

Constantino Pereira Martins\*

[ $A \wedge P ; P \wedge A$ ] [ $A$  AND  $P ; P$  AND  $A$ ]:  
ARCHITECTURE AND PHILOSOPHY, PHILOSOPHY  
AND ARCHITECTURE

ABSTRACT: This reflection is an attempt to bridge Architecture < and > Philosophy, supported by two main drives: a Wittgensteinian form and a Nietzschean intempestiveness. This means that the final result, besides being fragile, fragmentary, and slightly unorthodox, will only make sense if the reader abandons himself to the proposals to think with the text, accompanying the challenges that each proposition entails, like a peripatetic dialog in a philosophical garden.

KEYWORDS: philosophy, architecture, Wittgenstein, conjunction, bicondicionality

---

\* Constantino Pereira Martins: NOVA University of Lisbon; Institute for Philosophical Studies, Centre for Classical and Humanistic Studies, University of Coimbra; constan-tinomar@gmail.com.

This is an Open Access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial reproduction and distribution of the work, in any medium, provided the original work is not transformed in any way and is properly cited.

O.I P  $\wedge$  A

0.1 All the world's problems can be decomposed, recomposed, and re-problematised in various ways, explicit and inexplicit, complex or simple, macro and micro, *ad infinitum*.

0.1.1 All things in the world are related to all other things.

0.1.2 The relationship is multiple, in the orderly variation between chaos and order, but nothing subsists by itself, nothing exists in isolation.

0.1.2.1 Every report, construction, invention, and thought of relationships, connections, and correspondences, is a way of understanding the world and life.

0.1.2.2 Life is the highest value.

0.1.3 It is fair to point out that it is different departing from philosophy towards architecture than from architecture to philosophy.

0.1.3.1 *It is difficult to find the beginning*. But it's a game changer where you start your beginning from. Rawls tried very hard to create a solution for this problem.

0.1.4 The easiest way to start the introduction to our problem is by disjunction:  $P \vee A \therefore P$

0.1.5 Philosophy is an exercise in curiosity and perplexity. Curiosity is the state of tension to know something, to overcome ignorance, our great enemy. Curiosity is a *sine qua non* condition of knowledge. Perplexity has to do with a mismatch, a short circuit, an injustice in some way, a restlessness.

0.1.5.1 Philosophy is an exercise that springs from negativity, pain, suffering, and scars, from a mismatch with the world.

0.1.5.2 Philosophy is an exercise in radicalism, in abstract and concrete thinking. There is no pure metaphysics just as there is no absolute pragmatics. As in architecture, there is no such thing as pure inspiration or pure function (pure function would be engineering *tout court*).

0.1.5.3 Philosophy is an exercise in Humbleness. There is a demand for smallness, modesty, and relativity. Recognize in Pascal this absolute and concrete distension.

0.1.5.4 Philosophy inhabits a claim of universality, a long illness incapable of resolving the eternal problems that afflict each generation from the beginning. For some, a useless rational, and melancholy disease, for others, an honest way of life, and the courageous challenge of facing the unknown and the mystery of life.

0.15.41 The mystery of life has two main veins: as a miracle or as a condemnation.

0.1.5.5 All of philosophy could be summarized in two concepts: ignorance and desire.

0.1.6 The easiest way to start the introduction to our problem is by disjunction:  $A \vee P \therefore A$

0.1.6.1 Architecture is the result of an exercise in idealization and construction.

0.1.6.2 “*Architecture is what architects do,*” says the ignorant philosopher, being outside of the problem.

0.1.6.21 There are many ways to occupy your time and spend your life. There are a lot of things one can do. But there is a difference between doing and acting.

0.1.6.3 Architecture is an art based on technique, on the struggle between function and the pursuit of beauty.

0.1.6.4 [*dark (il)logical areas*] Ideological trenches 1: architecture is practical: it concerns use, money, the customer, and the order. The pursuit of beauty is a luxury (useless and unnecessary).

0.1.6.5 [*dark (il)logical areas*] Ideological trenches 2: the disjunction often settles in a fault, in a crack: the realm of prejudice.

0.1.6.6 [*dark (il)logical areas*] Ideological trenches 3: the disjunction can evolve into the affirmation of a contradiction: the kingdom of stereotypes.

0.1.6.7 In order for dialogue to exist there must be a willingness to listen to the other, and to want to know about the other.

0.1.7 The ideal way to start the introduction to our problem is by conjunction:  $[A \wedge P; P \wedge A]$

0.1.7.1 Philosophy and architecture can be linked in conjunction. All notebooks are proof of that. The thought and the drawn line.

0.1.7.2 There are many ways for two things to be related. Start at the beginning: philosophy and architecture are not in contradiction.

0.1.7.21 Philosophy and architecture can be understood through distributivity (and complementarity).

0.1.7.22 Philosophy and architecture can be understood by bi-conditional cumulativeness.

0.1.7.23 Philosophy and architecture can be understood, in their common richness, through associativity. But they can't be talking to themselves with their backs turned, using each other what they want from each other. Associativity as a principle of deepening (in the fight against ignorance). The task of philosophy is to show. More light. The work of philosophy is like a miner. Light and darkness.

0.1.7.23 Philosophy and architecture can be understood through linear biconditionality ( $p \leftrightarrow q$ ) but a new logical notation should be invented, a new symbol (close to the image of the bridge) that reveals a fragile biconditionality, a voluntary implication ( $P \langle \text{-----} \rangle A$ ). Which reveals the existence of philosophy in architecture and architecture in philosophy ( $P \rightarrow A$ )  $\wedge$  ( $A \rightarrow P$ ).

0.1.7.231 Sometimes everything would be simpler if we substituted the word philosophy for thought.

0.1.7.232 Clarity of thought and language is inestimable. Therefore, there is thought in architecture and an architecture of thought.

0.1.7.233 Philosophy has no place in the world today. It could be eradicated. There is a confusion between Philosophy and thought. Philosophy

closed itself off in the academy, misunderstood and bitter. Thought, on the other hand, can never close in on itself. It is dialogue. Without dialogue, there is no thought. Philosophy has been expelled from the *polis*, and in a sorrowful monologue it laments its heavy fate. Philosophy today is a Greek tragedy that everyone wishes could simply die far away and in silence.

0.1.7.234 Philosophy is today a Greek tragedy that everyone would like to die far away and in silence so that they could feast at ease, and thus look young and fresh. Cosmetic and image operations, fireworks, political economy of thought oriented towards quantification, results, funding, and markets. The voracity of the game is no match for the general barbaric cruelty.

0.1.7.2341 The existential tragedy can be defined as forcing our belonging in a place that rejects us. The tragedy of this tragedy, in addition to its ironic outcome of cancellation, is transvestism. The show must go on. But the abyss is still there, waiting to be filled, to be faced.

0.1.7.235 There is really just one paradigm of philosophical anthropology: *inclusion-belonging-recognition vs. exclusion-solitude-abandonment*. Translated to political philosophy in the eternal return of the same: the conquest and maintenance of power.

0.1.8 The hand that draws the line surrenders with the same impulse as the hand that writes the music sheet. In its most radical nudity, the same gesture is rooted in its utmost simplicity: a seeing-listening, a white sheet of paper, a pen or pencil. The virtual root of an invisible process. For this same reason, it revealed the fascination we feel for the unique beauty of notebooks, notepads, small papers, scribbles, and the first attempts that something makes to be born.

0.1.9 The relationship between philosophy and architecture is an invisible bridge, as is the spirit that supports the hand that draws.

0.1.9.1 The task of philosophy with architecture is to bring to the surface of words and concepts, the intuition and inspiration of the hand, and the eye, that imagines the solution, the form, the process.

0.1.10 Words are the crumbs we use to remember processes.

0.2 . R [ A  $\wedge$  P ; P  $\wedge$  A]. RELATION.

0.2.1 Relation is the way two or more entities interact.

0.2.11 All ontological propositions are quasi-evident, although necessary.

0.2.111 To think is to establish relationships. Phenomenon and representation. Co-relation.

0.2.2 In doubt, always go back to Kant: quantity, quality, modality, relation.

0.2.2.1 Relationship between the three cognitive faculties as well: sensitivity, understanding, and reason. But it is the imagination, and more properly a trap of the imagination (*focus imaginarius*), that allows progress.

0.2.2.2 Never forget the conditions of possibility of the phenomenon. Simplify and empathize, in short, make an effort. The attempt to understand and explain something is related to a context and in a context.

0.2.2.2.1 Like a philosophical mantra: *Never forget the context*. Even in the pure negation of context, in the absence of context.

0.2.2.3 Kant saw, in his own way, a balance in the architecture of reason. A game. It is that game that we still play and that will be playing for a long time.

0.2.2.4 No matter how much we rationally try to understand the relationships in the world, we are always left with a feeling of *deep mystery and hidden art*.

0.2.2.5 Philosophy builds concepts, architecture builds buildings, but there are systems of thought that are an architecture of ideas, and there are buildings that stand on the basis of concepts. The deeper problem is the explanation. Different from substantiating, explaining a thing is to detail its order of reason, and more profoundly its existence, its reason for being. A sketch of a building can be without reason, without explanation. But that doesn't rule out thinking about it. Difference between knowing and thinking.

0.2.3 In doubt, always go back to Aristotle.

0.2.3.1 Use categories as a mathematical linear schema in order to decompose a problem, *i.e.*, methodological principles: substance, quantity, quality, relation, space, time, position, condition, action, affection, etc.

0.2.3.11 Even if we use all categories in our power to aid us in understanding the world, *thought is surrounded by a halo*, *i.e.*, *the order of possibilities*.

0.2.3.111 Simplicity seems to be the hardest word.

0.2.3.12 When we think about relations we always think about the form that will be filled between two or more entities. That space, devoid of any possible form, will remain blank if the relation is not apprehended. That blank space, whichever form it takes (knowable or unknowable), is by itself a hiatus waiting to be realized. The existential becoming of that interval is an open discovery.

0.2.3.13 Some of us feel that we are lacking a sort of lost organon, that we were deprived of it.

0.2.3.2 The general paradigms we are facing today revolve around two main axes: a) *substance*, unity, and multiplicity: non-fusion / sharing; and b) *geometry*, linearity, and non-linearity: from dependence to freedom.

0.2.3.3 The main danger we all have to face, individually and collectively, now and in the future: relationship and suspicion. This may only be surpassed by the truth and not by the understanding of philosophy as a crutch, prothesis, entertainment, or rhetorical ornament. Philosophy, as an effort and thought, cannot be reduced to a marketing strategy of using words. The relationship only has strength when one commits to it. And surrendering to the other is always a risk. The other can pretend to catch us or leave after catching us. It is the challenge of trust. And therefore, the challenge of building a new organon.

0.2.3.4 Trust is a virtuous relation of mutual benefit. It's a relation beyond selfishness and altruism.

0.2.3.5 Relation and accident (erosion or creation). Facing the hermetic depth regarding dehumanization.

0.2.3.51 Facing the other has an intentional density beyond words. Fighters know that. And that is also why some people can't look others in the eye. In ethics, we must never forget small gestures. Our face is an ethical statement. In ethics, we must never forget Levinas.

0.2.4 The dialectical paradigm of identity and difference can be translated according to Aristotle in three figures of relation: utility, pleasure, and good.

### 0.3 A $\wedge$ P

0.3.1 All ontological or metaphysical propositions are unnecessary, with the exception of the first big question: being or nothingness? Irony of ironies.

0.3.2 There is only one contemporary dilemma: repetition.

0.3.2.1 There is only one contradiction in the contemporary: the very contradictory condition of the contemporary imprisoned in its totalitarian statute, *i.e.*, the infinite imprisonment in the present and the immediate. Sisyphus' dilemma.

0.3.3 Wittgenstein is the great founder of the bridge between philosophy and architecture: *de jure* and *de facto*.

0.3.4 The relationship between architecture and philosophy is rooted in the ancient battle between theory and practice, concept and fact, beauty and usefulness, light and shadow, thought form and crystalized form. But with blind people on both sides of the conflict. *There is no spoon.*

0.3.5 The ultimate object of philosophy is the affirmation of the individual, of the self, and the ultimate object of architecture is the other, as a self.

0.3.6 Everything that matters in the work of philosophy and architecture is posthumous. It belongs to the future. Philosophical and architectural work is an exercise in solitude. The advantage of architecture is the construction site: a live feed that is still part of the process.

0.3.6.1 There is a risk of philosophy becoming subsidiary of other disciplines, losing its autonomy and radicality, its self-sustainability, and

entering a process of subservience and weakening. Is this statement just a prejudiced prediction or does the existence of applied philosophy in no way affect the prestige of philosophical activity in its millenary path? Applied philosophy was always part of the exercise of philosophy until it was locked in the tower of the campus, becoming sterile and unrelated to the world and the real problems of the living. It became an archaeological discipline. We must rescue philosophical anthropology and restore the bridges of knowing and doing.

0.3.6.12 Philosophy is not a monologue. It's a dialogue. With life.

0.3.7 Loneliness and anonymity: shadow and dust, victory and defeat of what remains.

0.3.7.1 The ultimate fight is against space and time: ruins and memory.

0.3.7.11 The ultimate fight is against laziness. Become your principles, become your actions: embodiment.

0.3.7.12 The ultimate fight is against death.

0.3.8 Architecture, as an aesthetic and anthropological phenomenon, is a permanent challenge, far beyond its basic utilitarian and practical understanding, which is its undeniable origin. Crossing that initial line implies opening a frontier.

0.3.81 Maybe the journey is always more interesting than the finish line. Enjoy the ride.

0.3.9 The founding architectural gesture: *symbol*, victory over nature, or *choice*, and conquest of the unnecessary. Fold over the useless.

0.3.9.1 The architectural gesture rises up and edifies itself between ethics and aesthetics, with ethics and aesthetics, which are after all *one and the same thing*.

0.3.10 If the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be determined by sensations, emotions, and passions, then the challenge of architecture, and art in general, can be summed up in one word: immersion.

0.3.11 Beauty is the fight against the machine of the world.

0.3.111 Beauty is the fight against the ugliness of the world.

0.3.112 The teleology of beauty in one word: freedom.

0.3.113 Biology and dialectic of beauty: pleasure, agreement, surprise, overtaking, pleasure.

0.3.114 Architecture of beauty: Imagination vs. Reason. (*Cognition, desire, and feeling.*)

0.3.115 Beauty is the transcendence of function, the victory over logic. Expression, emotion, projection, immersion.

0.3.12 Projection of the self and others: the problem of identity. As in solitude or affirmation, in refusal or recognition.

0.3.13 Protection of oneself and others: the problem of nature. As in the scorpion and the toad. As in storm and lightning.

0.314 Architecture deals with need and desire. The desire part is what ties it to philosophy.

0.315 It is said of inspiration: struggle between form and matter, within time, between memory and oblivion, discipline and laziness, routine and anarchy.

There is no architecture without thought. That would be mere execution. Pure technique.

0.316 If the future is thrown on emotions, how will a dispositional architecture come about? An architecture beyond housing, that plays in dialogue with senses and that enhances them?

A power to unfold and discover.

0.317 Architecture is more than a contract, although it is always social, it is a Faustian pact between money and beauty.

0.318 With imagination as the ruling faculty, dreams, utopias, visions, possibilities, coexistences, and compossibility are diluted and melted together. The shadows and light that mix in reconnection with the past, present, or with future ruins, with what has already died and what is

about to be born, everything and everyone trapped in an orgiastic limbo of pure force and creation, of maximum potency, origin, and end. In this vital magma, we look into the fog of the future in search of a familiar face. Architecture is patient waiting. Or a machine to make money and please others. There is a difference between serving and obeying. Dialogue is born out of mutual respect.

0.321 Immersion is a dialogue for diving and housing. Architecture as a service.

0.322 The architectural practice ranges between two extreme borders: on one hand the common good, related to scarcity and poverty, and on the other the privileged, regarding luxury and rarity.

0.323 Will empty and linear architecture succumb to feeling and passion?

0.324 Architecture is an exercise in paradoxical movement because in movement it roots things but also fixes itself. And philosophy is an exercise in stopping, in suspension.

0.325 In architecture, ethics, and aesthetics go hand in hand. Wittgenstein knew of this unbreakable connection.

0.33 When we talk about philosophy and architecture, we should always start with Wittgenstein.

0.34 The search for the new, beyond adventure, is a risk of death.

0.35 At the crossroads of the present, where the real city and the virtual city overlap, complexity settles in and requires an ethical effort, a responsibility that will be increasingly at stake, in the optimistic expectation that technologies of care will replace the technologies of solitude.

In the labyrinth of the future and the present, there is both a clearing and a desert, which pushes some towards the comfort of the ordered past, and others towards the madness of the unpredictable, where we walk like blind people clinging to each other's shoulders.

0.36 One of the greatest beauties of architecture is its work with what does not exist, with what is not yet seen, with what is not there.

0.361 Sometimes you only discover things while doing them. Process is the key word. And eventually the thing that you are building starts to dialogue with you, demanding some gestures and refusing others.

At that precise point of unveiling, in the case of the architect, he unlocks a multi-dimension plateau that fuses architecture, engineering, mason, and voyeur.

0.37 Architecture is a primitive art. Incredibly, it belongs to a restricted set of primary gestures such as eating, dressing, protecting, attacking, and procreating. It belongs to the few arts and techniques from which we were able to return to an original position of survival such as hunting, walking around looking for food and water, painting. Even before telling stories, the great mother of all words in the struggle against silence.

0.371 There is something primitive that remains in the architectural gesture. In the fight against time, in the tearing of the space, Sisyphus celebrates an ancient gesture, similar to that of architecture, between effort and disappearance, habitation and death.

0.372 The essence of the architectural gesture or the problem of the origin in/of architecture.

Two paradigms: a) The menhir as a paradigm, architecture as a change. Exit the cave to the Dolmen, Anta, open air, and open space, facing human vulnerability and essential fragility. And recreating the cave again in plain field; or b) The possibility of overcoming survival. Beat nature or build a second nature, through choice, by preference: the aesthetic. The unnecessary.

0.373 An archeology of the essence of architecture is something too crude and distant for today's taste, too close to the smell, that long forgotten relative disappeared and far from our civilized sight, a futile attempt to find traces that did not yet inhabit the sound of the machines. Architecture is a search, a hunt.