



The Semio-Pragmatics of Architecture

Godofredo Enes Pereira & Susana Caló

To cite this article: Godofredo Enes Pereira & Susana Caló (2017): The Semio-Pragmatics of Architecture, Architectural Theory Review, DOI: [10.1080/13264826.2016.1270341](https://doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2016.1270341)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2016.1270341>



Published online: 06 Mar 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

THE SEMIO-PRAGMATICS OF ARCHITECTURE

Godofredo Enes Pereira and Susana Caló

Architecture, Royal College of Art, London; History and Theory, Escola Superior Artística, Porto

Email: godofredo.pereira@rca.ac.uk

This essay proposes a new semio-pragmatic framework to grasp the different assemblages of power in which architecture participates. It does so by deploying Félix Guattari's pragmatic conceptualisation of enunciation, developed in *Schizoanalytic Cartographies*, as the basis for a renewed analysis of the Red House by Philip Webb and William Morris. In distinguishing between polyphonic and ethico-aesthetic vectors of analysis, this framework is able to capture the heterogeneity of forces at work in the project and the multiple ways in which these enter in composition with people. In doing so, the essay attempts to expand our mode of understanding architecture and how it operates beyond both critical and phenomenological paradigms. Ultimately, this essay provides a new perspective on what an architectural project consists of.

Keywords: Architectural semiotics; enunciation; Guattari; Phillip Web; Red House

Article History: Received 28 June 2016; accepted 10 October 2016

1

From local political transformations to territorial and geopolitical ones, from real-estate projects to disciplinary debates, from technological developments to mutations in domestic life—architecture participates in, transforms, and reorganises very different socio-material assemblages. And, yet, little of this gets adequately framed in architectural theory. While critical analyses commonly disregard the multiplicity and heterogeneity of the forces at work in a design in their quest for overarching ideas and concepts, the pragmatics of architecture's existence are frequently simplified by the reification of the architectural object as the site for innovation. Often, the reaction to this focus on the object is equally problematic, abandoning architecture to sociological or anthropological accounts, the result of which is the introduction of an apolitical distance between object and use. The work of philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari offers an important perspective from which to engage in this discussion. Their joint work on abstract machines, and particularly Deleuze's interpretation of Foucault's diagram as a cartography of relations between forces, have often been mobilised for discussions of how power operates through architecture. However, it is Guattari's solo work that we think provides

the most effective basis from which to understand the pragmatics of the architectural project, including the multiple assemblages that architecture enters into and how it does so.¹

2

In an essay first published in *Schizoanalytic Cartographies*, Guattari elaborates on what he calls “architectural enunciation.”² The concept of enunciation is generally attributed to linguist Émile Benveniste. Benveniste proposed shifting the question of language from a study of the internal relation between signs (as pioneered by Saussure) to the act and circumstances of producing a statement. This act and circumstances of production were defined as *enunciation*. In his view, language was dependent on enunciation to be realised. Guattari’s use of the term echoes Benveniste’s focus on the pragmatics of the statement. However, Guattari’s notion can be applied beyond the linguistic domain. Enunciations can be spatial, musical, technical, political, etc. Moreover, for Guattari, enunciation is not the product of an individual as it was for Benveniste—the speaking subject—but of a collective, a multiplicity rather than a self, a collective pragmatics of sign production that goes beyond linguistic structures alone.³ Hence, enunciation is never really a matter of the linguistic statement only, but of an intervention in a particular context. It is, in essence, an existential matter. Likewise, it is also something that cannot be repeated.⁴

In this conceptualisation of *enunciation*, we find an opportunity to specify the concept of *project* in architecture, conceptualised as an intervention with a transformative character.⁵ However, this requires some additional unpacking as Guattari differentiates two modalities through which enunciation works: the “polyphonic” and the “ethico-aesthetic”. The polyphonic modality refers to expressive materials, and the ethico-aesthetic to affective materials. This distinction is crucial both in reference to Guattari’s broader philosophical and semiotic project and also for our current purpose. Let us start by focusing on the polyphonic modality. Guattari defines eight types of key assemblages of enunciation of which architecture is part, each providing different expressive materials: these are geopolitical, urbanistic, economic, functional, technical, signifying, ones of existential territorialisation, and scriptural.⁶ To exemplify, a land-use regulation corresponds to an *urbanistic* assemblage of enunciation; the determining of the thickness of a wall according to materials and their behaviours such as insulation coefficients or load is part of a *technical* assemblage of enunciation; and a *signifying* assemblage of enunciation can refer to the allocation of content to a built form such as the cruciform plan of a Catholic church.⁷ As we mentioned before, all of the above correspond to Guattari’s understanding of enunciation as polyphonic: it consists of expressive materials with a concrete material and spatial existence, and is termed polyphonic in the sense of the multiple “voices” at play. Of primary importance is the fact that the different expressive materials are coexisting, interacting yet autonomous, and showing distinct standpoints.⁸

Let us now turn to the other dimension of Guattari’s schema, the ethico-aesthetic, which corresponds to the affective modality of enunciation. Guattari argues that in addition to expressive materials that result from the different assemblages of which architecture is part, architectural enunciation also involves materials that are not expressive but affective. Crucial here are the

processes that the architectural object elicits, not as a “gestalt” or ideal form closed upon itself, but as what Guattari describes as a “catalytic operator”. Guattari referred to these as “spatialized affects”, examples of which would be the intimate memories, passions, or fears that are brought forth by composing a space that resembles one from our childhood, or the sensation of repetition produced by a certain rhythm in the setting out of a building’s elevation—sensations that act upon us regardless of us perceiving them or not.

With this brief introduction to the polyphonic and ethico-aesthetic modalities of enunciation, we have sketched out how Guattari’s semiotic framework is able to foreground the multiplicity of processes at work in the project. Conceived in these terms, the project emerges as an intervention that operates through the composition of expressive and affective materials— an intervention that is collective and unrepeatably.

3

To clarify the relevance of this conceptualisation to a renewed understanding of the *project* and its pragmatics, we will discuss the Red House designed in 1859 by Phillip Webb for William Morris in Bexleyheath, which would become the birthplace of the Arts and Crafts Movement. To make matters clear, we will address these two modalities separately, starting with the polyphonic.

The basic architectural layout of the Red House is an L shape that is two storeys high. The L delimits a patio, at the centre of which lies a well. An existing orchard of apple and cherry trees encloses the other half of the patio. From the outside, the Red House has a castle-like appearance with Gothic windows and simple red brick. The chimneys and different shapes of the windows give rhythm to its volume. On the inside, the rooms are oriented in an unusual way, with sitting rooms and drawing rooms facing north (with the exception of Morris’ studio), whereas the corridors and staircases face the sun-lit patio. Between 1859 and 1865, several people lived in the Red House together with the Morris family. Collectively, they designed its wallpaper, painted the walls, and designed and built its furniture. The Red House functioned as the testing ground for Morris’ company, “The Firm”.

The historiography of the Red House is disputed in terms of its revolutionary character and importance. Hermann Muthesius described it as “the first house to be conceived and built as a unified whole inside and out, the very first example in the history of the modern house”⁹ In a similar vein, for Nikolaus Pevsner, it was one of the pioneering buildings of the Modern Movement due to the relation of the simple elevation with the interior.¹⁰ However, for Brandon-Jones, the Red House was far less unique as it followed closely G. E. Street’s designs. Similarly, for Henry-Russell Hitchcock, it was little more than a typological variation of both Street and William Butterfield’s vicarages and parsonages, with their red brick walls, simple lines, high-pitched roofs, and functional internal circulations.¹¹ In all these readings, the key critical factors that establish where the Red House stands in the history of architecture are its use of red brick, the medieval construction techniques, the simplicity of its lines, and the styles and influences manifest in its design and decoration. These are particular components or aspects whose presence is seen either as evidence of a breakthrough (precedent to modern architecture) or as following a tradition set by Webb’s masters.

Following this critical method, a particularly insightful analysis of the Red House is that by Robin Evans, in his essay entitled “Figures, Doors, Passages” from 1978. In it, Evans addresses the paradox between Morris’ and Philip Webb’s radical questioning of Victorian society and their tacit implementation of the accepted spatial conventions of the nineteenth century. Evans referred to the lower- and upper-floor corridors, which not only allowed for familial ideas of privacy, but also structured divisions of labour between master and servants. The corridor, Evans reminds us, has a fairly recent history, making its first appearance in England in the late seventeenth century and becoming widely accepted during the nineteenth century as a replacement of the thoroughfare. For Evans, the existence of the corridor indicated that the Red House was far more common in social principles than might be expected from Morris’ notorious social extravaganza. In his view, Morris’ interest in the medieval period was mostly spiritual and did not extend to its carnal aspects. To further this point, Evans mentions the abstract diagrams of trajectory and position that Robert Kerr used to promote the privacy standards of Victorian society.¹² According to Evans, the Red House would be the perfect illustration of these diagrams, as “rooms never interconnect, never have more than one door, and circulation space is unified and distinct”.¹³ Evans’ analysis is both beautifully written and sharp, cutting through accepted conventions to reveal the underbelly of Webb and Morris’ project, and indeed of modern architecture itself. His point is that at the *heart* of Morris and Webb’s socialist ideas was in fact a fairly bourgeois imagination. The corridor is the give-away in its promotion of frictionless living.

And, yet, is there not a limit to this very modern practice of revelation? What we see in Evans, but also in all the previous interpretations of the Red House, is a method of analysis that draws upon singular aspects to derive general conclusions about the project as a whole. Each component of the design (the red brick, the corridor, etc.) is treated as evidence of the overall project’s intentions. While there is nothing wrong with the method when used for specific purposes (for instance, the presence of neo-Gothic windows allows the Red House to be located in a specific historic period), an overall critique of the *project* requires far more nuanced and careful approaches. In detaching the evidence from its pragmatic context, i.e. from a broader design, a very problematic reduction takes place. It is as an alternative to this rhetoric method whereby components are removed from their composition so that a revelation of what is “essential” might take place that Guattari’s framework proves more useful.

Let us return to the Red House. By all accounts, Webb followed Ruskin’s advice on how to detail architecture: “Do not be afraid of incongruities—do not think of unities of effect..., find out what will make you comfortable, build that in the strongest and boldest way, and then set your fancy free in the decoration of it”.¹⁴ The simplicity of the layout that has been noted by many authors attests to Ruskin’s influence over Webb. But so does the medieval approach to construction techniques, which requires a degree of formal autonomy from each part, from the steep roofs and the prominent chimneys to the cross gables and exposed-beam ceilings. Overall ambitions were also apparently incongruous: if, on the one hand, it manifested socialist principles in the choice of red brick instead of stucco, it also embodied a romantic understanding of landscape as is revealed by its location in a Chaucerian path of the Canterbury pilgrims. This allowance of difference and autonomy of parts is even more clearly felt in the treatment of each

detail in the house, from furniture and murals to textiles, wallpapers, and tiles, as each was the product of an artistic intervention. Most of the time, the making and decorating of the house were a collective labour, investing in each of these elements the quality of a social and affective register. From the paintings to the stained glass or the tapestry, the Red House was both site and object of collective material experimentation. We can safely argue that multiplicity of modes of expression was central to the project from the start.

All these and many more are examples of the veritable polyphony of voices that are speaking in the Red House and of the complex nature of Webb's project. To speak of autonomous voices is not to say the house lacked a sense of unity—quite the opposite is noted by H. Muthesius, as we mentioned above; nor are these voices something unique to the Red House. To speak of polyphony is to identify the many modes of expression at work in a certain project and the different ways in which these complement each other. Polyphony, thus, undermines the critical search for the essential by foregrounding the multiplicity of possibilities in play. Is it not possible, for instance, that the collective modes of living produced a different conception of privacy than the one of a typical Victorian family; that the wallpapers designed by Morris gave consistency to the formation of new subjectivities; that certain aspects of the layout would counter-balance the role of the corridor? For instance, Brandon-Jones provides an almost inverse perspective regarding the plan: “more revolutionary than any of the architectural features was the raising of the kitchen from its customary position in the basement, and the provision of windows allowing the servants to overlook the garden”.¹⁵ The problem of Evans' analysis in this sense—and that of many other critics—is the reduction of the project to the singular aspect that has been identified. That the corridor was unaddressed by centuries of architectural theory is an important critical insight. But only by taking into consideration these different types of expressive materials, and how they enter into composition with each other, can a rigorous discussion of the Red House take place.

The Red House provides a clear example of the polyphonic nature of an architectural project. It brings to the forefront the different “expressive materials” that architecture composes, with their interrelated and yet autonomous elements. Evans' analysis, brilliant as it is, is a perfect example of how these have been silenced by the modern tradition of critique. And in doing so, it tends to disregard not only the multiplicity of processes at work in architecture, but also the continuing and shifting balances of power between all these voices. That these different expressive materials come together to form a singular architectural project does not mean they are not autonomous. And it is this coexistence within the project that, in not being subsumed to a totalising unity, in our view, allows differences to remain productive of novel and unexpected consequences.

4

Recall Guattari's two modalities of enunciation. He distinguishes them in order to capture the very different modes by which architecture operates. Having discussed the polyphonic modality, let us now move on to the ethico-aesthetic. For Guattari, it is the architect's role to compose “spatialized affects”. A spatialised affect is not something one can draw or measure; it is not

extensional or susceptible to be numbered, nor something the architect can clearly determine. In Guattari's terms, an affect is "a pre-personal category, installed before the circumscription of identities".¹⁶ A spatialised effect, therefore, corresponds to relations established through architecture—and by this, we mean both through the drawing or the built object—such as the creation of an ambience, the unleashing of architectural imaginations, the producing of a sense of intimacy or feelings of repulsion. For Guattari, through learning from one's experience of spaces and the way they act upon us, the architect is able to *compose*, or at least not to block, a series of spatialised affects. Importantly, it is not simply that the architect *composes*, in the modern sense of the term. By composition, we mean *entering into composition with*—allowing oneself to be traversed by a collective subjectivity.¹⁷

Let us return to Webb's Red House corridors. As noted by Evans, these imply ideas of privacy and class difference resulting from the separation in plan between a circulation space and a private space. But the corridors did more than imply this: they actually promoted these as sensations. The reason for this is that the simple introduction of a door, for example, might promote curiosity when left ajar, or powerlessness when one has to ask for permission to enter. The corridor itself, in its lack of other apparent purpose, reinforces feelings of efficiency and organisation in daily life. If we follow the tradition of certain architectural historiography, we find that a lot of attention is devoted to what architectural forms or signs mean. The way in which the corridor articulates relations of privacy, however, is not a matter of representation or signification: the corridor's shape or size does not communicate the feeling of intrusion that is induced by the opening of a closed door, nor does it represent the sensation of moving through it at night. The same type of operation—even if with different social consequences—happens when bringing the kitchen to the ground floor. It is not the symbolic dimension of this gesture, but the daily repetition of movements—no more heading underground, to an inferior space—that directly affects modes of inhabitation. This simple assertion takes us to a key point in Guattari's thought, which is that spatialised affects are a-signifying:¹⁸ regardless of the motives behind design options, spatialised affects consist of pre-personal and pre-signifying relations between bodies. The moving of the kitchen perhaps symbolises something, but how it affects bodies does not.

Let us take a second example, focusing on the design of Morris' wallpapers. At dawn, the multicoloured lights coming through the stained glass windows and shining upon the wallpaper might cause a child to experience fear, or elicit a sensation of melancholia that is exclusive to that time of the day. The lining of entire rooms with floral motifs and textures might directly affect sensations of comfort or claustrophobia. Architecture is full of such refrains that, day after day, allow the constitution of existential territories. And most of these are not even conscious; they are simply working on us, in the background of our attention. Staircases are particularly powerful sites in the multiple ways in which they act upon bodies, from determining movements to composing lines of sight. In the Red House, the staircase occupies a central role, articulating the key circulations and open to the sunny courtyard. It is *frequency* and *resonance* that are at work in a-signifying affects: the repetition of a certain view or movement, and the catalytic capacity of certain ambiances or atmospheres. Spatialised affects are not a direct result of a particular

style, but of how that style promotes certain kinds of sensation. They result from expressive components that are decoupled from the overall object and enter into unpredictable relations.

Any project implies the orchestration of a multiplicity of voices or modes of expression. But the importance of this lies not only in recognising their existence and the multiplicity of what is being expressed through architecture, but also in the fact that these voices allow the catalysing of multiple spatialised affects. In other words, architecture operates both through expressive materials (signs that have indexical, signifying, or communicational capacities) and through spatialised affects, which are inseparable and yet independent from these expressive materials. Consider, for instance, religious or ritual events, where objects such as relics or icons catalyse processes of ecstasy or collective delirium: an icon in a Catholic church is an expressive component that belongs, in Guattari's terminology, to a signifying assemblage of enunciation. However, the icon does not simply *signify* or *represent* a saint. More than that, it also potentially opens "a territory of enunciation to a believer, making her enter into direct communication with the Saint".¹⁹ Importantly, the opening up of a territory of enunciation is not a matter of signification—it is a matter of architecture, through spatialised affects, being able to operate as a catalyst for existential processes. That such processes cannot be predicted does not diminish the intentionality of their composition. Contrary to architectural theory's habit of focusing on what icons mean or try to communicate, here we speak of a displacement of the focus from what is being represented to what enunciations a certain representation, within a specific pragmatic context, opens up. What spaces represent matters, but what both spaces and representations *do* or *catalyse* matters even more.

We come then to the understanding that affects, conceptualised as a-signifying relations, are essential for capturing the multiple ways in which architecture acts in the world. In particular, they are indispensable when constructing a political critique of architecture, as so much of what architecture does results from aspects of the design that have neither symbolic nor representational dimensions (the dimension of a turnstile in a border, the change of thickness in a passageway, the colour of corridors might, under certain circumstances, contribute to the production of immensely violent spatialised affects in the context of a detention centre); and even all those aspects that do have a signifying dimension, from icons to advertising logos, are equally operating at the level of affect and in ways that are not necessarily related to their represented content. Thus, the fact that what architecture expresses and how it acts upon us are *inseparable and yet independent* processes allows us to grasp how it is often deployed to ends other than those clearly expressed in the drawing.²⁰

We can understand now the ethico-aesthetic dimension of enunciation (and of the project): it is a matter of composing expressive components (aesthetics) in ways that open up a series of existential territories and spatialised affects. In Guattari's texts, this is typically presented in a positive light: "It is up to the architect, if not to compose all these fragmentary components of subjectification harmoniously, at least not mutilate the essentials of their virtualities in advance".²¹ But from the example above, we can see how this refers as well to the catalysing of a series of negative reactions, such as the famous internalisation of control in Bentham's panopticon or the promotion of social hierarchies in the Red House's corridors. The fact that architecture is not

a matter of exactly predicting consequences does not mean that the composition of spatialised affects is not one of its key objectives.

5

In this essay, we have introduced Guattari's idea of architectural enunciation as an entry point for an alternative conceptual framework with which to grasp the pragmatics of the project in architecture. We have already exposed its main implications, but it is worth returning to them now, in a systematic way. The first set of implications results from thinking the project *qua* enunciation as an orchestration of multiple voices. The immediate consequence of this is a better capacity to understand the multiple assemblages the project is part of, the diversity of factors that influence it, and the multiple constituencies to which it matters. Equally, it recognises the autonomy of the constituent elements of architecture and how they work both in support of the project and independently from it. In doing so, the polyphonic undermines the totalising focus on form, organisation, and program as the almost exclusive objects of architectural analysis, bringing back the importance of discarded topics such as decoration, furniture, or lighting. The second set of implications results from an attention to how a project operates in both perceptive and affective ways. This allows complementing an attention to indexicality, representation, symbolism, and signification with an attention to the non-representational and a-signifying ways through which buildings and spaces work directly on bodies (mostly imperceptible ones). This implies shifting the focus of analysis from what the drawing is (determined according to what it expresses, symbolises, or represents) to what the drawing aims to do (the project). Ultimately, we can say that understanding the *project* through enunciation allows it to be anchored in the pragmatics of design and to avoid its reduction to an ideal concept. If the context changes, the project will necessarily change as well, even if most of its broader social or political commitments remain the same.

These insights are extremely important if we are to critically access the ways in which architecture exists in the world. Through enunciation, we gain a far more precise cartography of what a project does and of the possibilities it opens up. The project emerges as an intervention in a pragmatic context, via the composition of both expressive and affective materials, without ignoring their autonomous nature—an orchestration of voices and a catalyst of spatialised affects.

About the Authors: *Godofredo Pereira* has a degree in architecture from the University of Porto, an M.Arch from the Bartlett School of Architecture, and a PhD from Goldsmiths University. His research, *The Underground Frontier*, focuses on territorial politics, geo-architecture, and fetishism. He teaches at the Royal College of Art, where he leads the Ecologies of Existence design studio. He was the editor of the book, *Savage Objects*, and the curator of the exhibition, *Object-Project*, for the 2016 Lisbon Architecture Triennale.

Susana Caló holds a PhD from the Centre for Research in Modern European Philosophy (CRMEP), with a research on the relations between language, semiotics, and politics in the work

of Felix Guattari. She has a degree in psychology and a Master's in modern and contemporary philosophy from the University of Porto. She currently teaches at Newham College University and at ESAP in Porto.

Disclosure Statement: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

NOTES

1. Apart from his well-known work developed in collaboration with Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari was a prolific writer on semiotics and paid particular attention to the a-signifying operations of signs. This serves to ground both a critique of the place of language as the prime semiotic register and also a critique of structuralism and its implications for psychoanalytic and political theory. Specifically, his work is key to the theory of assemblages made famous by *A Thousand Plateaus*. First introduced in *Kafka*, the theory of assemblages owes much of its conceptualisation to Guattari's semiotic project. This is clear from Deleuze's preface to *Psychoanalysis et Transversalité*, in which he credits Guattari for the early conception of the "machinic" (from Hjelmslev's "the semiotic machine"), allowing them to escape from the impasse of a structuralist theory of meaning. The full potential of a theory of the *machinic* that cuts across psychological, linguistic, or political registers can be found in Guattari's *The Machinic Unconscious: Essays in Schizoanalysis*, published prior to *A Thousand Plateaus*. It is due to its specificity in addressing issues of semiotics and pragmatics that we refer here to Guattari's solo work, but also because Guattari found in architecture—one of his passions—a valuable space for testing out and refining the conceptual and practical dimensions of his theories. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (1980; repr., London/New York: Continuum, 2004); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan (1975; repr., Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976); Félix Guattari, *Psychoanalysis and Transversality*, trans. Ames Hodges (1972; repr., Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e), 2015); Félix Guattari, *The Machinic Unconscious: Essays in Schizoanalysis*, trans. Taylor Adkins (1979; repr., Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e), 2011).
2. Félix Guattari, "Architectural Enunciation", in *Guattari: Schizoanalytic Cartographies*, trans. Andrew Goffey (1989; repr., London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 231–9.
3. For a full understanding of Guattari's pragmatic theory of enunciation, we would have to draw upon his reinterpretation of the Hjelmslevian semiotic model of substance–form–purport interactions and the reciprocal presupposition between expression and content.
4. In the latter sense, it is Foucault's notion of the statement that Guattari's pragmatics of enunciation is closest to.
5. It is important to distinguish between the concepts of *design* and *project* in architectural theory. Whereas a *design* refers to the set of formal, material, legal, technical, or programmatic decisions made explicit in the drawings of a building, the *project* refers to something (an idea) that lies beyond the concrete design. The concept of *project* carries a transformative political potential. For Pier Vittorio Aureli, it concerns "the possibility of architectural thought to propose an alternative idea of the city rather than simply confirming its existing conditions". Pier Vittorio Aureli, *The*

Possibility of an Absolute Architecture (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2010). In Latin languages, the *progetto* (Italian), *proyecto* (Spanish), or *projecto* (Portuguese) refers to these two aspects at the same time, although, in English, these are two different words. As a consequence, the concept of *project* is often detached from the concrete material pragmatics of the *design* and in particular from the political spaces these open up. As we will demonstrate, enunciation allows for a stronger anchoring of the concept of *project* to its conditions of existence.

6. It is important to note how this categorisation draws on a broader set of 20 categories devised by Philip Boudon in *Sur l'espace architectural. Essai d'épistémologie de l'architecture* (Paris: Dunod, 1971); for Guattari, the eight categories he devised corresponded to what he thought to be the most relevant assemblages traversing architecture. Despite this fact, he notices how, from the perspective of enunciation, categorisations such as these are potentially infinite.
7. This is actually a far more complex issue, requiring reference to the concept of *formalisation*: within Guattari's semiotics, *formalisation* corresponds to the distinct processes at work in each given sign and which are mutually presupposing. The sign is the result of the interaction between the dimensions of content and expression with the dimensions of non-formed matter, substance, and form. This allows Guattari to discuss enunciation—say, the signifying assemblage of enunciation manifest in the cruciform plan of a Catholic Church that we mentioned above—according to two distinct yet reciprocally presupposing processes of formalisation: a formalisation of content (the history of the cross in Catholicism) and a formalisation of expression (the history of the cruciform plan). This distinction is paramount in semiotics, as it breaks with the understanding of content and expression on the basis of an association, relation of correspondence, or representation. Such a semiotic framework is derived from Louis Hjelmslev's theory of the sign; cf. Louis Hjelmslev, *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*, trans. Francis J. Whitfeld (1943; repr., Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).
8. The concept of polyphony is one developed by Mikhail Bakhtin in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1963; repr., Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984). Borrowed from music, it means multiples voices. It refers to the diversity of voices within a novel and their autonomy from a common and single denominator, in the form of the voice of the author.
9. Hermann Muthesius, *The English House* (1904; repr., London: Frances Lincoln, 2007).
10. Nikolaus Pevsner, *Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to Walter Gropius* (1936; repr., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005).
11. In particular, Hitchcock identifies a clear reference to All Saints Clergy House in Margaret Street, London, and St Saviour's Vicarage in Coalpit Heath, Gloucestershire; cf. Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *Architecture, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (1958; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1977).
12. Robert Kerr, *The Gentleman's House* (London: J. Murray, 1864).
13. Robin Evans, *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays* (1978; repr., London: Architectural Association, 1997), 55–91.
14. "You must expect at first that there will be difficulties and inconsistencies in carrying out the new style; but they will soon be conquered if you attempt not too much at once. Do not be afraid of incongruities—do not think of unities of effect. Introduce your Gothic line by line and

stone by stone; never mind mixing it with your present architecture; your existing houses will be none the worse for having little bits of better work fitted to them; build a porch, or point a window, if you can do nothing else; and remember that it is the glory of Gothic architecture that it can do *anything*. Whatever you really and seriously want, Gothic will do for you; but it must be an *earnest* want. It is its pride to accommodate itself to your needs; and the one general law under which it acts is simply this,—find out what will make you comfortable, build that in the strongest and boldest way, and then set your fancy free in the decoration of it. Don't do anything to imitate this cathedral or that, however beautiful. Do what is convenient; and if the form be a new one, so much the better; then set your mason's wits to work, to find out some new way of treating it". John Ruskin, *Lectures on Architecture and Painting, Delivered at Edinburgh in November 1853* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1854).

15. John Brandon-Jones, "The Work of Philip Webb and Norman Shaw", *Architectural Association Journal*, June 1955: 9–21; July 1955: 40–5.
16. Guattari, "Refrains and Existential Affects", in *Guattari: Schizoanalytic Cartographies*, 201.
17. We should note that terms such as *composition* or *affect* enter Guattari's lexicon most probably through the influence of Gilles Deleuze and his reading of Spinoza; cf. Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 257. Our concern, however, is not with the genealogy of concepts used by two authors that mutually influenced each other, but with making use of Guattari's work on semiotics and enunciation. This was a work initiated before his collaboration with Deleuze, and remained central both to his solo writings and to those written in partnership with other authors.
18. It is important to distinguish between a-signifying and non-signifying. For Guattari, the matter is not to avoid signification, but to understand it as a function of a more abstract relation between bodies. It is such relation that is a-signifying.
19. Guattari, "Refrains and Existential Affects", 209.
20. For an excellent exposition of these politics of a-signifying operations in architecture, see Adrian Lahoud, "Fallen Cities", in *The Arab City: Architecture and Representation*, eds Amale Andraos and Nora Akawi (New York: Columbia Books on Architecture and the City, 2016).
21. Guattari, "Architectural Enunciation", in *Guattari: Schizoanalytic Cartographies*, 238.