

## Have architects come too late to the Lacan party?

- 1 — have they come at all?
- 2 — what have they come with?
- 3 — what could they possibly add?

What is architecture anyway? The “yes-no” answers

- 1 — buildings?
- 2 — theories about buildings?
- 3 — instruction (studio is the original element)?

What are they bringing with them?

- 1 — a psychoanalytical kind of instruction, not unlike Analysis (cf. Tim)
- 2 — the ethnography of inhabited spaces
- 3 — an interest in space itself, but over-conditioned by Euclid
- 4 — openness to seeing space and time as the same
- 5 — openness, even insight into
  - a — inside frames
  - b — extimacy
  - c — part-objects
  - d — the barred Other ( $\bar{A}$ )
  - e — parapraxis
  - f — ornament
  - g — boundaries, boundary behaviors
  - h — dispositif ...

(topics where architecture theory seems to have “gotten there first,” even where Vitruvius divides architectural concerns into S and s.

6 — The matter of “thinking graphically,” and of reading psychoanalytic materials with a more graphic sensibility.

7 — implicit interest in the RSI as such, i.e. as a topology

8 — Lacan allows architecture theorists to “find a ground” ... to “get out of the house” and at the same time legitimate their speculations by submitting to the “impartial jury” of Lacanian thinking. What about Architecture scholarship’s hostility to Lacan, Freud (bad Phenomenology)?

## WHAT I WOULD SAY/WRITE PERSONALLY ...

- 1 — The centrality of metaphor as key to stages of mentality (Vico)
- 2 — not metaphor in the usual version (as with Ricoeur)
- 3 — mirroring, reversal, extimacy involved (both Vico and Lacan)
- 4 — architecture? creation of insides that have inside frames
- 5 — basis if the uncanny, thence anamorphosis (Dolar on making anamorphosis universal, Miller on making extimacy universal)
- 6 — If architecture is drenched in the uncanny, anamorphosis, and extimacy, then ipso facto it “has something to offer Lacanians”
- 7 — bonus? The way architecture and arch.theory involves time and space, overcoming the Cartesian alienation. Vectors in projective geometry as simultaneously temporal and spatial.
- 8 — The RSI is also the professional snobbery issue: negative exclusion, so well-known to Lacan, is the absence (suppression) of the third, “on behalf of the unity of the two who are linked. Is this not  $\sim\emptyset x$ ?
- 9 — the connection of metaphor with virtuality, hence the RSI and anamorphosis.
- 10 — No one could fault Lacan for including a wealth of ethnographic, mathematical, historical materials. Architecture finds its master in Lacan’s blah blah blah.
- 11 — metaphor/metonymy as contiguity and semblance, theories of neurological binary and also magic (sympathetic, contagious), then on to issues of effigy and contamination, and things that prevent contamination, such as walls, boundaries, and distance (which walls and boundaries condense) ... then semblance becomes the A, that is restricted (barred).
- 12 — is architecture not, in a way, the “missing third element” in the Borromeo knot, the glue that holds together psychoanalysis? This is hinted at in Lacan’s interest in projective geometry, which is “architecture without the buildings.”

dk