

Philippe Barré, Isabelle Guilet, Bruno Plisson

The conception of architectural works went through extreme intellectualization laid bare by a reading of contents, shown naively in transcendental analysis as the meaning despite its having one unique significance. What resulted from this was knowledge but not truth.

Let us state instead that the question was in the transition from the imaginary dimension to the dimension of reality, of expressing in another typology the tension of deliquescence; this alone is capable to bring to light what one sought to achieve, that is effectivity.

Through chemical deterioration, the architectural algorithms, selected in a specific manner, were susceptible to the transcendence of the meaning of the particular in relationship to the general. This typology of semblance made it possible to forego an image or a reality and indeed paved the way for a historical dimension of the symbolic kind, leading eventually to a non-radicalization of the parts and to an acceptance of the line of separation of the immersed part and the emerged part.

Out of this articulation of construction, from the meaning of the discourse and displacement into space, what has been allowed to emerge and is specifically operative in the field which retains our interest today, is "the mediate dimension of architecture".

