

© 2001 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

This book was set in Janson Text and Franklin Gothic by Graphic Composition, Inc., Athens, Georgia, and was printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Grosz, E. A. (Elizabeth A.)

Architecture from the outside : essays on virtual and real space / Elizabeth Grosz.

p. cm. — (Writing architecture)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-262-57149-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Architecture—Philosophy. 2. Space (Architecture)—Philosophy. I. Title. II. Series.

NA2500 .G76 2001

720'.1—dc21

2001018300

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3

Acknowledgments vii

Foreword by Peter Eisenman xi

Introduction xv

Part One Embodied Spaces

one **Embodying Space: An Interview** 3

two **Lived Spatiality (The Spaces of Corporeal Desire)...** 31

three **Futures, Cities, Architecture** 49

Part Two Transitional Spaces

four **Architecture from the Outside** 57

five **Cyberspace, Virtuality, and the Real: Some Architectural Reflections** 75

six **In-Between: The Natural in Architecture and Culture** 91

Part Three Future Spaces

seven **The Future of Space: Toward an Architecture of Invention** 109

eight **Embodied Utopias: The Time of Architecture** 131

nine **Architectures of Excess** 151

ten **The Thing** 167

Notes 185

Bibliography 207

Index 215

Philosophy

What can philosophy bring to architectural discourse and its practice (the practices of design, cost analysis, siting, building)? And what can architecture bring to philosophical discourse and its practices (reasoning, arguing, formulating problematics, framing questions)? What are some pertinent points of overlap or mutual investment that may implicate each in the other in mutually productive ways? Perhaps more pertinently, what are the blind spots within the self-

understanding of each? And how can each be used by the other, not just to affirm itself and receive external approval but also to question and thus to expand itself, to become otherwise, without assuming any privilege or primacy of the one over the other and without assuming that the relation between them must be one of direct utility or translation? One very small strand draws these two disciplines together: an idea of newness or virtuality, latency or becoming, which may be highlighted and productively developed within both disciplines through the help, the overlap, and the difference that each offers the other. This idea of the virtual, a concept prevalent if undeveloped in philosophy since at least the time of Plato, introduces a series of questions to both architecture and philosophy (with different effects) that may force them to change quite fundamental assumptions they make about space, time, movement, futurity, and becoming.

Architecture has tended to conceive of itself as an art, a science, or a mechanics for the manipulation of space,

Seven **The Future of Space:**

Toward an Architecture of Invention

indeed probably the largest, most systematic and most powerful mode for spatial organization and modification. Space itself, the very stuff of architectural reflection and production, requires and entails a mode of time, timeliness, or duration. Indeed, space must always involve at least two times, or perhaps two kinds of time. The first is the time of the emergence of space as such, a time before time and space, a temporalization/spatialization that precedes and renders the organization or emergence of space as such and time as such and thus emerges before any scientific understanding of a space-time continuum.¹ This is the space-time of difference, of *différance* (Jacques Derrida discusses *différance* as precisely the temporization of space and the spatialization of time), or differentiation (in Deleuzian terms, differing from itself), which is a precondition of and prior to the space and time of life, of understanding, of science.

Derrida, for example, claims that the insertion of an interval that refuses self-identity and self-presence to any thing, any existent, constitutes *différance*. This interval, neither clearly space nor time but a kind of leakage between the two, the passage of the one into the other, propels any being beyond itself, in space and in time. Neither space nor time can exist as such "before" this interval, which expands being into a world in order that it paradoxically be both itself and other to itself:

An interval must separate the present from what it is not in order for the present to be itself but this interval that constitutes it as present must, by the same token, divide the present in and of itself, thereby also dividing, along with the present, everything that is thought on the basis of the present, that is, in our metaphysical language, every being, and singularly substance or the subject. In constituting itself, in dividing itself dynamically, this interval is what might be called *spacing*, the becoming-space of time or the

becoming-time of space (*temporization*). And it is this constitution of the present, as an "originary" and irreducibly nonsimple . . . synthesis of marks, or traces of retentions and protentions . . . that I propose to call *archi-writing*, *archi-trace*, or *différance*. Which (is) (simultaneously) spacing (and) temporization.²

The time and space of architecture, and for that matter, of philosophy, can rarely afford to consider this primordial differential, the movement, the shimmering of the differing of a time and space not yet configured, enumerated, mastered, or occupied. This time before time, the time of the interval, the time of nontime, enables space to emerge as such and is that to which space is ineluctably driven, the "fate" of space.

There is a second kind of time, the time of history, of historicity, the time of reflection, the time of knowledge—a time to which we are accustomed in the history of architecture and of philosophy in the very idea of history, of orderly progression, of the segmentation or continuity of time and space. Architecture has tended to face time and temporality through the questions posed by history and through its response to the ravages of that history, its orientation toward monumentality. Architecture has thought time, with notable exceptions, through history rather than through duration, as that to be preserved, as that which somehow or provisionally overcomes time by transcending or freezing it.

I am more interested here in the relevance of the first sense of time, which I will represent through the concept of the virtual and virtuality, a concept that requires not only a time *before* time but also a time *after* time, a time bound up not only with the past and with history and historicity but also, perhaps primarily, with futurity, thus providing a mode of resistance to the privilege of the present and the stranglehold that the present and its correlatives, identity

and intention, maintain on space and matter. The times before and after time are the loci of emergence, of unfolding, of eruption, the spaces-times of the new, the unthought, the virtuality of a past that has not exhausted itself in activity and a future that cannot be exhausted or anticipated by the present. This past, which layers and resonates the present, refuses to allow the present the stability of the given or the inevitable. It is the past that enables duration as a mode of continuity as well as heterogeneity. Both Derrida and Deleuze, in very different ways, indicate this central role of difference as a vector in the modalization of space.

In articulating a notion of virtuality linked to futurity, to becoming and to differentiation, I want to explicate what I understand as a particularly underrepresented philosophical mode, which philosophy may share with architecture, what might be called a "logic of invention" as opposed to an Aristotelian logic of identity, reflection, reason, self-containment. A logic of invention has yet to be invented: only such a logic can mediate between the reflective categories of philosophical thought and the pragmatic requirements of any empirical project, here the architectural project. It is a linkage that invents new philosophies and new architectures. Instead of the self-containment of the syllogism (in which conclusions are logically entailed in validly constituted premises), a logic of invention is necessarily expansive, ramifying, and expedient, producing not premises so much as techniques, not conclusions so much as solutions, not arguments so much as effects. Such a logic can never be regulative (distinguishing valid from invalid arguments) but is always descriptive (do this, then this, then this).

Philosophy, according to Deleuze, is both a mode of solving problems and a mode of thinking or theorizing multiplicities. Architecture too is bound up with problem solving and with multiplicities, though the multiplicities

with which it deals are not simply conceptual or simply material. Philosophy is not, for Deleuze, a mode of mastering the real, framing its rules, understanding its principles; rather, it is what deals with the coagulation, the alignments between the actual and the virtual, the ways in which the actual feeds off and grows in distinction from the virtual and, conversely, the ways in which the virtual continually enriches and diminishes the actual by forcing it to diverge from itself, to always tend toward and to be absorbed by virtuality. Architecture, like philosophy (and for that matter, biology and physics), is perpetually verging on, irresistibly drawn to, its own virtualities, to the ever-increasing loops of uncertainty and immanence that its own practices engage and produce. The future of each discipline requires that each open itself up to a reconsideration of the virtual and the promise it holds for newness, otherness, divergence from what currently prevails.

What does the notion of the virtual mean? Here I only have the time (or is it the space!) to deal with one conception in any detail, Deleuze's reading of Bergson, and Bergson's understanding of the virtual and the return of the virtual image to the actual. Deleuze claims that Bergson is one of the great thinkers of becoming, of duration, multiplicity, and virtuality. Bergson developed his notion of duration in opposition to his understanding of space and spatiality. This understanding of duration and the unhinging of temporality that it performs are of at least indirect relevance to the arts or sciences of space, which may, through a logic of invention, derail and transform space and spatiality in analogous ways.

Space is understood, according to Deleuze (who follows Bergson at least up to a point on this), as a multiplicity that brings together the key characteristics of externality, simultaneity, contiguity or juxtaposition, differences of degree, and quantitative differentiations.

Space is discontinuous, infinitely divisible, static, and always actual. Space in short is the milieu of things, matter, identities, substances, entities that are real, comparable, and calculable. It is the natural home of science, of the actual, where there are differentiations of degree but not in kind:

Space, by definition, is outside us . . . space appears to us to subsist even when we leave it undivided, we know that it can wait and that a new effort of our imagination may decompose it when we choose. As, moreover, it never ceases to be space, it always implies juxtaposition, and, consequently, possible division. Abstract space is, indeed, at bottom, nothing but the mental diagram of infinite divisibility.³

Duration, by contrast, is a multiplicity of succession, heterogeneity, differences in kind and qualitative differentiations. It is continuous and virtual. Duration is divisible, of course, but it is transformed through the act of division—indeed, much of Bergson's work explores the implications of dividing time, among the more serious of which is the freezing of all motion into discrete momentary units. Duration is perfectly capable of subsisting without division, which is always imposed on it from the outside. Duration is not, through its continuity, homogeneous, smooth, or linear; rather, it is a mode of "hesitation," bifurcation, unfolding, or emergence.

If space and time are represented as discrete phenomena, as separate and indeed opposed, in their various qualities and attributes, then not only are these primordial processes of temporization that induce space ignored, but the primitive processes of spatialization through which the notion of duration and temporality exists also fail to emerge. Bergson himself acknowledges this, though only

rarely, when he qualifies and refines his understanding of space. It is not that space in itself must be or can only be the space of quantification; rather, it is a certain mode of doing science, particularly science under the determinist, predictive Laplacian model, that effects the mathematization and ordering of space and makes this seem to be the very nature of space itself. In a certain sense Bergson acknowledges the becoming one of the other, the relation of direct inversion between them, when he conceptualizes space as the contraction of time, and time as the expansion or dilation of space.

Space is mired in misconceptions and assumptions, habits and unreflective gestures that convert and transform it. Architecture, the art or science of spatial manipulation, must be as implicated in this as any other discipline or practice. According to Bergson, a certain habit of thought inverts the relations between space and objects, space and extension, to make it seem as if space precedes objects, when in fact space itself is produced *through* matter, extension, and movement:

Concrete extensity, that is to say, the diversity of sensible qualities, is not within space; rather it is space that we thrust into extensity. Space is not a ground on which real motion is posited; rather it is real motion that deposits space beneath itself. But our imagination, which is preoccupied above all by the convenience of expression and the exigencies of material life, prefers to invert the natural order of the terms. . . . Therefore, it comes to see movement as only a variation of distance, space being thus supposed to precede motion. Then, in a space which is homogeneous and infinitely divisible, we draw, in imagination, a trajectory and fix positions: afterwards, applying the movement to the trajectory, we see it divisible like the line we have drawn, and equally denuded of quality.⁴

Space in itself, space outside these ruses of the imagination, is not static, fixed, infinitely expandable, infinitely divisible, concrete, extended, continuous, and homogeneous, though perhaps we must think it in these terms in order to continue our everyday lives (and the architect is perhaps more invested in this understanding of space than anyone else). Space, like time, is emergence and eruption, oriented not to the ordered, the controlled, the static, but to the event, to movement or action. If we "shut up motion in space," as Bergson suggests, then we shut space up in quantification, without ever being able to think space in terms of quality, of difference and discontinuity. We do not think of spaces but can at best allow ourselves to utter "places," in a gesture to localization. Space seems to resist this kind of pluralization: it asserts itself as continuous, singular, and infinite. Space presents itself as ready-made, as given in its constancy, fixed in its form: it is then a mode of the capture of both space and time when time is understood as the fourth dimension of space common in post-Einsteinian ontology.

It is relevant that Bergson calls for a space, or spaces, sensitive to the motion and actions that unfold in them. Rather than seeing motion in its scientific terms as distance or space over time, Bergson indicates, though he does not develop, a different understanding, where space emerges through specific motions and specific spaces, where motion unfolds and actualizes space. As Deleuze explains,

Space, in effect, is matter or extension, but the "schema" of matter, that is, the representation of the limit where the movement of expansion would come to an end as the external envelope of all possible extensions. In this sense, it is not matter, it is not extensity, that is in space, but the very opposite. And if we think that matter has a thousand ways of becoming expanded or extended,

we must also say that there are all kinds of distinct extensities, all related, but still qualified, and which will finish by intermingling only in our own schema of space.⁵

This kind of space can no longer be considered static, infinitely extended, smooth, regular, amenable to gridding, to coordinates, to geometric division, the kind of space one can leave behind and return to intact, independent of what has occurred there. In opening up space to time, space becomes amenable to transformation and refiguring; it becomes particular, individualized. It is not clear that we need to return, as Bergson suggests, to the space of immediate, lived experience. For one thing, our lived experience at the end of the millennium involves spaces that were quite literally unimaginable in Bergson's time, and moreover, the immediacy of experience is itself not uninvested by the social modes of inhabitation of space. For another, it is not clear that immediate experience is any more the point of proliferation of virtualities and intensities than, say, the most intensely artificial and manufactured movements and spaces.

In a rare moment, Bergson contemplates the possibility of thinking space otherwise, understanding it in terms other than as the binary opposite of duration. Instead of being the pure medium of actuality, space too can be conceived as the field for the play of virtualities:

In regard to concrete extension, continuous, diversified and at the same time organized, we do not see why it should be bound up with the amorphous and inert space which subtends it—a space which we divide indefinitely, out of which we carve figures arbitrarily; and in which movement itself . . . can only appear as a multiplicity of instantaneous positions, since nothing there can ensure the coherence of past with present. It might, then, be possible, in a certain measure, to transcend space without stepping

out from extensity; and here we should really have a return to the immediate, since we do indeed perceive extensity, whereas space is merely conceived—being a kind of mental diagram.⁶

Bergson suggests that we can reinvent, or rather, return to a conception of space that does not so much underlie or subtend matter, functioning as the indifferent coordinates of the placement of matter, as function as an effect of matter and movement. It is not an existing, God-given space, the Cartesian space of numerical division, but an unfolding space, defined, as time is, by the arc of movement and thus a space open to becoming, by which I mean becoming other than itself, other than what it has been:

If we try to get back to the bottom of this common hypothesis [shared by philosophical realism and idealism] . . . we find that it consists in attributing to homogeneous space a disinterested office: space is supposed either merely to uphold material reality or to have the function, still purely speculative, of furnishing sensations with means of coordinating themselves. So the obscurity of realism, like that of idealism, comes from the fact that, in both of them, our conscious perception and the conditions of our conscious perception are assumed to point to pure knowledge, not to action. But now suppose that this homogeneous space is not logically anterior, but posterior to material things and to the pure knowledge which we can have of them; suppose that extensity is prior to space; suppose that homogeneous space concerns our action and only our action, being like an infinitely fine network which we stretch beneath material continuity in order to render ourselves masters of it, to decompose it according to the plan of our activities and our needs. Then . . . our hypothesis [has] the advantage of bringing us into harmony with science, which shows us each thing exercising an influence on all the others and, consequently, occupying, in a certain sense, the whole of the extended.⁷

The same attributes of becoming that Bergson accords to duration can now be seen to accompany spatiality: just as the whole of the past contracts, in various degrees, in each moment of the present, that is, just as the present is laden with virtualities that extend it beyond itself—the ballast of the virtual past being enough to propel an unpredicted future out of an uncontained and endlessly ramifying present—so too the whole of space, spatiality, contracts into the specificity of location, and the occupation of any space contains the virtual whole of spatiality, which is to say, the infinite possibilities of my action on and being acted on by matter in space and time. To remember any moment is to throw oneself into the past, to seek events where they took place—in time, in the past; to experience any other space is to throw oneself into spatiality, to become spatialized with all of space. To remember (to place oneself in the past), to relocate (to cast oneself elsewhere), is to occupy the whole of time and the whole of space, even admitting that duration and location are always specific, always defined by movement and action. It is to refuse to conceptualize space as a medium, as a container, a passive receptacle whose form is given by its content, and instead to see it as a moment of becoming, of opening up and proliferation, a passage from one space to another, a space of change, which changes with time.

Instead of a return to the prescientific immediacy that Bergson suggests as a remedy for the containment that science places on space, I would suggest a different approach to the reinvigoration of space through duration, the restoration of becoming to both space and time. If time is neither linear and successive nor cyclical and recurrent but indeterminate, unfolding, serial, multiplying, complex, heterogeneous, then space too must be reconfigured not as neutral, nor as singular, and homogeneous but as opening

up to other spaces, not regulating processes and events so much as accompanying them. We do not, as Bergson claims, need to *experience* or live such a space (or time): this does not seem possible or necessary. We need more adequately intellectual, but above all pragmatic, models by which to understand and actively seek the maximal paths of proliferation for virtual time becoming virtual space. These models are not simply modes of self-complacency that enable us to live our lives as before, now with a justification and a rationale; rather, these models may help us to understand, see, think, build differently, according to other logics of invention and experimentation.

Perceiving

To understand how the virtual may enrich conceptions of space and thus of the architectural project, we may need to make a brief detour through the role that the virtual plays in duration and especially in inserting the past into the present as its state of virtuality. This may in turn provide some of the key concepts or terms by which to think spatiality in terms of virtuality.

Bergson wants to define perception and memory, our modes of access to the present and the past, in operational or pragmatic terms: the present is that which acts, while the past can be understood as that which no longer acts or whose actions are at best virtual.⁸ Perception must be linked to nascent or dawning action, action-in-potential. Perception is actual insofar as it is active and thus relates primarily to an impending future. By contrast, instead of memory being regarded as a faded perception, a perception that has receded into the past, as is commonplace, it must be regarded as ideational, inactive, virtual. "The past is only idea, the present is ideo-motor." A present perception and a past recollection are not simply different in degree (one a faded, diminished version of the other) but

different in kind. Perception is that which propels us toward the real, toward space, objects, matter, the future, while memory is that which impels us toward consciousness, the past, and duration.¹⁰ If perception impels us toward action and thus toward objects, then, to that extent, objects reflect my body's possible actions upon them.

The present is that which acts and lives, that which functions to anticipate an immediate future in action. The present is a form of impending action. The past is that which no longer acts, although in a sense it lives a shadowy and fleeting existence. It still is. It is real. The past remains accessible in the form of recollections, either as motor mechanisms in the form of habit memory, or, more correctly, in the form of image memories. These memories are the condition of perception in the same way that the past, for Bergson, is a condition of the present. Whereas the past in itself is powerless, if it can link up to a present perception, it has a chance to be mobilized in the course of another perception's impulse to action. In this sense, the present is not purely self-contained; it straddles both past and present, requiring the past as its precondition, oriented as it is toward the immediate future. Our perception is a measure of our virtual action upon things. The present, as that which is oriented toward both perception and action, is the threshold of their interaction and thus the site of duration. The present consists in the consciousness I have of my body. Memory, the past, has no special link with or proximity to my body. Most significant for the purposes of this argument is that as the present functions in the domain of the actual, the past functions as virtual.

The past cannot be identified with the memory images that serve to represent or make it actual for or useful to us; rather, it is the seed that can actualize itself in a memory. Memory is the present's mode of access to the past. The past is preserved in time, while the memory image,

one of the past's images or elements, can be selected according to present interests. Just as perception leads me toward objects where they are, outside of myself and in space, and just as I perceive affection (which Deleuze would refer to as intensity) where it arises, in my body,¹¹ so too I recall or remember only by placing myself in the realm of the past where memory subsides or subsists. Thus, paradoxically, memory, the past, is not *in us*, just as perception is not *in us*. Perception takes place outside ourselves, where objects are (in space); memory takes us to where the past is (in duration). In Deleuze's reading, Bergson goes so far as to say that the only subjectivity or life is time and that life participates in this subjectivity to the extent that it is submerged in duration.¹²

Bergson seems to problematize a whole series of assumptions regarding our conceptions of the present and the past. We tend to believe that when the present is exhausted or depleted of its current force, it somehow slips into the past where it is stored in the form of memories. It is then replaced by another present. Against this presumption, Bergson suggests that a new present could never replace the old one if the latter did not pass while it is still present. In place of the more usual claim of the succession of the past by the present, this leads to his postulate of the *simultaneity* of past and present. The past is contemporaneous with the present it has been. They exist, they "occur" at the same time. The past could never exist if it did not coexist with the present of which it is the past:

The past and the present do not denote two successive moments, but two elements which coexist: One is the present, which does not cease to pass, and the other is the past, which does not cease to be but through which all presents pass. . . . The past does not follow the present, but on the contrary, is presupposed by it as the pure condition without which it would not pass. In other words, each present goes back to itself as past.¹³

Bergson argues that the past would be altogether inaccessible to us if we can gain access to it only through the present and its passing. The only access we have to the past is through a leap into virtuality, through a move into the past itself, through seeing that the past is outside us and that we are in it rather than it in us. The past exists, but it is in a state of latency or virtuality. We must place ourselves in it if we are to have recollections, memory images. This we do in two movements or phases. First, we place ourselves into the past in general (which can only occur through a certain detachment from the immediacy of the present), and then we place ourselves in a particular region of the past. Bergson conceives of the past in terms of a series of planes or segments, each one representing the whole of the past in a more or less contracted form. We move from one set of memories to another through a leap into a virtual time. We must jump into the milieu of the past in general in order to access any particular memories. The present can be understood as an infinitely contracted moment of the past, the point where the past intersects most directly with the body. It is for this reason that the present is able to pass.

Each segment has its own features, although each contains within itself the whole of the past. Memories drawn from various strata may be clustered around idiosyncratic points, "shining points of memory," as Bergson describes them, which are multiplied to the extent that memory is dilated.¹⁴ Depending on the recollection we are seeking, we must jump in at a particular segment; in order to move on to another, we must make another leap: "We have to jump into a chosen region, even if we have to return to the present in order to make another jump, if the recollection sought for gives no response and does not realize itself in a recollection-image."¹⁵ For Deleuze, this provides a model for Bergson's understanding of our relations to other systems of images as well (and hence Bergson's suitability to Deleuze's analysis of cinema).

It is only through a similar structure that we can detach ourselves from the present to understand linguistic utterances or make conceptual linkages. The structure of the time image also contains that of the language image and the thought image. Only by throwing ourselves into language as a whole, into the domain of sense in general, can we understand any utterance, and only by leaping into a realm of ideas can we understand problems.¹⁶ In all three cases, this leap involves landing in different concentrations of the past, language, or thought, which nonetheless contain the whole within them to different degrees.

Along with the simultaneity or coexistence of each moment of the present with the entirety of the past, there are other implications in Bergson's paradoxical account. Each moment carries a virtual past: each present must, as it were, pass through the whole of the past. This is what is meant by the past in general. The past does not come after the present has ceased to be, nor does the present become or somehow move into the past. Rather, it is the past which is the condition of the present; it is only through a preexistence that the present can come to be. Bergson does not want to deny that succession takes place—of course, one present (and past) replaces another—but such actual succession can only take place because of a virtual coexistence of the past and the present, the virtual coexistence of all of the past at each moment of the present—and at each level or segment of the past. Thus, there must be a relation of repetition between each segment whereby each segment or degree of contraction or dilation is a virtual repetition of the others, not identical, certainly, but a version. The degrees of contraction or dilation that differentiate segments constitute modes of repetition in difference.

In Deleuze's reading, Bergson systematically develops a series of paradoxes regarding the past and present that run counter to a more common, everyday understanding:

(1) we place ourselves at once, in a leap, in the ontological element of the past (paradox of the leap); (2) there is a difference in kind between the present and the past (paradox of Being); (3) the past does not follow the present that it has been, but coexists with it (paradox of coexistence); (4) what coexists with each present is the whole of the past, integrally, on various levels of contraction and relaxation (*détente*) (paradox of psychic repetition).

These Bergsonian paradoxes, which are only paradoxical if duration is represented on the model of space, are all, Deleuze claims, a critique of more ordinary theories of memory, whose propositions state that

(1) we can reconstitute the past with the present; (2) we pass gradually from the one to the other; (3) . . . they are distinguished by a before and an after; and (4) . . . the work of the mind is carried out by the addition of elements (rather than by changes of level, genuine jumps, the reworking of systems).¹⁷

It seems clear that a series of analogous unhings of the self-containment and fixity of spatiality can also be developed, though Bergson himself refrains from doing so. Duration contains as part of its conceptual content the ideas of (1) unevenness, heterogeneity, states of contraction and expansion, such that time exists in a state of detailed elaboration or in a state of compressed schematism; (2) difference, specificity, and multiplicity: each movement has its own duration, each event its own unfolding. These durations, though, are never simply isolated or self-contained but always both intersect with other durations (the duration of my actions may interact with the durations of the objects and materials with which I work) and participate in a kind of megaduration, a world duration that renders them in a web or weave of comparable and interlocked durations and becomings; (3) simultaneity, the coexistence of

the past in the present, the anticipation of the present as the actualization of the past (in other words, the coexistence of two kinds of time, one frozen and virtual, the other dynamic and actual). These two kinds of duration are irreducible in their difference: the past is contemporaneous with the present it has been; and (4) succession, the complication of the past, present, and future. Each is necessarily involved in the function of the others, not by way of determinism (which in fact annuls the existence of the future and enables the effectivity of the past only) but through the divergence of the present from the past, and the future from the present, the interlocking of the past and the future (both virtual, both productive without emerging as such through the present) without the mediation of the present.

These questions remain: Do these rather strange and paradoxical formulations of duration have any spatial counterparts? Can the ways in which we conceive, indeed live, space be subjected to a similar unhinging, a similar destabilization of presence and habitual self-evidence? To return to my earlier question: What would virtual space be like? What does such a conception entail? How can it be thought? How can it be built, lived, practiced?

I wrote above about the need for a logic of invention. Instead of requiring logical certainty, the guarantee of universal validity, the capacity to provide rules of procedure independent of the particularities of space and time, such a logic would instead require ingenuity, experimentation, novelty, specification, and particularity as its key ingredients. It would not seek to be certain but rather to incite, to induce, to proliferate. Rather than direct itself to questions of consistency, coherence, and regularity, such a logic would focus on an intuition of uniqueness, the facing of each situation according to its specific exigencies, the openness to failure as much as to innovation. I am not pro-

posing that we replace Aristotelian logic with such a logic of invention; I only propose that we acknowledge that each may work and be relevant in its particular spheres. Such a "logic of invention" has always governed architecture. The question is: What are the best terms by which to articulate this logic? In other words, how can we extract its *own* theory from its architectural practices rather than simply import or impose a theoretical frame from the outside? This is to inquire about architecture's own (theoretical) latencies, its virtualities.

I can offer only a more general understanding of virtuality and what it implies for rethinking or perhaps reinventing space. I have two thoughts: one on the rethinking of space in terms of becoming and duration; the other on what the virtual can offer to architectural theory and practice.

To look, then, at some possibilities for the reconceptualization of space in terms of its openness to its own processes of differentiation and divergence. It seems possible that many—or at least some—of the qualities that Bergson attributes to duration may also be relevant to a considered spatiality, especially given that the time-space of primordial experience links space, before mathematization, to the movement of duration. Many of the attributes particular to duration may have some spatial equivalent. For example, if duration exists in states of contraction and expansion, in degrees of uneven intensity, either elaborated in increasing detail or functioning simply as "shining points" of intensity, then perhaps space too need not be construed as even, homogeneous, continuous, infinitely the same. Perhaps space also has loci of intensity, of compression or elasticity; perhaps it need no longer be considered a medium. Perhaps it can be considered lumpy, intensified, localized, or regionalized. I am not talking here simply of locale or landscape but also of the fundamental or ontological space that underlies a specific

region. Nor am I simply confirming the insights of an Einsteinian space-time, in which there is still a relation of smooth, mathematical alignments between the expansion of time and the contraction of space. The very configurations of space itself may be heterogeneous, just as the movements or configurations of duration vary. Perhaps, in other words, there is a *materiality* to space itself, rather than materiality residing with only its contents.

This implies that space itself, if it is heterogeneous, is multiple, differential, specific. There are specific locations, places, regions that have their own modes of extensity: like intensity, the extensive always radiates from a point, given spatially as "here," the spatial present. The spatial present defines its own region, but this regionality both intersects with the regionality of other heres and, like world duration, links to a larger space, a world space or even a universal space, which in no way qualifies or marginalizes the concrete differences between different spaces. Cosmological spaces are not the master or overarching space within which places or regions are located in a mode of neutralization; cosmological space could itself be regarded as patchwork and uneven.

If two types of time coexist, one virtual (the past) and the other actual (the present) and their coexistence is necessary for the functioning of either, then perhaps there is a spatial correlate for this unhinging of temporal continuity through Bergson's paradoxical idea of the temporal simultaneity of present and past. Obviously, spatial relations happily admit relations of simultaneity: space is that which enables simultaneous or coextensive relations. Perhaps it would be more intriguing to consider spatiality in terms of the coexistence of multiple relations of *succession*, space as a layering of spaces within themselves, spaces enfolded in others, spaces that can function as the virtualities of the present, the "here." Here a notion of virtual space will be

of crucial relevance. If past, present, and future are always entwined and make each other possible only through their divergences and bifurcations, then perhaps there is a way to consider spatiality in terms of relations of nearness and farness, relations of proximity and entwinement, the interimplications of the very near and the very far, rather than of numerals or geometry.

This possibility returns us once again to the vexing question of the virtual and its particular spatial resonances. One cannot of course directly specify what a virtual is, for insofar as it *is*, insofar as it exists, it exists as actual. In the process of actualization, the virtual annuls itself as such in order to reemerge as an actual that thereby produces its own virtualities. At best one can specify what the virtual may produce, what effects or differences it may generate. We need to remind ourselves of how Deleuze distinguishes between the virtual and the possible: he claims that the possible is the correlate or counterpart of the real. There are two distinctive connections between the possible and the real: the real both resembles the possible and is a limitation of the possible. The possible, or at least one of them, is a preformed real: the real is simply the coming into material form of this nonmaterial possible. The real is a mode of conformity with the possible, its plan or blueprint. Or equally, the possible is simply the retrospectively conceived past of the real. By contrast, the virtual is counterposed with the actual rather than the real (indeed the virtual has a reality without any actuality). The actual in no way resembles the virtual nor does it limit or select from the virtual. It is linked to the virtual through "difference or divergence and . . . creation":

It is difference that is primary in the process of actualization—the difference between the virtual from which we begin and the actuals at which we arrive, and also the difference between the

complementary lines according to which actualization takes place. In short, the characteristic of virtuality is to exist in such a way that it is actualized by being differentiated and is forced to differentiate itself.¹⁸

Thus the virtual *requires* the actual to diverge, to differentiate itself, to proceed by way of division and disruption, forging modes of actualization that will transform this virtual into others unforeseen by or uncontained within it. In other words, virtuality functions evolutionarily: it functions through the production of the novelties that remain unforeseen by, yet somehow generated through, the virtual materials ("genes" or seeds). The virtual is the realm of productivity, of functioning otherwise than its plan or blueprint, functioning in excess of design and intention. This is the spark of the new that the virtual has over the possible: the capacity for generating innovation through an unpredicted leap, the capacity of the actual to be more than itself, to become other than the way it has always functioned. It is differentiation that, while propelled by a tendency or virtuality, can only actualize itself through its encounters with matter, with things, with movements and processes, and thus with obstacles, through which it produces itself as always other than its virtuality, always new, singular, and unique.¹⁹

How then can space function differently from the ways in which it has always functioned? What are the possibilities of inhabiting otherwise? Of being extended otherwise? Of living relations of nearness and farness differently?

*How [can] a city engage in philosophy
without being destroyed?*

Plato, *The Republic*

*What is realized in my history is not
the past definite of what was, since it
is no more, or even the present perfect
of what has been in what I am, but
the future anterior of what I shall
have been for what I am in the pro-
cess of becoming.*

Eight Embodied Utopias:
The Time of Architecture

Jacques Lacan, *Écrits: A Selection*

The theme of embodied utopias provides me with the opportunity to explore some paradoxes or aporias, which are my favorite topic because they always imply a movement of systems—here systems of reason—beyond their own systematicity, and modes of containment that are unable to quite contain or control that which they draw into their circle of influence. The phrase "embodied utopias" itself hovers between terms that are tense and uneasy in their relations. It is this tension, especially when it expresses itself most acutely in the form of the paradoxical, that always provides the strongest motivations for rethinking categories, terms, and assumptions, and for adding complications to perhaps oversimplified frameworks within which those terms were thought. Utopias are the spaces of phantasmatically attainable political and personal ideals, the projection of idealized futures; embodiment, though, is that which has never had its place within utopias. It is not clear whether the phrase "embodied utopias" is an oxymoron or not! I want to look at the productive (and perhaps impossible) relations between