

PRZEMYSŁAW BIGAJ

ORCID: 0000-0003-0808-6286

Cracow University of Technology, Poland

ARCHITECTURE – THE DRAWN WORLD OF MYTHS OR THE ART OF CONSTRUCTED REALITY?

ARCHITEKTURA – RYSOWANY ŚWIAT MITÓW CZY SZTUKA ZBUDOWANEJ RZECZYWISTOŚCI?

Abstract

In the field of art theory, architecture rarely goes beyond the drawn world of myths. Whereas in practice, it concentrates on the actual work of art. The following paper aims to show architecture in these two culturally relevant aspects – theoretical and practical or mythical and physically tangible ones. While theory involves creative activities, organising space according to compositional principles and seeking the ideal ratio of proportions, practice is usually the architect's response to individual and social human needs, which it seeks to provide with a spatially useful form. The text analyses different attitudes, outlooks and creative views on architectural activity and defining architecture based on key issues discussed in professional publications. This leads to the conclusion that there is a need to draw fictional or mythical things so that they could at least partially transfer a tangible element of art from the utopian vision to the egalitarian reality, thus testifying to the uniqueness of human thought concerning the aspects of shaping form and space.

Keywords: myths of architecture, drawn architecture, built architecture, defining architecture, fiction vs reality of architecture

Streszczenie

Architektura na polu teorii sztuki często nie wychodzi poza rysowany świat mitów. Z kolei na płaszczyźnie praktyki koncentruje uwagę na realnie istniejącym dziele. Celem tekstu jest ukazanie architektury w tych dwóch istotnych kulturowo aspektach – teoretycznym i praktycznym albo mitycznym i fizycznie namacalnym. O ile teoria absorbuje działania twórcze, organizując przestrzeń według zasad kompozycji i poszukując idealnego stosunku proporcji, tak praktyka jest zazwyczaj odpowiedzią architekta na indywidualne i społeczne potrzeby człowieka, którym stara się nadać przestrzennie użyteczną formę. W tekście dokonano analiz różnych postaw, zapatrywań i poglądów twórczych na działalność architektoniczną, a także definiowanie architektury w oparciu o kluczowe problemy poruszane w publikacjach fachowych. Prowadzi to do wniosków o potrzebie rysowania rzeczy fikcyjnych czy mitycznych, aby z utopijnej wizji mogły choć w części wnieść do egalitarnie traktowanej rzeczywistości namacalny pierwiastek sztuki, zaświadczać tym o wyjątkowości ludzkiej myśli dotyczącej aspektów kształtowania formy i przestrzeni.

Słowa kluczowe: mity architektury, architektura rysowana, architektura zbudowana, definiowanie architektury, fikcja a realność architektury

1. INTRODUCTION

Architecture is both a drawn world of myths created in the creator's mind and the art of constructed reality whose tangibility is a clear expression of the materialism of man's spatial needs. The drawn world of the myths of architecture usually remains the focus of attention of artists, critics, architecture enthusiasts and art historians. Paradoxically, drawn architecture is not addressed to a wider audience although it is sometimes exhibited in galleries and museums. Yet, a majority of people see architecture as the art of constructed reality, fulfilling first and foremost the existential needs of individuals and entire communities. There are edifices, cultural buildings, temples that are distinguished by a higher status of plastic sublimity in this art. It has usually been for the sake of their creation that experiments have been made, creating a variety of visions of drawn myths and fairy-tale forms of architecture in the human imagination. Today, the world of architecture absorbs any idea that finds recognition and approval from a potential investor-recipient. Whether we are dealing with architecture unfolding in one's mind within the field of purely theoretical considerations or with the art of constructed reality, an architectural drawing (free-hand, digital, artistic, technical one, ...) is necessary for it to be conceived, recorded, shown, sometimes physically realised. The myths of architecture need images to be told.

2. ARCHITECTURE AS A DRAWN WORLD OF MYTHS

Before architecture transforms into a built object, it must be drawn. These drawings are usually a technical record of forms and spaces based on the principles of descriptive geometry and technical codification of markings that facilitate the reading of the solutions adopted in a design. However, there are special drawings that convey the unique character of the conceived architecture. Their purpose is to visually present the idea of a fictional unbuildable world of art. In this context, architecture can be shown as a drawn world of myths that is either created by the designer at the level of theoretical considerations or is developed for the sheer pleasure of inventing attractive images. What becomes crucial here is the artistic vision of space and forms that build the architectural world of myths, employing a carefully directed and visually refined narrative characterised by individualism, technical excellence, but above all creative talent. Writing *On the Presentation of the Architectural Idea*, Maria Misiągiewicz addresses the issue of *Mythical Space*. She explains that

a particular kind of drawn architecture, constituting fiction, without assuming the possibility of verifying the design or architectural object in concrete reality, and translating the drawn thing into real architecture, remains as a philosophical leaven, search, inspiration, creating – the Mythical Space. The manner of presentation seems to have a decisive role in the ambiguities between alleged physical space and intellectual or artistic space created through the drawing.¹

The numerous achievements of the architect-artist in creating the *Mythical Space* are analysed here – starting with the drawn interiors of Piranesi's fantastic worlds, the futuristic

¹ M. Misiągiewicz, *O prezentacji idei architektonicznej*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2003, p. 147.

forms of buildings and cities of the future by Antonio Sant'Elia, Hugh Ferriss, through the 'biomorphic' and 'mechanomorphic' forms of the mythical worlds of Lebbeus Woods' architecture, as well as the spatial records of the architectural world of John Hejduk, Rob Krier, Franco Purini, Massimo Scolari, Raimund Abraham and others, to the recollection of the image of the mythical world of Dariusz Kozłowski's *City of the Immortals*. Maria Misiągiewicz points out that "The Mythical Space is the realm of individuality; mythmakers create personal ways of recording them, and the division of these presentations into kinds seems inappropriate."² The mythical world of drawn architecture is a depicted expression of human imagination about spaces, forms, shapes, symbols, artefacts and other objects or phenomena that are the result of abstract thinking. It is a world of individualised architecture that presents this unique kind of art of shaping space originally and attractively – the art created mainly to be looked at and not necessarily to be built. This kind of 'paper' architecture exists beyond reality and is oriented towards *the wonderful lie of art*.

Leszek Maluga referred to this type of record of architectural works as *autonomous architectural drawings*. He emphasizes that

among the drawings made by architects, there are depictions of architectural ideas that were created as a result of the creative process; they only serve to document it and are not meant for further realization in actual space. These drawings have been called 'autonomous architectural drawings.'³

They frequently document the fruits of the search for the authorial worlds of ideal architecture. Against the background of many artistic achievements, the drawn works of three artists are examined more closely here: John Hejduk, Massimo Scolari and Lebbeus Woods. Maluga highlights certain essential features of autonomous architectural drawings and the worlds they depict. He notes that

drawn architectural visions can disregard all earthly conditions such as the law of gravity, the strength of materials, the scale of space, environmental conditions, etc., offering suggestions for spatial solutions ranging from the merely unrealistic technological considerations to fantasies beyond the valid boundaries of the concept of architecture.⁴

This detachment from the laws of physics, matter and environmental conditions seems to be crucial in building the mythical world of architecture found in the layers of human imagination. The drawn record has a specific task to express artistic creative aspirations aimed at seeking new spatial and formal solutions in the theoretical field. It is sometimes an attempt to systematize design thoughts included in a certain typology. At times, the drawn world of the myths of architecture is created for the sheer pleasure of creating interesting forms or spaces. Evoking specific emotions and the interest of the recipient in the presented images depends on the talent and ability to attractively record the products of imagination. This is often due to the originality of a certain proposed narrative that creates an abstract play of spots, lines, planes, colours or shapes, being an illusion of reality or spatial myths of the world of architecture.

² *Ibidem*, p. 171.

³ L. Maluga, *Autonomiczne rysunki architektoniczne*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, Wrocław 2006, p. 9.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 90.

Walter Gropius' words become crucial for the quest for the essence of the mythicality of the drawn worlds of architecture. In his theory of design education, the architect assumed that "artistic creation draws its life from the mutual tension between the subconscious and the conscious faculties of our existence, fluctuates between reality and delusion."⁵ Perhaps it is all about a spatial illusion embedded in real shapes or the ephemerality of the resulting impression, or maybe the memorised contours that bring out the iconic effect of uniqueness and the emotions that accompany it build this poetic expression. The drawn architecture has an initiating role in the exploration of spatial myths here. A myth is a certain story. In architecture, this story is most often expressed through a carefully directed image presenting a narrative about an invented plastic vision of the world proposed by the creator-architect based on a certain sequence of forms and spaces. A good example might be images that initiate the creation of a specific work of architecture. This is evidenced by the exhibition of Dariusz Kozłowski's works collected under the name of *Prenatal Architecture*. The presented works indicate a creative path of seeking the essence of the poetics of architecture found in the initial phase of creation. Most importantly, Dariusz Kozłowski states that "architecture is the art of building fictitious things in such a way as to make them look real."⁶ In the context of this definition of architecture, the world of fiction is the basis for the wonderful lie of art, preceding the potential realization of the fairy-tale work depicted earlier in Kozłowski's plastic – mainly painterly – images.

In his book *Zapisy myśli o przestrzeni* (*Records of Thoughts about Space*), Piotr Gajewski identifies a description of an idea, a scalar image (plan), a perspective image (view), a film, a mock-up and the most common form of presentation nowadays – a digital model – among the means of recording architecture⁷. The architectural sketch also deserves special attention here. Any of these recording tools can be used to depict the mythical world of architecture that originates in the artist's imagination to render its essence most clearly. The depiction of this essence is most meaningful if it takes the form of a concrete drawing produced by the very creator. Only then, it is possible to look at the invented world through the eyes of the creators, surrendering to the narrative created by them. Whether the world of architectural myths of a given artist will be noticed and accepted in its originality depends on the ability to evoke emotions in the recipient through the images. Such an image frequently becomes a recognizable icon considered in terms of the theory of architecture. The ability to evoke emotions in architecture is undoubtedly a matter of talent, and drawing architecture is a form of verification of that talent. At least, that is how it used to be. Today, the architectural world of myths is flourishing in the virtual world through modern digital technologies. The prevalence of this phenomenon has begun to dominate since the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries. This is evident in architecture, but also film, computer games, animation, etc. By creating spaces of unbuildable virtual worlds, new countless myths of architecture are created. Their fictionality delights the viewer, putting him in a state of ecstasy and euphoria, and at times emotional addiction. The multitude of virtual worlds solicits the recipient, becoming a lure to absorb their time. What is crucial here is the aesthetic attractiveness of the proposed originality of images that constitute the illusory worlds invented in virtual reality based

⁵ W. Gropius, *Pełnia architektury*, Karakter, Kraków 2014, p. 44.

⁶ D. Kozłowski, *Skąd dziś wziąć nowy tekst? – albo preteksty racjonalne i poetyckie*, Pretekst, 2004, no. 1, p. 5.

⁷ P. Gajewski, *Zapisy myśli o przestrzeni*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2001, pp. 11–95.

on which equally fictitious events occur. The authorial architectural drawing or its painterly equivalent is gradually and consistently being replaced by images generated with specialist software supporting the design process. Today, even small design studios are introducing software such as BIM (Building Information Modelling) that allows for modelling the structure of an object along with the simultaneous determination of its functional and physical parameters reflecting their actual properties in a digital record of space. This results in the inevitable phenomenon of gradual transfer of the design process to virtual reality, recorded in digital form without the participation of free-hand drawing that used to crown the process of designing a work of architecture. Becoming an indispensable tool and sign of the design present, digital technologies have appropriated the way of depicting the mythical worlds of architecture buried in the human imagination. Hand-drawn architecture more and more often ceases to exist at the stage of architectural education as an indispensable element of the didactic process, and even here the importance of drawing seems to be losing its significance in the recruitment of subsequent generations of architectural students. The art of drawing architecture in further professional practice seems to limit its existence to sketches – merely reflecting the creative thought process, presenting the forms of intended works concisely, often contained in a notation of a few lines – being a record of the author's intentions. And it is the very sketch that has become the main carrier of drawn myths of architecture that ignites the imagination today. One can refer to the works of contemporary artists such as those contained in the authorial sketches of Mario Botta, Tadao Ando, Frank Gehry, Alberto Campo Baeza, and many others. Apart from mere sketches and the use of modern technologies, some studios remain faithful to the visual presentation of their works kept in an exhibition convention. Pezo von Ellrichshausen's achievements may serve as an example here.

The fact that a certain phenomenon in craftsmanship and art is undergoing a crisis or is slowly becoming a thing of the past may be evidenced by the fact that first museums are being created to present or preserve the outstanding achievements of a given artistic or creative field. Perhaps this phenomenon has also begun in the context of drawn architecture with the development of a small Museum of Architectural Drawing run by the Tchoban Foundation (by SPEECH Tchoban & Kuznetsov) on the site of the former Pfefferberg industrial complex in Berlin. It houses a collection of both old works, dating back to the 16th century, and drawings by contemporary architects. One of the objectives of this museum initiative was to “revive interest in architectural drawing.”⁸ Presenting a hand-drawn mythical world derived from the creator's imagination, unbuildable architecture is giving way to digital presentation technologies. This phenomenon is progressing, and as strange as it may seem, the traditional architectural drawing may become a niche skill in the architectural profession in the future. Regardless of whether it is done by hand or using digital technologies, the essence of drawn architecture seems to be unchangeable. This presentation of a spatial solution for a real or theoretical context contains the features of an individual interpretation derived from the thoughts of a particular artist. What, then, is the point of drawn artistic creation? It seems to have been the same for centuries. The answer to this question is provided by Maria Misiągiewicz, who presented it in her publication *Architektoniczna geometria (Architectural Geometry)*:

The meaning of the drawn creative work should be recognized in two basic categories: as the renderings resulting from the procedure of an implementation intent and as the renderings which are not explicitly subordinated to such an aspiration, and at some point, they constitute

⁸ P. Olszewska, *Rysunki na Pieprzowej Górze*, Architektura & Biznes, 2013, no. 7/8, pp. 70–73.

an end in itself as analysis, hypothesis, experiment, or they are simply an expression of thought. The former is subordinated to pragmatic goals, the latter is a pictorial statement, an expression of thought. As history shows, both influence the attitudes of architects, direct aspirations, and inspire the current and future reality of architecture. This archive of knowledge and experience is usually turned to when building customs or artistic canons change.⁹

3. ARCHITECTURE AS THE ART OF CONSTRUCTED REALITY

Nonetheless, the vast majority of the public as well as a substantial number of creators see architecture as the art of constructed reality and drawn architecture is only a means to that end. As early as in the last quarter of the century B.C. Vitruvius described architecture as the art of building whose principles were set out in his work *De architectura libri decem* and which remained valid in principle for centuries to come. Going back to the more recent past, it is worth mentioning one of the proponents of built architecture – Adolf Loos who, at the beginning of the 20th century, noticed that the profession of an architect increasingly came to be associated with that of a skilful artist – an architectural draughtsman – rather than its creator – a builder. In his 1910 essay *Architecture*, he advocated that drawing should be treated primarily as a means to an end – architecture. It is there that Loos states: “The architect has reduced the noble art of building to graphic art. The one who receives the most commissions is not the one who can build best but the one whose work looks best on paper. There is a world of difference between the two.”¹⁰ Loos goes on to comparatively explain the essence of drawing in the architectural profession. According to him: “But for the old master builders, the drawing was merely a means of communicating with the craftsmen who carried out the work. Just as a poet has to communicate through writing.”¹¹ Loos also clarifies the differences between depicting architecture through drawings and the essence of the authentic experience of a completed building. He states:

What is really terrible, however, is to see an architectural drawing, which, given the medium, one has to accept as an example of graphic art – and there are genuine graphic artists among the architects – carried out in stone, iron and glass. The sign that a building arises from a genuine feel for architecture is that it makes no impression as a two-dimensional representation.¹²

The standpoint presented in this way rationally treats drawn architecture as a means to illustrate the creator’s intention. It is only the final form – the constructed object – that gives the authentic fullness of impressions in experiencing the element of material culture, i.e. the building. The purpose of the architect’s activity is to design buildings that can be physically realized. Such realization is the verification of the appropriateness of the creative process, the adopted spatial-material, aesthetic and utilitarian solutions – serving the creation of the living environment of man and the community in which one lives.

⁹ M. Misiągiewicz, *Architektoniczna geometria*, Instytut Projektowania Architektonicznego, Wydział Architektury Politechniki Krakowskiej, Kraków 2005, pp. 56–57.

¹⁰ A. Loos, *Architektura*, 1910 [in:] A. Loos, *Ornament i zbrodnia. Eseje wybrane*, Fundacja Centrum Architektury, Warszawa 2013, p. 147.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 147–148.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 148.

Likewise, many contemporary artists treat architecture as the art of constructed reality. Peter Zumthor claims that:

Architecture is always concrete matter. Architecture is not abstract, but concrete. A plan, a project drawn on paper is not architecture but merely a more or less inadequate representation of architecture, comparable to sheet music. Music needs to be performed. Architecture needs to be executed. Then its body can come into being. And this body is always sensuous.¹³

Tomasz Kozłowski also tells us that “architecture must be built though!” in one of the concluding chapters of his book *Architecture and Art*. According to Kozłowski, “whatever is said or written about architecture should refer to something built.”¹⁴ It is not without a reason that the Corbusieran slogan is recalled here: *Build. Don't talk*.¹⁵ After all, the architecture built according to Corbusier's designs proved in its tangible form that even the boldest visions should be undertaken with courage, as their creation can permanently change the way we look at modern architecture, just as it happened in the 20th century. Antonio Monestiroli has also discussed the importance of the stage of building architecture in the creative process. He sees “the assumptions underlying each project as the result of a long and laborious reflection on the meaning of what is to be built.”¹⁶ Construction is treated here as the essence of the social viable goals of architecture. Is building the domain of architects, though? Perhaps it once was in a historical sense.

Conversely, Leon Krier believes that when an architect says that he built something, it is just a cliché. Only craftsmen and artists are entitled to use these words in the proper sense. The domain of architects is design and the result of their work is a project recorded in drawings. According to Krier:

Drawings are at once fragile as objects and powerful in their influence on the shaping of the material world. Just like the written page, a drawing has little intrinsic value; its power and authority lie in its capacity to describe, suggest, direct and give a form and shape to objects, structures and events according to a precise aim and vision. The authority of a drawing is like that of a banknote, a symbolic one.¹⁷

However, it is not the design but the tangibility of the built architecture that constitutes the essence of its social perception. Constructed architecture is a carrier of the civilizational thought of the times in which it is created. This applies to currents, styles, aesthetic trends, but also to technological achievements and the method of organizing human living space as superior good and value. Not only does it reflect individual expectations towards the residential environment, but it also shows the image of a harmonious social life depicted through urban planning. This image does not always appear positive, especially when considering the individual architecture of specific buildings created in isolation from the context of a larger whole. Modernity, as described in the treatises by Corbusier, Gropius, or other visionaries and fathers of architecture in the first half of the 20th century, was supposed to modernize historically ossified approaches to city-making and architecture. Modern times reveal another

¹³ P. Zumthor, *Myślenie architekturą*, Karakter, Kraków 2010, p. 66.

¹⁴ T. Kozłowski, *Architektura a sztuka*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2018, p. 211.

¹⁵ Le Corbusier, *W stronę architektury*, Fundacja Centrum Architektury, Warszawa 2012, p. 143.

¹⁶ A. Monestiroli, *Trygłif i metopa. Dziewięć wykładów o architekturze*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2009, p. 137.

¹⁷ L. Krier, *Architektura wspólnoty*, Słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2011, p. 22.

problem with constructed architecture – the detachment of the building from the space in which it is created and which it co-creates. This problem was most clearly diagnosed by Rem Koolhaas when he wrote: “The built (...) product of modernization is not modern architecture but Junkspace.”¹⁸ According to him,

Junkspace is the sum total of our current achievement; we have built more than all previous generations together, but somehow we do not register on the same scales. We do not leave pyramids. According to a new gospel of ugliness, there is already more Junkspace under construction in the 21st century than survived from the 20th... It was a mistake to invent modern architecture for the 20th century. Architecture disappeared in the 20th century; we have been reading a footnote under a microscope hoping it would turn into a novel; our concern for the masses has blinded us to People’s Architecture.¹⁹

It is this *Junkspace* that is inherent in today’s planning developments and the misunderstanding of the significance of a building in a particular context of place. It seems that this process is exacerbated even though architecture is in the heyday of its realization capabilities to date. Koolhaas claims that

now we are left with a world without urbanism, only architecture, ever more architecture. The neatness of architecture is its seduction; it defines, excludes, limits, separates from the ‘rest’ – but it also consumes. It exploits and exhausts the potentials that can be generated finally only by urbanism, and that only the specific imagination of urbanism can invent and renew.²⁰

Although the wonderful world of built architecture manifests itself in individual remarkable buildings, it does not create a harmonious whole. It is said that beautiful cities are made of average, expressionless and often ugly buildings. The attractiveness of architecture should go hand in hand with the attractiveness of the very space it co-creates. After periods of postmodernism, resurgent regionalisms, brief periods of dominance of deconstructivist thought, interspersed with currents of minimalism, the forms and technologies of alternative architecture seeking sustainable methods of the ecological organization of living on our planet, involving a return to the primordial symbiosis of nature and building, are becoming increasingly dominant after two decades of the 21st century. That may be the reason why Philip Wilkinson mentions *Green Architecture* last in his book entitled *50 Architecture Ideas You Really Need to Know*. He notes that

the idea of green or sustainable architecture has emerged over the past few decades to address these issues. Green architecture aims to produce buildings that have a low impact on the environment while remaining attractive structures to look at and to use. The movement had produced very diverse buildings – there is no visual style that is ‘green.’²¹

Regarded as the art of constructed reality, architecture is currently undergoing a crucial transformation focused on pro-environmental solutions, probably changing its face dramatically. Will these ideas turn out to be just another myth of architecture or will they become

¹⁸ R. Koolhaas, *Śmieciowa przestrzeń* [in:] R. Koolhaas, *Śmieciowa przestrzeń. Teksty*, Fundacja Centrum Architektury, Warszawa 2017, p. 101.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*.

²⁰ R. Koolhaas, *Co się stało z urbanistyką?* [in:] *ibidem*, p. 61.

²¹ P. Wilkinson, *50 teorii architektury, które powinny mieć znaczenie*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2011, pp. 212–213.

a permanent, real phenomenon? – only time will tell. While following the global direction of these changes, it is worth considering Tadao Ando's creative philosophy of universal asceticism. Ando reveals its essence in the statement: "Whatever the nature of the site, I try to create architecture that is never more imposing than its environment."²² Technological trends focused on sustainability and pro-environmental solutions that try to impose ideas devoid of the element of art, often in an artificial and forced way, will become just another technocratic installation devoid of the architectural spirit of humanism. No matter how it is formed – in what style, current or trend – architecture was created by man and is a product of his mind. It is worth quoting here the statement made by Mario Botta, who emphasizes that architecture must be

a counterpoint to Nature, a dialogue with Nature. Architecture is an artificial factor. The only means of paying tribute to Nature is to be in exact opposition to her, in confrontation. (...) Architecture is a violation of landscape; it cannot simply be integrated, it must create a new equilibrium.²³

4. CONCLUSIONS

To have an element of uniqueness, architecture should first create and experiment in the area of drawing myths, fictional imaginations or spatially original stories so that it can then emerge in real form. It is the ability to build an appropriate narrative of forms and voids that shapes the *genius loci* of a place with a clear, often iconic expression. For the artist, architecture in the field of art theory is above all a drawn world of myths to look at. These are images that fire the imagination, often created for the sheer selfless need to invent or look at the unreal and fantastic world of fictional forms and spaces. Regarded as the art of constructed reality, architecture is in turn a testing ground, directly influencing the emotions of both the individual viewer and the social reception of the work, to eventually gain universal acceptance, even when it becomes controversial. The usefulness of architecture seems to be crucial here, as it is an element offering concrete existential benefits to people that can be measured and estimated. However, it is the spirit of architecture, once manifested in the sense of beauty and today rather in the attractiveness or originality of the work, that is most important for this acceptance and determines the social consent for its continuation in a specific time and spatial context. Leon Krier once posed the question: "is it not true that even the most robust of buildings has but a short life expectancy if it is lacking in beauty?" He replied to it, writing that "utility and stability are absolutely no guarantee of material permanence."²⁴ It is in the field of the drawn world of the myths of architecture that such ideas and visions are born that would allow this art of constructed reality to gain artistically valuable features that determine the uniqueness or originality of a building aspiring to be a work of architectural art. This is why the idea of a work of art can last in the pages of the history of human artistic achievements, even when its material form no longer exists. Society is the

²² T. Ando, *Reflections on Underground Space* [in:] *ibidem*, p. 216.

²³ P. Gössel, G. Leuthäuser, *Architektura XX wieku*, Taschen-TMC Art, Köln-Warszawa 2006, pp. 446–449.

²⁴ L. Krier, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

ruthless judge here that can bring to annihilation even the most unconventional visions and achievements of architecture that have seen the light of day and resurrect the spatial values and forms that are important to it from the rubble whenever they provide it with a visually tangible foundation of cultural continuity. Therefore, the ability to arouse aesthetic emotions in architecture is not only a matter of trained professional skills or innate talent but also an intuition that allows one to create beautiful things. Le Corbusier noted that

the Architect, by his arrangement of forms, realizes an order which is a pure creation of his spirit; by forms and shapes he affects our senses to an acute degree and provokes plastic emotions; by the relationships which he creates he wakes profound echoes in us, he gives us the measure of an order which we feel to be in accordance with that of our world, he determines the various movements of our heart and of our understanding; it is then that we experience the sense of beauty.²⁵

Experiencing architecture was always important for Le Corbusier. To be experienced by people, it must become a tangible art of constructed reality in which they could live, stay, work, realize their needs or relax. Architecture is also a drawn world of myths, fantasies, spatial fun and games. It is a world of human imagination. It is the domain of architectural creativity, being a kind of plastic experiment and at the same time a testing ground for alternative, virtual reality, most often presented today in a digital computer record. Exploring it can be as much pleasant and intriguing as dangerously addictive, as soon as the constructed reality fails to meet our expectations.

References:

- [1] Gajewski P., *Zapisy myśli o przestrzeni*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2001.
- [2] Gössel P., Leuthäuser G., *Architektura XX wieku*, Taschen–TMC Art, Köln–Warszawa 2006.
- [3] Gropius W., *Pełnia architektury*, Karakter, Kraków 2014.
- [4] Koolhaas R., *Śmieciowa przestrzeń. Teksty*, Fundacja Centrum Architektury, Warszawa 2017.
- [5] Kozłowski D., *Skąd dziś wziąć nowy tekst? – albo preteksty racjonalne i poetyckie*, Pretekst, 2004, no. 1, pp. 4–8.
- [6] Kozłowski T., *Architektura a sztuka*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2018.
- [7] Kozłowski T., *Tendencje ekspresjonistyczne w architekturze współczesnej*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2013.
- [8] Krier L., *Architektura wspólnoty*, Słowo/obraz terytoria, Gdańsk 2011.
- [9] Le Corbusier, *W stronę architektury*, Fundacja Centrum Architektury, Warszawa 2012.
- [10] Loos A., *Architektura*, 1910 [in:] Loos A., *Ornament i zbrodnia. Eseje wybrane*, Fundacja Centrum Architektury, Warszawa 2013.
- [11] Maluga L., *Autonomiczne rysunki architektoniczne*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, Wrocław 2006.
- [12] Misiągiewicz M., *Architektoniczna geometria*, Instytut Projektowania Architektonicznego, Wydział Architektury Politechniki Krakowskiej, Kraków 2005.
- [13] Misiągiewicz M., *O prezentacji idei architektonicznej*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2003.
- [14] Monestiroli A., *Tryglif i metopa. Dziewięć wykładów o architekturze*, Politechnika Krakowska, Kraków 2009.
- [15] Olszewska P., *Rysunki na Pieprzowej Górze*, Architektura & Biznes, 2013, no. 7/8.

²⁵ Le Corbusier, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

- [16] Wilkinson P., *50 teorii architektury, które powinieneś znać*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2011.
- [17] Zumthor P., *Myślenie architekturą*, Karakter, Kraków 2010.

Author's Note:

Przemysław Bigaj, PhD, Arch.

A research and didactic assistant professor at the Faculty of Architecture at Cracow University of Technology. The main area of the author's scientific interest focuses on the possibility of using the aesthetic properties of fair-faced concrete in residential architecture with particular emphasis on monolithic technology. The study of relations between form and the matter that creates it is the aim of the author's search for the essence of architecture, especially the one whose poetics of the idea has been expressed in a specific building material, which determines the originality of the artistic expression of the architectural work. Games and plays with concrete forms and their aesthetics also become a pretext for the author's theoretical and practical experiments as part of didactics conducted with students of the Faculty of Architecture at CUT.

przemyslaw.bigaj@pk.edu.pl