiar trajectory, the circular Oglala tipi to be a constative statement that effectively describes and/or references the presumed circularity of "all things in nature" and of all time. However, the circular tipi, placed as it is in a circular camp, "by saying or in saying," that the tipi is round like all else in the world other than stone, that is, by citing the presumed roundness of all things, also, along with all other circular Oglala artifacts quite powerfully render the Oglala world both experientially, and in a sense literally, circular. The Oglala don't simply believe and say all things are round, they render their world visibly round through the agency of, among others, the circular tipis, set in circular camps, and so on.

It may well be in tacit recognition of this link between saying and doing characteristic of performative acts that for the Oglala the circle is interchangeably the "symbol of the world and of time" and the "symbol of the tipi and of shelter." The circle unites and confounds them into one. Thereby, the power and authority of each "symbol" is conferred by the evidential citation of the other. Much as the tipi is shaped in the round like the world and time, it also confers its shape on the world and time.⁵ The Oglala tipi is as much an inaugural event as it is a citation.

It is important to note here that the constative and the performative aspects of cultural utterances and/or acts are not mutually exclusive. As Austin noted and Jacques Derrida has critically argued, there is no pure constative or performative utterance as such (Austin, *Performative Utterances*; Derrida, *University without Condition*).⁶ There is a performative aspect to every constative statement, much as there is a constative aspect to every performative statement. To a degree, the “binding or conferring power” of performative acts, inclusive of architecture, is tied to their constative (reiterative) aspect/function. However, for reasons that we shall discuss in the next chapter, the discourse of architecture has long disregarded the performative aspect of architecture in favor of its constative aspect, to the point of the former’s invisibility.

The constative/performative distinction is entwined with the distinction between culture and architecture, which as the Oglala tipi and numerous other examples one may readily cite indicate is also complex and nuanced. In their perpetual interplay, neither culture nor architecture could be readily posited as a non-contingent prior term. As a performative act, architecture does not merely re-present culture; it constructs and reifies culture as the unalterable shape of reality. Insofar as culture is not reducible to a set of beliefs or ideas that come to be of their own volition, apart from a collection of authoritative and exclusionary practices, culture is always inevitably and already implicated in the performative function of, among others, architecture. The power and authority of culture as a “control mechanism,” in the sense Clifford Geertz explicates the term, is lodged in this implication (45). To better envisage the interplay between culture and architecture we may turn to Clifford Geertz’s description of “sacred symbols” which he tells us:

... function to synthesize a people's ethos—the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood—and their worldview—the picture they have of the way things in sheer actuality are, their most comprehensive ideas of order. In religious belief and practices a group's ethos is rendered intellectually reasonable by being shown to represent a way of life ideally adapted to the actual state of affairs the worldview describes, while the worldview is rendered emotionally convincing by being presented as an image of an actual state of affairs peculiarly well-arranged to accommodate such a way of life. (89–90)

Although Geertz’s description pertains to “religion as a cultural system,” we can readily read into his account a compelling description of the role of ecclesiastical buildings as “sacred symbols” within their broader cultural context and by extension, of architecture as another “cultural system.” We can remind ourselves of the pivotal role architecture plays in shaping a people’s ethos and trace an interminable link from their ethos to their worldview. This is a link without which architecture would be hopelessly lost in having too great a choice of action and not sufficient grounds for the delimitation of its choices. We can go on to read the evidence of the “confrontation and mutual confirmation” between the dominant worldview and ethos of, for instance, the Gothic, the Renaissance, or the Baroque period, respectively, in the translucent world of a Gothic Cathedral, the proportional

harmonies of a Renaissance Chapel, or the unfolding, infinite universe of a Baroque Church. In each instance, we can detail how the specifics of each design objectified “moral and aesthetic preferences by depicting them as the imposed conditions of life implicit in a world with a particular structure, as mere common sense given the unalterable shape of reality,” and how the experience of each building served to support “received beliefs about the world’s body by invoking deeply felt moral and aesthetic sentiments as experiential evidence for their truth” (89–90).

For an example of the invocation of deeply felt moral and aesthetic sentiments we may recall Abbot Suger’s well-known account of his experience at the remodeled Carolingian church of St. Denis (1135–1144) at the onset of the Gothic period.

When out of my delight in the beauty of the house of God—the loveliness of the many-coloured gems has called me away from all external cares, and worthy meditation has induced me to reflect, transferring that which is material to that which is immaterial, on the diversity of the sacred virtues: then it seems to me that I see myself dwelling as it were in some strange region of the universe which neither exists entirely in the slime of the earth nor entirely in the purity of Heaven, and that by the grace of God I can be transported from this inferior to that higher world in an anagogical manner. (Panofsky 61)

What this faith affirming anagogical transportation attests is the “binding or conferring power” of architecture as a performative act. It is architecture’s capacity to synthesize faith and experience, worldview and ethos, and “in so doing sustain each with the borrowed authority of the other” (Geertz 90). Crossing the monumental threshold of St. Denis’ front portal, leaving the profane world to one side and entering the sacred realm thus constituted on the other side, to then traverse the nave or the analogical path to Christian redemption, to arrive at the altar and the choir surrounded by the translucent stained-glass walls of the ambulatory that are brought to life by the light that passes through them—like Jesus shining through the world as the new light (*Lux Nova*)—the faithful might well have come to share Suger’s exuberance in a transformative experience that reified the tenants of Christian faith in the twelfth century. The “beauty” of this house, that is, its aesthetic value to Suger and his contemporaries, is effectively lodged in a performative synthesis that renders God, salvation, and heavenly reward tangible and experiential. As such, St. Denis cannot effectively be said to reflect or *represent* anything other than what it makes emotionally tangible and evidentially *real*. In other words, St. Denis does not *reiterate* mid-twelfth-century Christianity per se, it inexorably constitutes it.

One may also move forward to a different place and time to imagine a person of faith at the turn of the fifteenth century in front of the church of Sant’Andrea in Mantua, Italy, by Leone Battista Alberti (b. 1470s), about to embark on a journey that though sequentially similar to St. Denis’, would have a different conclusion by design. This person too would marvel at “the beauty of the house of God” as had Suger, though for reasons that hadn’t to do with light and translucency “transferring that which is material to that which is immaterial.” Rather the reasons here would have to do with an unmistakable performative testimonial to a mathematical

order that pervades the building's design, as it pervades all of nature by divine ordinance. The reasons here would have to do with the meticulous symmetrical correspondence of parts and the harmonic proportions that pervade the parts as it does the whole of the church in "the imitation of nature, as the greatest artist at all manner of composition" (Alberti, *Ten Books* 195). At the conclusion of this faithful journey, the person may well be prepared to consent with Alberti that "nature is sure to act consistently, and with a constant analogy in all her operations: from whence I conclude that the same numbers, by which the agreement of sounds affects our ears with delight, are the very same which please our eyes and our mind" (196–7). Harmonic proportions unite nature and architecture, much as the circle did in the Oglala world.

Even though harmonic proportions may well supplant translucency as an evidence of God's existence, the role of architecture as a performative act remains constant. Yet, it is important to note that powerful as architecture's performative capacity is to synthesize a people's worldview and ethos, it also speaks to the volatility of culture and its inevitable susceptibility to change. The need for synthesis points to an inherent gap between the world as we imagine or wish it to be and the world as we experience it to be. This gap may be bridged, but never fully closed. The very gap that necessitates synthesis also sees to the perpetual transformation of culture as changes in one lead to changes in the other in perpetuity. As such, culture is never static. Much as total synthesis is desired and sought, it is never achieved.

Were we to further engage the exercise of tracing the "confrontation and mutual confirmation" between worldview and ethos in ecclesiastical edifices of different ages, we would have, as we did with the Oglala tipi, Suger's St. Denis or Alberti's S. Andrea, the advantage of temporal distance and a markedly different worldview. Both readily allow us to assume the probing role of the "mythologist," as Roland Barthes described it years ago (238–9). Focusing, as we may, on the "distortion," or the mechanics of universalizing the particular, it is not likely that we will experience the culture under study assume the guise of inevitability through the agency of its architecture. We will not experience the "confrontation and mutual confirmation" of the worldview and ethos that ecclesiastical edifices were erected to affect. Such a confirmation, when and if it occurs, largely goes unnoticed. An edifice performs its cultural role effectively, when we do not see in it the passage of culture into objectivity. It succeeds when we do not take note of the edifice as an ideological construct, or the explicit embodiment of a metaphysics. It succeeds when we take its peculiarities either for granted, or else attribute them to pragmatic concerns, and proceed as though the latter were immune to ideological conditioning. This is to say, that those aspects of an edifice which appear to be the most objective, that is, impervious to ideological and metaphysical conditioning, are often the parts more thoroughly conditioned by such considerations, and as that the most successful from a culture's perspective.

Although it is not with great difficulty or much resistance that we may trace the "confrontation and mutual confirmation" of a culture's worldview and ethos in the design and experience of its ecclesiastical architecture, past or for that