

Eisenman, Peter. "Architecture as a Second Language"  
Eisenman Inside Out Selected Writings 1963-1988. New Haven:  
Yale University Press, 2004.

Eisenman, Peter

"Architecture as a Second Language"

Eisenman Inside Out Selected Writings 1963-1988  
New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004

To be able to read off a text as a text without interposing an interpretation is the last form of inner experience.

—Nietzsche, *Will to Power*

With the influx of non-native English-speaking students to American colleges and universities, it is now possible to see college course offerings entitled "English as a Second Language." The idea behind the title is that this course will be offered to students whose first language is not English. The word "second" in this context does not mean merely to come after in a temporal sense because the idea of a first language or mother tongue implies an originary and even moral value. Thus the idea of a second language suggests the absence of these values as a negative condition.

The idea of temporality and original value becomes key if this notion of "second language" is transferred to the idea of architecture. In one sense, "second language" would suggest that architecture is always a second language even to those who speak and read it. In another sense, the term second language could suggest that architecture is grounded in other disciplines, that it is secondary to philosophy, science, literature, art, and technology. But finally, there is a third possibility for the idea of a second language in architecture; that is, architecture as text.

While the term "text" is at present quite fashionable, its value as an idea is almost obscured by its intellectual currency as a catchall for anything related to meaning. The concept of a text has a very precise and necessary condition as a strategy for dislocation in architecture, and more precisely for dislocating what is thought to be the natural or "first language" of architecture itself.

For the purpose of this discussion a more specific use of the term "text," which incorporates two recent developments, will be used. As a result of these two developments, text is no longer a vague and generic term for meaning, but is in fact a term which always dislocates the traditional relationship between a form and its meaning.

In the first of these developments, text is not so much the representation of a narrative but rather the representation of the structure of the form of the narrative. In the second, text "is no longer something complete, enclosed in a book or its margins, it is a differential network. A fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself." In this latter sense, text "displaces the conventional" or the "natural" idea of the literary work. Whereas the concept of text as the structure of the work referred inwardly to the work itself, text in this sense is a fundamental condition of displacement; it depends on no terms of internal reference such as structure. It is neither a complete work nor a meta-language. It is not a "stable object" but a process, a transgressive activity which disperses the author as the center limit and guarantor of truth.

author

What do these developments of the idea of text mean for architecture? What is an architectural text and how can it inform a strategy for dislocation? First, it must be understood that the extended idea of a text, whether in architecture or not, is the idea of essential multivalence. It does not cancel or deny prior notions of narrative or structure nor does it



necessarily contain them, but exists simultaneously with them. Text never allows a single signified. Everything is shown to mean more than one thing.

Architecture, because of its presence, its here and now, its time and space specificity, was traditionally seen as necessarily univocal. Thus, it would be resistant to the dislocating multivalency of text. The implications for an architecture of texts would be the same as that of the second language, in other words, non-ordinary and unnatural. Thus in architecture it is possible to say that text is what always exceeds the immediate response to a visual or sensory image, i.e., that which we see on the surface as the story, or that which we see as the beautiful. This is the heart of the matter.

Since the terms of the natural in architecture have always been thought to be the specificity of time and place, it might be useful to examine this textuality, the dislocation of time and place, in another medium. Film is a discourse that is constantly impacted by a "second language." Film is the *sine qua non* of a dislocated place and time because it always has at least two times and two places: the actual time and place of watching, and the narrative time and place. In its early history the fact that film moved in linear time was thought to mean that the narrative moved in chronological time. However, when sound was introduced into film in the 1930's, this coincidence of linear time and chronological time was brought into question; textual time, that is, the multivalence of time, developed out of chronological time.

For example, in David Lynch's film *Blue Velvet*, the story, but not the text, is about an average young American couple in a small town in North Carolina in the fifties and their adventures related to a bizarre murder in the town. But *Blue Velvet* is not only about this. It is not about the fifties as a temporal narrative, but, among other things, it is about time as text. In fact it is about the dislocation or the dissolution of narrative time in film seen as a natural or first language. All of the icons which are used in this film in a seemingly innocuous and straightforward way set up a condition whereby the space of narrative time in the film is dissolved. This is accomplished particularly, though not exclusively, through the soundtrack. For example, the lead song, "Blue Velvet," is from 1951, when it was sung by Tony Bennett. It was restylized by a group called the Statues in 1960, and that version was covered by Bobby Vinton in 1963 (which is the version used in the film). So there is already a first temporal dislocation in the soundtrack itself. In the film, the star, Isabella Rossellini, sings the same song in a nightclub over a microphone which is certainly of a 1940's vintage, if not earlier. Another major song in the film, "In Dreams," by Roy Orbison, also dates from 1963. Further, the convertible car that Jeffrey drives is a 1968 Oldsmobile, and when he first visits the Lincoln apartments, a single 1958 Fleetwood Cadillac is conspicuously framed in the film. Equally, to drink a Heineken beer in a local Southern bar before the late fifties is clearly anachronistic in the film, as is the earring in one of the male character's ears.

*Blue Velvet* is textual in that one of its intrinsic "image" components, sound, is not about the film's narrative structure of a time and place in the fifties. The complex and intentional tissue of superpositions of future and past create a temporal dislocation. While those images and sounds are present so are their displacements. In other words, the text of the



film is about something else. And yet, the film is crafted so as to render the gap between these disjunctions as virtually natural. This is an example of a text of "between"—between, but not a structure of between—where time is out of focus and interstitial. Textual dislocation comes about from the juxtaposition of two structures of sound and image, a narrative one and a chronological one, neither seen nor heard as dominant or original. One does not know what the "truth" of these sounds and images is. They do not appear to be related to the narrative but to something other than narrative, some other structure of relationships outside the film's structure. This "something other" than the narrative is the text between. The dislocating play of sound and images is uniquely possible in the temporal play of the film medium.

Such an idea of a text in relationship to a narrative or representational form such as a plot becomes a condition of a second or non-natural language. The dislocation of narrative time in *Blue Velvet* is exemplary for the case of text in architecture for two reasons: because it illustrates another text in an aesthetic medium, but more importantly, because of its dislocation of the concept of an internal time or time of narrative. Film, the media par excellence for displaying internal time, is used in *Blue Velvet* to dislocate the very phenomenon of narrative time supposedly natural to it.

Architecture, unlike literature or film, has never had the capacity to contain or display a linear or internal time. This has problematized the concept of an architectural text. Despite the critique made by Colin Rowe and Bob Slutzky, much is still made of Sigfried Giedion's notion of space, time, and architecture, that is, the potential of new materials and new spatial organizations—in particular, glass and the free plan—to collapse time in such a way that the user could experience different aspects of a plan or its façades from a single vantage point, this is still time as an aspect of the experience of the subject and not internal.

The question of how time could be introduced into architecture itself, rather than merely as the experience of our response to architecture, remained unanswered. Architecture, because it was thought to have the single temporal dimension of the now, and because the static object of architecture was incapable of displaying a multivalent time, was thought not to be textual. However, architecture as text does not reside in the aesthetic or functional presence of the object, but rather as a state of between. Therefore, textual time can be introduced into architecture to produce an architecture which dislocates not only the memory of internal time but all the aspects of presence, origin, place, scale, and so forth. The potential for this textual time was always there and it was always hidden by matching narrative time with chronological time as in early films.

A dislocating architecture confronts originary or authorial value; it does not represent an original source or imagery or figuration; nor does it represent the uses of an object or even an outside discourse. Dislocating architecture displays its multiple meanings by representing the various relationships between other texts, between an architectural text and other texts. The nature of these other texts is the subject of the remainder of this paper.

A dislocating text is always a second language. In retrospect, the potential for a dislocating text in architecture can be found at least since the Renaissance. Alberti took the form of the traditional Greek temple front, which by the fifteenth century had become almost a



banal vernacular form with an internalized iconography, and synthesized it with the triumphal arch of Septimius Severus in Rome to form the façade of Sant'Andrea in Mantua. This synthesis conflated the symbol of the sacred (the Greek temple front) with the symbol of man's power (the triumphal arch). Although this architecture did not dislocate the "isms" of occupation—the rituals of the church remained intact—one can find in it the operation of a text between; it displayed a between of the theocentric world and the anthropocentric world, and its references were spatially between Greece and Rome and temporally between the present and the past. But the actual superimposition of two formal systems or types, one of which remained dominant (that is, symbolizing the church), produced an incipient betweenness, but no dislocation.

Any interpretation of a text which is thought to be natural to the discourse of architecture can be called a text of authority, that is, given correctness and value by architecture itself. Architecture is constantly writing texts of authority without realizing that it is engaging in this activity. For example, representation is a text of authority. Representation is a false authority that suggests some sort of correct truthful relationship between the object of architecture and what it is signifying. The apparent truth of architecture is in its claims for the univocality of the representation of the architectural object, that is, that object which has an immediate aesthetic and a function that it represents in its presence. The idea of presence and the representations of presence represses all other interpretations, represses textuality. The idea that the classical orders or a functional type is natural to architecture is an example of the representation of presence.

The dislocating text attacks the terms by which presence is represented, that is, that origin, beauty, function, truth are "natural" (i.e., authentic) and not conventional to architecture. The dislocating text does not deny function or beauty but denies their authority and thus shifts the perception of them.

A dislocating text in architecture confronts this idea of originary (or what is thought to be the originary) or authorial value; i.e., that there is a correct way to read the object. Text, therefore, is not an originary source of imagery or figuration; it is not the representation of use or the aesthetic of an object. These are texts but are not dislocating. A dislocating text is or *represents* the various relationships between these other texts. In this sense, text is always a strategy which seems to be dislocating and thus a second language.

In a dislocating text the object is seen and read as different, as between its abstract and necessary object being and some known iconic form, which in its iconicity contains the traditional architectural text. Dislocating texts refuse any single authoritative reading. They do not appeal to the logic of grammar or the reason of truth. Their "truth" is constantly in flux. Although they are directed, they are authorless. They are directed in the sense that they suggest a way of reading which seems to be internal to the object. But, at the same time, they deflect any single reading.

Text is then perhaps a term that can be used for any and all strategies and conditions which dislocate architecture from its authorial or natural condition of being; that is, the detaching of what architecture looks like from the need to represent function, shelter, meaning, and so forth. It is not so much that the look of architecture will change (archi-



texture will always look like architecture) but rather the style and significance of its look will be different. The idea of text is not in opposition to the reality of architecture, just as the imaginary is not the opposite of the real; it is an *other* discourse. Text surrounds reality at the same time that it is internal to reality.

The *Romeo and Juliet* project for the castles of the same name outside of Vicenza in Montecchio for the Venice Biennale of 1986, because of its already having in place an *other text*, that is, the play by the same name, presented an ideal opportunity to present an architectural text that was no longer guaranteed by the tradition of architecture. Here, for the first time, there was a text of between; a fabric of images referring to something other than itself in order to create a dislocation in time and space. Traditional textuality (which includes the modernist idea of dispersal, incongruity, and fragment) is ultimately projected to return the system to closure. The textuality of the *Romeo and Juliet* project is as a set of fragments which are internally incomplete. They signal the impossibility of a return to more traditional forms of text in architecture such as the relationship of form to type or form to man. The object is no longer identical to a substance.

In the *Romeo and Juliet* project, the texts are made to close on themselves by insisting on a condition of self-similarity which countered any single authoritative scale and detached this analogous process from the pursuit of a geometric ideal. It is this closure potential afforded by superposition which opens the possibility for a text between. Within the project, a process which moved toward closure, rather than end, guaranteed that there was something yet to be written before the reality of the castle sites in Montecchio and after the narratives of the Verona of *Romeo and Juliet*. This yet to be written is a temporal dimension outside of the present tradition of architecture, yet exists within the specific project. The design process is no longer governed by a teleology which moves it from an origin to a final goal of truth, but rather is an open-ended series of superpositions.

The *Romeo and Juliet* project also necessarily confronts the traditional authority of architectural representation. Traditionally, architecture is represented in a set of drawings and models subservient to and depicted by a single object. Thus the representation in its singularity mediates and separates text from object. In *Romeo and Juliet*, on the other hand, each manifestation differed from the other creating the between, the figuration united with discourse to create text.

*Romeo and Juliet* is an example of what Jeffrey Kipnis calls an immanent text. An immanent text is one that is not authorized by architecture. It is a text which is authorized by the program and by the site, not in architecture but rather in using this idea of text to denote a strategy for the dislocation of traditional ideas of time and place in architecture.

Using this idea of the superposition of two texts to generate a strategy for the dislocation of time and place in architecture also can be seen in our project for the Via Flaminia in Rome. In this project, the first text was the actual site in Rome, and the second text was the dislocation of the sites along the Via Flaminia in time, place, and scale. Traditionally an axis such as the Via Flaminia represented a linear progression in time, a continuous and indifferent movement between two or more points, which in themselves have a meaning and a relationship because of the axis. Again through a process of superposition of elements of a different scale



and place, similar to the one used in *Romeo and Juliet*, the elements of such an axial progression are continuously dislocated, appearing to be simultaneously in a different place.

This was achieved by superposing the end points of any three different length segments (in this case the segment of the Via Flaminia from the Ponte Milvio to San Andrea, and from San Andrea to Piazza del Popolo, and the entire segment from Ponte Milvio to Piazza del Popolo) and thus making them the same length. In this way their analogous relationship, as end points of different segments of an axis, is revealed. While these segments become the same length, they obviously become different scales. This in turn dislocates the traditional notion of a dominant scale typically generated by the human body or the aesthetic preferences of the eye. Each of these segments now loses its real dimension, location, place, and time; ultimately the whole notion of the axis as a form bound to linear time with its implicit hierarchy and continuity is subverted. More importantly, because elements along each of the axes are relocated, they begin to also superpose other elements to reveal unexpected correspondences, the architectural analogy to the rhetorical figure *catathesis*, which in their former state would have remained unexpressed. What is revealed from the initial superpositions cannot be predicted.

These superpositions result in a dislocation of origin and destination, of time and space. By incorporating in an end point of the Via Flaminia, such as the Piazza del Popolo or the Ponte Milvio, an assemblage from disparate but analogous elements of other sites on the axis, such as Vignola's Church of Sant'Andrea, the two figures occupy origin and destination contemporaneously. At the same time movement along the axis of the Via Flaminia toward a destination (supposedly the Piazza del Popolo) seems to result in a return to origin, the beginning of the axis at the Ponte Milvio.

In this way, the idea of a place along the axis of the Via Flaminia is both reinforced and denied. While new places are created, the traditional notion of place is undercut because each place is actually many places at once. The result is a text which displaces the traditional notion of time and space. It does not deny traditional and privileged ideas of context and aesthetic presence as modernism attempted, but subverts them.

While the elements of the site seem to be in their original position, that is, they seem to be located according to their previous condition of formal structure (events at the beginning, middle, and end of such axes), they in fact are not. Origin and destination are perceived contemporaneously while movement toward the destination results in a return to origin. The perception at one point of all the elements of the progression, rearranged in scale and distance, dislocates the relationship between time and space. In the same way, one might proceed along the axis encountering the same elements several times. Time and space, figure and form, are thus collapsed as interdependent entities. This allows these elements—time, space, place, form, figure—to be deployed in a system which contains its own contradictions, and the meaning of space and time is freed from a linear symbolic representation. The definition of time as linear or circular, and of space as dynamic or static, now has no meaning in the traditional sense.

Most importantly, the received system of meaning, i.e., the cultural significance of a form, is denied without denying the form, but now the forms in themselves have neither



transcendental nor a priori meanings. They are cut off from the authority of their former singular significance. The architecture is between the signs.

The two conditions of text thus far described maintain the idea of text and reading within the tradition of architecture. However, there is yet another condition of text, of a text between, which in its displacement does not return to the authority of traditional architecture. The idea of a text between requires an initial condition of two texts. The texts themselves are not dislocating. The dislocation or condition of between is the result of the texts being seen, initially, as two weak images, that is, not having a strong aesthetic iconic or functionally recognizable image. This weak image in itself leads to an idea of reading as dominant.

In the Frankfurt Biocentrum Project, two texts, one not from architecture and one not from biology, but rather between both, were used; neither was strictly authorized by the project. Here the form of the biology building was the result of the superposition of two texts, one displaced from biology and the other displaced from architecture. In the former, three aspects of DNA's protein production were articulated as the processes replication, transcription, and translation. These three processes were seen to have analogous processes in three dimensions in something called fractal geometry, which is also outside of architecture's Euclidean or topological geometries and is, interestingly enough, a "between geometry"—that is, its forms are between whole number dimensions.

At first, the question to be asked was why should a biology building look like or be the result of the processes of biology. But in fact neither the processes of DNA or of fractal geometry are themselves the issue nor produce the form; they are merely the second text, from which the text of architecture generates the text between.

The question is why the idea of text in general, and more specifically, a dislocating text, has been resisted or repressed in architecture. Perhaps because this idea of text removes the restraint of morality, that is, the responsibility of form to the traditions of architecture. What text demonstrates is that a building may function, shelter, be constrained by site, have an aesthetic and be meaningful without necessarily symbolizing in its forms these conditions. It can in fact do all of these things and still speak of something else. In a sense it radicalizes such formal concerns which in the past had been constrained by a morality without even realizing it, because formalisms assume such a morality to be natural and thus neither constrained nor morally impacted. When these constraints are removed then form can be read as a text, a text between as both outside the author's intentions and outside the authoriality of architecture.

Therefore, the idea of a text between is necessarily dislocating. It does violence to the former celebrations of architecture as an object of desire (of an aesthetic pleasure); as a reification of man (anthropomorphism and human scale); as an object of value (truth, origin, and metaphoric meaning). Such a between text is not place specific, time specific, or scale specific. It does not symbolize use, shelter, or structure. Its aesthetic and history are other. Its dislocation takes place between the conventional and natural. Thus, what is being violated is the maintenance of the system as a whole.



It has often been argued that modernism derived its principles from the philosophy of Hegel. In this argument, the fundamental principles developed in Hegel's *Lectures on Aesthetics* evolved into the terms of the modernist rupture with the classical tradition. Of particular significance was the central concept of the metaphysical dialectic from which evolved dialectical opposites such as form and function, structure and ornament, figuration and abstraction. The fact that in architecture today these terms persist unquestioned, free from critical scrutiny, indicates that the grip of the metaphysic of the dialectic remains powerfully in place.

Now, in retrospect, it is clear that, despite the novelty of its imagery, and the radical intentions of its social program, modernism's self-proclaimed rupture was illusory; modernism remained firmly within the continuity of the classical tradition. While the forms indeed did look different, the terms and manner by which the forms gained significance, i.e., how they represented their intended meaning, were derived from the tradition of architecture.

In other disciplines, particularly in science and philosophy, there have been extreme changes in the substantive form, the method for producing meaning, since the mid-nineteenth century. Today, the cosmology that articulates the relationships among Man, God, and Nature has moved far from the strictures of the Hegelian dialectic. Nietzsche, Freud, Heidegger, and, more recently Jacques Derrida, have contributed to the dramatic transformation of thought and the conceptualization of man and his world. However, very little impact of this transformation has found its way into contemporary architecture. While science and philosophy were critically questioning their own foundations, architecture did not. Architecture remained secure in those very foundations derived from philosophy and science that were themselves being rendered untenable by the internal questioning which characterized those disciplines. Today, the foundations of those disciplines remain essentially uncertain. Therefore it is possible to question whether architecture's foundations are also in a state of uncertainty. In architecture this question has never been articulated; its answer is left unformulated.

This is because architecture has never had an appropriate theory of modernism understood to be a set of ideas which deals with the intrinsic uncertainty and alienation of the modern condition. Architecture always believed that the foundations for its modernism lay in the certainty and utopian vision of nineteenth-century science and philosophy. Today, that vision cannot be sustained. All of the speculative and artistic disciplines— theology, literature, painting, film, and music—have in one way or another come to terms with this dissolution of foundations. Each has reconceptualized the world in its own way in what might be called post-Hegelian terms. What has been called post-modernism in architecture, a blatant nostalgia for the lost aura of the authentic, the true, and the original, has specifically avoided this most important task.

It can be seen that today the last bastion of individual design is in the commitment to this aura of the authentic, the original, and the true. The result of architectural post-modernism, however, has been the mass production of objects which attempt to appear as though they were not mass-produced. In this way, post-modernism destroys its own essence, its own *raison d'être*, by becoming a vehicle for the aestheticization of the banal.



The question must then be asked, why does architecture have such difficulty moving into the post-Hegelian realm? The answer is that architecture is simply the most difficult discipline to dislocate because the essence of its activity is to locate. Architecture, in the public consciousness, is the structure of reality, presence, and objecthood. It is literally bricks and mortar, house and home, shelter and enclosure. Architecture does not merely speculate on gravity, it actually operates with and against gravity. For these reasons, its object presence, within the terms of reality, has traditionally been constrained to symbolize those terms, to symbolize its functioning as providing shelter and enclosure.

Thus, architecture faces a difficult task: to dislocate that which it locates. This is the paradox of architecture. Because of the imperative of presence, the importance of the architectural object to the experience of the here and now, architecture faces this paradox as does no other discipline.

Obviously, architecture is tied to the fundamental conditions of shelter. However, shelter must be understood both physically and metaphysically. It exists in both the world of the real and the world of the idea. This means that architecture operates as both a condition of presence and a condition of absence.

Architecture in its continuing nostalgia for authenticity has always sought, without realizing it, to repress the essential aspect of absence which operates within it. Therefore the tradition of architectural presence and objecthood has always been taken as natural—as natural the representation of man and his origins. This was accomplished in a formal language that was also taken to be natural. The column and the beam, the arcade and the arch, the capital and the plinth, for example, were all thought to be natural to architecture. Therefore the post-modern nostalgia attempted to effect a return in architecture to its “truthful,” “natural” heritage. But, counter to this notion, it is possible to propose an architecture that embraces the instabilities and dislocations that are today in fact the truth, not merely a dream of a lost truth.

The idea that architecture must be in the tradition of truth, must represent its sheltering function, must represent the good and the beautiful constitutes a primitive and unnoticed repression. In fact, it is this truth of instability which has been repressed. However, if architecture is a convention, i.e., not in any sense “natural,” then there are other truths that it can propose besides the “natural” truth of the classical object. Only when architecture dislocates this idea of a natural truth—lifts the repression engendered by the concept of the “natural”—will it meaningfully enter the post-Hegelian project.

This repression is also rooted in the persistence of the supposedly value-free nature of the typological categories of architecture and their intrinsic hierarchy. However, there is no equivalency between structure and ornament; ornament is added to structure. There is no equivalence between figure and ground; figure is added to primordial ground. Each of the terms of these dialectical opposites carries an intrinsic value—structure is good; ornament is bad. For architecture to enter a post-Hegelian condition, it must move away from the rigidity and value structure of these dialectic oppositions. For example, the traditional oppositions between structure and decoration, abstraction and figuration, figure and ground, form and function, could be dissolved. Architecture could begin an exploration of the “between” within these categories.



Such an architecture would no longer seek a separation of categories, a hierarchy of values, or the traditional classification systems of functional and formal typology; it would seek instead to blur these and other structures. This idea of blurring is not less rigorous, less rational, but it admits the irrational to the rational. Today one can see this blurring in the paintings of David Salle, in the photographs of Cindy Sherman. There the blur occurs between the beautiful and the ugly, between the sensual and the intellectual; they explore at once the beautiful in the ugly and the ugly in the beautiful.

What is the "between" in architecture? If architecture traditionally locates, then to "be between" means to be between some place and no place. If architecture traditionally has been about "topos," that is, an idea of place, then to be between is to search for an "atopos," the atopia within topos. Many American modern cities are examples of atopia. Yet today, architects want to deny the atopia of today's existence and restore the topos of the eighteenth century, to bring back a condition that can no longer be. What is there of real value in the re-creation of an eighteenth-century village today in Los Angeles or Houston?

Equally, the lesson of modernism suggests that there is no topos of the future. The new topos of today has to be found by exploring our inescapable atopia of the now. This exists not in aestheticized nostalgia of the banal, but in the between of topos and atopia.

To accomplish this, the way meaning is manifest today also must be critically examined. As in the other disciplines of theology, philosophy, and science, architecture must place its truths under scrutiny, particularly the truth of the tradition of architectural representation.

Since Aristotle, truth has conditioned the metaphor. Metaphor is understood as based on relating a referent to the truth of a known. It is possible, however, to employ other rhetorical tropes and thereby question the status of the metaphor. There is, in fact, a rhetorical trope called catachresis which speaks to "the between." Catachresis cuts into truth and makes it possible to look at what truth represses. Truth and metaphor can be reopened not by throwing them away, but by going into them, critically examining their structure. Tafuri says there are two types of architect: the magician and the surgeon. Today there is a need to be surgical: to cut into metaphor to uncover catachresis, to cut into atopos to uncover a new topos.

There are two conditions of catachresis and atopia that exist in the very heart of architecture: the arabesque and the grotesque. Arabesque exists between figuration and abstraction, between nature and man, between meaning and form. Traditionally it has been restricted to merely decorative use, but it is possible to suggest that in arabesque can be found structure, or at least found a condition between structure and decoration.

Similarly, the grotesque, whose roots are related to those of arabesque, can be used to explore the between. It is not coincidental that the works of Sherman and Salle are frequently referred to as grotesque. In Edgar Allen Poe's *Tales of the Arabesque and the Grotesque*, the haunted house is a central image. This does not suggest that we should literally make haunted houses or that we should romanticize the quality of the haunted. Rather it might outline a poetic potential, a possibility today for the architecture of "between."