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Introduction:

This paper, as part of the conference entitled: 'Transient boundaries in/of architecture' (Fig 1a), argues that ‘other’ disciplines, e.g. Philosophy, Classics and Psychoanalysis, can provoke the Architecture discipline to transile or leap (salire Latin = to leap) across (or under) the impenetrable boundaries being put in place against the underprivileged in the current 'Age of Apophasis'.

Architecture:

The threshold (Latin: limen), the limit or the boundary condition has fascinated European Architecture from Romulus (Snodgrass, 1990) and Vitruvius (Mckew, 2003) through Gottfried Semper (1851) to the present day. Indeed the desire to take out a pen and draw the boundary line appears primal for many practicing architects.

At the end of the 20th century with the birth of the digital age, the noun ‘threshold’ as a building element (Coyne and Yokozawa, 1990) was transformed into an active verb, ‘to threshold’. ‘To threshold’ is a paranoid neologism, a new word, a new logic, imbricated not only in digital image processing, but also in the society of digital capitalism. The verb’s present participle, ‘thresholding’ is an integral process in image processing for digital architecture today. The architect/designer imposes a limit on the subtle polychrome image so that everything above the limit is privileged as white, and everything below the limit is black (Figure 1a). There is no in between, no nuanced grey tone, no shadow, no shade, and no shelter.

Liminal and boundary conditions have long been ambivalent and problematic in European Architecture. Romulus used both a white and a black ox to pull the furrow-cutting plough around the boundary/limit of the city of Rome (Snodgrass, 1990). Vitruvius learned that “Also circular is the horizon that embraces the earth to limit (horizein in Greek) human sight”, but he also learned from Cicero that “the horizon varies “without limit for different people in different places” (McKew, 2003, page 161). However, Vitruvius was primarily concerned with privileging the Roman Emperor: “The notion of what we call the Roman Empire – a spatial unit with a centre, Rome, and a clearly marked limit or periphery – first took shape under the all powerful Augustus Caesar, through whom, as through the golden milestone and the Prima Porta statue, all expressions of unity were initially formulated” (McKew, 2. pp 275-276).

The ‘boundary’, one of Gottfried Semper’s key elements of 19th century architecture, is today in the 21st century called into question in ‘other’ Architecture, outside Europe in the former British Empire; “far from being neutral, the boundary works to structure (other) relations between the inside and outside of the building. These mirror the power relations between centre and periphery.” (Le Roux, 2004). Thus boundaries or borders are not just simple facts, lines, or artifacts on the ground / lines on a plan; they are also part of the discourse of power.

The verb ‘to threshold’ in digital architecture is defined (OED on line, 2009) as “To alter (an image) by reproducing it in two tones only, each part being dark or light according as the original is darker or lighter than some chosen threshold shade. In praxis, however, when an architect/designer ‘thresholds’ a digital image, there is no boundary or ‘threshold shade’ in the ‘othered’ image, only a limit often privileging for her/his master/patron some object of her/his desire. The act of thresholding has a consequent loss of
'other information/information about others' and there is no possibility of a return to a pre-thresholding or pre-limiting condition. (See also Gonzalez and Wintz, 1977).

It is particularly appropriate to explore these different interpretations of limit, boundary and threshold at the University of Edinburgh. For the last 1866 years, the location for what is today’s City of Edinburgh straddles a point several miles due east of the northern limit of the then Roman Empire – Antonine’s Wall - built to privilege the Emperor Antoninus Pius about 143 A.D..

Transiling or Subsiling Antonine’s Boundary/Limit (Figure 2)

The Antonine wall’s ‘boundary area’ (Figure 2) of the turf-covered boulder wall, the ditch to the north, and the cobbled road to the south are lines on the map and artifacts on the ground. Together they became a ‘site’ in the UNESCO patrimonial World Heritage discourse in 2008. Just as the boundary has both ‘ups’ and ‘downs’ of elevation in terms of walls and ditches, so the transilience of boundaries may be considered vis a vis the discourse of power not only in terms of leaping ‘up’ and ‘across’, but also in terms of subverting and plunging ‘down’ and ‘under’ the discourses of power. Such ‘subsiling’, or leaping down, may be the way across the boundary for those who have not been privileged by the dominant discourse (Bloor and Bloor, 2008). ‘Understanding these apparently different interpretations of boundary transilience, both literally as in Figure 3 below, and metaphorically ‘down’ through the ‘un’conscious is the intent of this paper.

Fig 3. Subsiling boundaries literally, as at the Rafah crossing of the Palestine-Egypt border on Feb 10th 2009 and also figuratively, as when we plunge into the ‘unconscious’ to breach the boundaries of the mind.

http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/feb/10/gaza-tunnels-israel

This paper proposes that Architects who dare to leap over/down under the boundaries imposed by paranoid ‘thresholding’ into other disciplines like philosophy, classics and psychoanalysis, may find discourses other than those of the privileged ‘affirmative and denial’, ‘you are either with us or against
us’ which prevail in the current Age of Apophasis. Denial eliminates and excludes those without power and privilege. Some have the red stamp ‘Visa Denied’ placed in their passport. Others may be off-loaded from the flight on the basis of a digitally enhanced reflective x-ray image. The sick have their ‘DNA’ taken to DeNy them Access through fortress Europe’s cordon sanitaire, International students at UK universities are denied open access to Erasmus Mundus programmes in Schengen country universities. Many university libraries deny access, or ‘bar’ entry, to those with no ‘bar’ code. Private sector ‘swipe’ cards affirm or deny access to Architecture at the University of Edinburgh. People without a password are denied entry through many ‘portals of learning’ on the internet (Coyne, Lee, and Parker. (2005). The homeless person is denied access to a place to be for the night by ‘charities’ with a locked door and a digitally recorded voice saying: ‘We’re sorry we can’t come to the phone right now’.

The Architecture Discipline within the School of Arts, Culture and Environment at the University of Edinburgh (Figure 4) also considers liminal and boundary conditions with some degree of ambivalence. The inaugural professorial lecture by the first Head of the new School of Arts, Culture and Environment followed Gottfried Semper’s tradition, but from an Architectural Engineering perspective, with a lecture entitled ‘Structure and Architecture: Supporting Illusion’ with an emphasis on architecture as enclosure (MacDonald, 2005). The subsequent Head of the School also gave a key address to post-graduate students proposing ‘A Theory of Transgression’ (Coyne, 2004) which celebrates the threshold or limen as ‘a site of resistance’ ~ ‘often a necessary condition for the creative impulse to disclose itself.’ A group of Architectural post graduate students and alumni have presented a transcultural approach focusing not so much on the boundary or limit, but rather on facilitating ‘mutual reciprocity’ among students dwelling on either side of any supposed boundary or limen (e-Fusions, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>4c</th>
<th>4d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The design or re-design of the ‘home’ of Architecture within the School of Arts, Culture and Environment (Figure 4, with Liang and Chanen, 2005) reflects: (4a) Open access and egress with coexistent learning for people to enter and join the discourse in lectures, studios and the Matthew Art Gallery as well as for students to go outside and learn from those who dwell on the street; (4b) limited or one way access for some, but denial for others -perhaps akin to the one-way process of digital image thresholding; (4c) the threshold of allure with the light door, the threshold of allure with the light inside apparently welcoming those outside. (4d) the paranoid denial of the closed door, facilitated by the digital swipe card operated through remote surveillance by the private sector, leaving the homeless person to sleep in the liminal crypt-like condition of alcoholism, drugs and death. (Note: a, b, c d order reversed in Row 1 in Figure 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philosophy:

Let our ‘conversation’ on transilient liminal or boundary re-design, commence not with the external limen of Architecture at 20 Chambers Street in Edinburgh (Fig 4, above and (See Figure 5 Row 1 below) but rather with the internal limen of a philosophical ‘other’. An other ‘home’ of architecture is 19 Kunmangasse in Vienna, the house that Ludwig Wittgenstein designed to be built for his sister, Margaret Stonborough-Wittgenstein between 1926 and 1928. Here I shall use the house designed by Wittgenstein as an example of a typical upper-middle class home to investigate the relationship between a middle class property and the community in which it dwells. Kunmangasse 19 is a house where
decorations, ornament and emotion have been eliminated. (*limen*, Latin = threshold) so that proportions and the play of light become all important. The Royal Academy in London in 2002 exhibited these photographs of some of the internal thresholds or *limina* from Wittgenstein’s Kundmangasse 19 under the title ‘The Unknown Wittgenstein’ as illustrated in (See Figure 5 Row 2 below.

The Closed Door Denying the Other. (See Figure 5 Row 2 Image a) The door is closed by the decision makers or key holders who have decided they wish to be unaware of what is going on the other side of the *limen*, boundary or limit. The other, like the homeless person, is kept absent. People cannot cross the threshold from one side to the other or vice versa. There are two separate categories and there is no threshold space between. Only the key holder(s), [the person(s) who conceived the categories which entail the threshold] can open the door. Access is denied.

The Lure of Direct Observation through Glass Doors (See Figure 5 Row 2 Image b) Both the one side and the other side are reciprocally related across the *limen*, boundary or limit by the difference in light intensity through the glass paneled doors. The relatively bright light from one side shining on the person on the other side lures and controls them, but leads to a loss of identity for the person on the one brightly lit side. The relative shadow cast over the person kept on the other side also leads to a loss of identity thus reinforcing the panopticon effect. The *visa* is ‘seen’.

Half Closed and Half Open Doors Denying Re-Entry (See Figure 5 Row 2 Image c) In the case of the half open glass door, a person can pass through the *limen* boundary or limit via the light side on the right into the darkness, but despite appearances, once one is deprived of light, there is no way back in via the left side for the same person trying to return across the boundary to the light. The possibility of ‘RE-entry’ is indetermined, and the permission to enter is in question.

Wide Open Doors ~ Out ‘In’ to Freedom (See Figure 5 Row 2 Image d) Wittgenstein’s wide open solid doors and inner glass panel doors allow two way movement, or ‘play’ from one side to the other side of the *limen*, boundary or limit and vice versa; from light into darkness and from darkness into light. Although some loss of identity because of the bright light and shadow still exists, nevertheless unrelated people from both sides can meet each other on either side of the threshold and thereby reveal their identity. Their ‘identity’ (Latin *identitatem* = “sameness”) is revealed.

Wittgenstein’s Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus

In introducing the English version of Wittgenstein’s Tractatus Logico-Philosphicus, Bertrand Russell stated in May 1922 four years before the design of Kundmangasse 19, “The essential business of language is to deny facts”. Russell as well as highlighting the essence of Wittgenstein’s Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, is describing Aristotle’s ‘Contradictories’ *Kataphasis* and *Apophasis* – Affirmative and Denial - and the Law of the Excluded Middle that underpins digital image thresholding. When thresholding an image (Figure 1a – a pixel in the image is assessed to be above the light limit or to be not above the light limit on the light histogram scale. The algorithm does not allow the pixel value to be on the limit. It must be assigned either to the white category or to the black category.

In his own preface Wittgenstein writes; “The book will, therefore draw a limit to thinking, or rather – not to thinking, but to the expression of thoughts, for, in order to draw a limit to thinking we should have to be able to think both sides of this limit (we should therefore have to be able to think what cannot be thought). The limit can, therefore, only be drawn in language and what lies on the other side of the limit will be simply nonsense”. Later when making propositions, Wittgenstein states in proposition 4.112 ....“Philosophy should make clear and ‘delimit’ sharply the thoughts which otherwise are, as it were, opaque and blurred”. ‘Thresholding’ in the sense of actively ‘delimiting’ may therefore not be a paranoid neologism of digital capitalism. Active ‘thresholding’ in terms of delimiting or drawing a boundary around is clearly seen in the German verb for delimit ‘*abgrenzen*’ In proposition 5.6 Wittgenstein notes: “The limits of my language mean the limits of my world”. He goes on to say in proposition 5.61 “Logic fills the world; the limits of the world are also its limits. We cannot therefore say in logic: This and this there is in the world, that there is not. For that would apparently presuppose that we exclude certain possibilities, and this cannot be the case since otherwise logic must get outside the limits of the world: that is, if it could consider these limits from the other side also”. 


This mention of ‘the other side’ raises an eyebrow of concern in this writer. Is this ‘thresholding’ limiting our understanding of other cultures’ because I do not know their language, or because they do not share our classical contradictory logic and the Law of the Excluded Middle? Can there be no other logics and no understanding between our cultures? (King, 1999) Indeed Wittgenstein goes on to state in proposition 5.63 “I am my world.” In proposition 5.631 he states “The thinking, presenting subject, there is no such thing. …” And in 5.632 “The subject does not belong to the world but it is the limit of the world” Again the writer’s eyebrow is raised, for if the subject is the limit of the world, s/he must be ‘thresholding’ the world as in Aristotle’s contradictories - actively elucidating certain propositions and in the process of...
so doing denying the existence of ‘other’ premises or premises by others, and losing lots of information – oh woe is me!

Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Investigations

Wittgenstein’s posthumous Philosophische Untersuchungen (literally and perhaps metaphorically meaning Searching Under Philosophy in German) published in 1953 twenty five years after the completion of Kundmangasse 19 may allow a different discourse(s) on the *limen*, boundary or limit because they appear more problematic. Thus in his aphorism 76 Wittgenstein writes: “If someone were to draw a sharp boundary, I couldn’t acknowledge it as the one that I too always wanted to draw, or had drawn in my mind. For I didn’t want to draw one at all. It can then be said: his concept is not the same as mine, but akin to it. The affinity is that of two pictures, one of which consists of coloured patches with blurred boundaries and the other of patches similarly shaped and distributed but with sharp boundaries. The affinity is just as undeniable as the difference”

Wittgenstein goes on to place the Law of the Excluded Middle in a thought provoking context, possibly one assuaging my raised eyebrow with regard to coexistence and reflective learning with the other. He talks about the expressions ‘above’ and ‘beneath’, but we may equally consider the expressions leaping ‘over’ and plunging ‘under’ in the context of this conference on boundaries. Wittgenstein in aphorism 351 uses the example of ‘applying the expressions ‘above’ (over) and ‘beneath’ (under) to the globe.”Here we all have a quite clear idea of what “above” (over) and “beneath” (under) mean. I see well that I am on top (over): the earth is surely beneath (under) me! (And don’t smile at this example. We are indeed all taught at elementary school that it is stupid to talk like that. But it is much easier to bury a problem than to solve it). And it is only reflection that shows us that in this case “above” (over) and “beneath” (under) cannot be used in the customary way. (That we might say that people at the antipodes are “beneath” (under) our part of the earth, but must then also recognize it as right for them to use the same expression about us.)

In Aphorism 352 Wittgenstein re-evaluates the Law of the Excluded Middle, Aristotle’s kataphasis and apophasis. viz: At this point our thinking plays us a strange trick. That is we want to quote the law of the excluded middle and say: ‘Either such an image (an image or picture that enframes our mind like the white on the thresholded digital image, and also masks out the real world which is also in the black part of the digitally thresholded image ) floats before his mind, or it does not, there is no third possibility!” So really – and this is surely obvious – it says nothing at all, but gives us a picture. And the problem is now supposed to be: Does reality accord with the picture or not? And this picture seems to determine what we have to do, what to look for, and how - But it does not, precisely because we do not know how it is to be applied. Here, saying, “There is no third possibility” or “There really isn’t a third possibility!” expresses our inability to turn our eyes away from this picture – a picture which looks as if it might already contain both the problem and its solution, while all the time we feel that it is not so …

Finally in the context of our ‘Transilient Boundaries in/of Architecture’ conference, Aphorism 499; To say “This combination of words has no sense” excludes it from the sphere of language, and thereby bounds the domain of language. But when one draws a boundary, it may be for various kinds of reason. If I surround an area with a fence or a line or otherwise, the purpose may be to prevent someone getting in or out, But it may also be part of a game and the players are surprised, say, to jump over the boundary, or it may show where the property of one person ends and that of another begins, and so on. So if I draw a boundary line that is not yet to say what I am drawing it for. (So why does the digital designer choose to set the limit at 100 or even 120 on the histogram of light scale?)

The millimetre precision of Kundmangasse 19’s limits seems to have been re-moved from Wittgenstein’s mind by the time of the Philosophical Investigations. Wittgenstein changes the limits by changing the language game. There appears a much greater need to search ‘under’neath for the different meanings of language in different contexts. Wittgenstein thought that meaning comes from our “form of life”; if we really want to change the limits of (our) thought, we have to change our form of life; or, to see what is on the other side of the limit, we have to embrace somehow, or come to understand, an Other form of life².

Classics:

Many consider that the classical writings and syllogisms of Aristotle of Stygera underpin the Manichean boundary. Lord Ferguson and Colin Powell appeared to invoke Aristotle’s syllogism in the ‘Age of Apophasis’ ~ where people ‘leap across ’ or ‘do not leap across’ ~ where barbarians are ‘with us’ or ‘against us’ ~ where ‘we converse’ or ‘we do not converse’ and where the door is open or not open for the homeless person (see Figure 5 Row 3 image a). Transilying this but partial interpretation of Aristotle’s types of opposite reveals ‘not apophasis’ or ‘not only kataphasis and apophasis’, but also Aristotle’s other three perspectives on oppositions (Row 3 in Figure 5): pros ti; Steresis kai hexis; and enantia. (Hass, 1998) These additional perspectives in Figure 5 Row 3 may open up very different discourses on the *limen*, boundary or limit condition.
**Kataphasis and Apophasis:** (Contradictories) (See Figure 5 Row 3 Image a)

*Kataphasis* and *Apophasis* together form a distinct type of opposition in which an affirmative proposition is contradicted by a negative proposition which denies the affirmative proposition and vice—versa, as for example: (i) S/he leaps over (or transiles) ~ is contradicted by (ii) S/he does not leap over (or transile). and vice-versa(i) (S/he does not leap over (or transile) ~ is contradicted by (ii) S/he leaps over (or transiles). Whether the subject ‘S/he’ exists or does not exist, one of the two propositions in a *kataphasis* and *apophasis* type of opposition is true and the other is thereby false. In other words, if the subject does not exist, then the proposition ‘S/he leaps over (or transiles)’ becomes false. And if the subject does not exist, then the proposition ‘S/he does not leap over (or transile) becomes true.

**Pros ti** (Correlatives); (See Figure 5 Row 3 Image b)

Each of the *Pros ti* pairs of opposites are related to each other. Each opposite is explained by reference to the other, for example: the father is ‘the father of a son’ and vice-versa, the son is ‘the son of a father’. In Aristotle’s time there was a habit of using the example of ‘the master of a slave’ and ‘the slave of a master’. This was the origin of Hegel’s Master Slave dialectic and then via Kojève’s teachings, Jacques Lacan’s discourse of Le Maître and Salvador Dali’s pencil and ink drawing of the Study for the Slave Market (see Figure 5).

**Steresis kai Hexis** (Privatives and Positives); (See Figure 5 Row 3 Image c)

The pairs of opposites in *Steresis kai Hexis* refer to one and the same subject. Aristotle took as an example subject, the eye. The same eye that possesses the positive property of ‘sight’ is deprived of possessing that positive property and possesses the property of ‘blindness’. For Aristotle, privatives and positives could not be reversed – the subject possessing the quality of “blindness” could not regain possession of his ‘sight’ ~ a process uncannily similar to digital image ‘thresholding’ in which a digital image possessing large amounts of information is deprived of much of that information upon implementing the thresholding rule, but thereafter that lost information which Shannon and Weaver might term ‘noise’, cannot be regained. Although in today’s Europe, bionic eye technologies and the Italian premier’s hair grafts may appear to run ‘contrary’ rather than ‘pros ti’, nevertheless privatives and positives still occur.

Given that the Greek *Steresis* = addiction, perhaps the modern day Schengen Fortress example of this pair of opposites is the ‘fit’ young subject trained in the military to perform ‘violent action’ and drafted not to the northern limit to man Antonine’s wall, but rather to the eastern limit of NATO to eliminate opium in Afghanistan. Upon his return to Europe, the Law rules him guilty for performing some ‘violent action’. He therefore cannot return to his family and becomes homeless. He becomes addicted to opium or alcohol in order to numb the pain. The homeless addict then lies in the crypt like threshold. The same ‘fit’ subject has become ‘addicted’. *Steresis kai Hexis* may still rule in 21st century Europe!

**Enantia** (Contraries): (See Figure 5 Row 3 Image d)

Pairs of opposites like the *enantia* are not interdependent. Aristotle’s example is that ‘white’ (is not) spoken of as the white of the black’ and similarly vice versa black is not spoken of as the black of the white. The *enantia* pairs of opposites are contraries. Both pairs of *enantia* opposites must belong to the same genus, just as black and white are both colours. The subjects in which black or white are naturally present must necessarily contain either ‘black’ or ‘white’. Aristotle emphasizes, that it is not true to say that everybody must be white or black. There are bodies with intermediary shades: “grey, sallow (pale brown and yellow), and all the other colours that come in between”. With enantia pairs of opposites, each opposition may change from itself into the other, while the subject retains its identity, unless indeed one of the contraries is a constitutive property of the subject such as... (white is to snow). In other words, that which is white (may) become black. And in the case of the late Michael Jackson, black may become white. Just as in the first millennium, Aristotle of Stagyira showed Greece that a ‘bad’ person may change towards a person of ‘virtue’, so George Kelly has shown third millennium Ireland, Europe and the world that a terrorist may change to a peace negotiator. All four Aristotelian oppositions provide 21st Century Europe with alternative opportunities for transient ‘conversations’ (whether with Ahmadinejad or Obama). Perhaps Aristotle’s *enantia* opens up the broadest range of opportunities for transient boundaries. *Enantia* bears an uncanny resemblance to the semiotician/architect, Umberto Eco’s and Alain Le Pichon’s concept of *Transcultural* Education (Eco, 2001) involving mutual reciprocity among scholars and students outside and within Europe. While there may be a tendency for architects in Edinburgh to dwell upon the Northern limits of the Roman Empire, the multiple opportunities of
Psychoanalysis:

Sigmund Freud, who lived in Vienna at Bergasse 19, did not focus on Margaret Stonborough-Wittgenstein’s home at Kundmangasse 19, but rather on an ‘ancient home’, the unconscious mind. Depending whether architects position the limen or threshold below or above the entrance door, it may be suggested, in the latter case, that Freud was interested in sub-liminal architecture. Through his lifetime’s work with patients, Freud used parapraxes, dreams and jokes to try to understand the transience of thoughts and nonsense back and forward across and ‘un’der (trans and sub) the boundary between the conscious and the ‘un’conscious mind. In his classic work on: ‘The Joke and its Relation to the Unconscious’, Freud, (1905) associates the ‘ancient home’ of play across the boundaries of rational consciousness with the infantile world. viz:

“...during its development on the level of play – in the childhood of reason, that is – the joke is able to produce these pleasure-bringing condensations; and that...it performs the same feat on a higher level by plunging the thought into the unconscious. For the infantile is the source of the unconscious; unconscious processes are nothing more than those produced simply and solely in early childhood. The thought plunging into the unconscious in order to form the joke, is only revisiting the ancient home of its erstwhile play with words. For a moment thinking is transposed back to the childish source of pleasure. Even if we did not already know it from research into the psychology of neuroses, we could not but surmise from jokes that the strange unconscious revision is nothing other than the infantile type of thinking” (Freud, 1905. pp166-167).

Freud’s work was further developed by the French psychoanalyst, Jacques Lacan, who like Wittgenstein saw language as ‘limiting’ the world of the subject. By reflecting upon child development studies, Lacan saw language as locating the subject within the world and also as splitting the subject ($) between the imaginary ego of the conscious and the irrational passions and drives of the ‘un’conscious. Lacan used the language structures of the ‘un’conscious, revealed through psychoanalytic patients’ jokes, dreams and parapraxes, to ‘under’stand the ‘un’known emotions that Wittgenstein sought to eliminate both from the Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus and from the design of K’un’d’magasse 19.

Psychoanalysts like Jacques Lacan illustrate desire leaping across the boundary between the shadow of the ‘un’conscious and the bright light of the conscious. They consider the gaps in the Master signifier (S1), Capitalism, built like Wall Street upon the bo’un’daries of the enclosure movement. They highlight the ‘desire not to know’ of the ‘Un’iversity built upon its paranoid limits to library access. They hear the jouissance cry of the hysteric begging at the threshold for their child’s food while the United Nations awaits the BBC Humanitarian appeal. They share the analyst’s understanding of the joke about the homeless at the home of the millionaire (Freud, 1905, page 11) or ‘miglionnaire’ (Lacan, 1957-58, page 47). The architectural structures of these psychic processes recognize the other’s paranoid misunderstandings, like ‘Bushisms’.

In his 17th Seminar Series in 1969-70 entitled L’envers de la psychanalyse’ (The ‘other’ or perhaps the ‘under’ side of psychoanalysis), Jacques Lacan tries to outline four alternative discourses following his fourfold mathemes, or algebraic formulae, (See Figure 5 Row 4), each arranged in the form of an architectural ‘arch’. For each of the four discourses, Lacan developed a matheme with the same four components inter-related in different ways. Each ‘arch’ representing one of the discourses subsequent to the discourse of Le Maître Master is generated by rotating counterclockwise the positions of all four symbols constituting the previous arch.

Le Maître (See Figure 5 Row 4 Image a)

As seen from the first arch, in the matheme for Le Maître, the Master’s discourse, the Master Signifier (S1) occupies the ‘driver’s seat’ in the discourse (sitting on the upper left of the lintel and exerting influence and power over the world as does any other discourse). The position or power of any nonsensical Master Signifier, like capitalism, sitting above the bar is ‘under’ pinned by the pillar of ‘truth’. The truth is that the power of the Master comes from the alienated subjects or workers [aptly represented by the castrated dollar sign ($)]. The Master Signifier (S1) acts across the arch upon the slave (in the upper right) who, while slaving away, learns and comes to embody knowledge (S3). In turn the slave’s work produces a surplus value or to use Lacan’s frisson, jouissance, what he terms l’objet petit a or ‘the cause of desire’ as the right pillar below the bar or limen. This surplus jouissance is appropriated for the Master’s enjoyment. However, try as s/he may to pretend otherwise, the Master is her/himself also alienated by the language of our capitalist world.

Aristotle’s oppositions in Ancient Greece may provoke a rethinking of the Eastern European limen especially with its present-day ‘Other’, Turkey.
The apophasic essence of this alienation of *Le Maître* is captured by Zygmunt Bauman in a section entitled, ‘Out of Touch Together’ (Bauman 2010). He emphasizes that ‘Closed Communities are supposed to be separate worlds’ He then discusses the characteristics of the condominium where many of *Les Maîtres* live. ‘The most prominent feature of the condominium is its ‘isolation and distance from the city… isolation means separation from those considered to be socially inferior’, and as the developers and the real estate agents insist, ‘the key factor to assure this is security. This means fences and walls surrounding the condominium, guards on duty twenty four hours a day controlling the entrances, and an array of facilities and services’ for keeping the others out’.

**L'Université** (See Figure 5 Row 4 Image b)

Lacan proposes discourses, alternative to the dominant status quo of the master discourse by rotating each of the four symbols ( S₁, S₂, a and $) the components of the arches by a quarter turn anti-clockwise to produce to put a different agent, University knowledge S₂, in the driver’s seat on the upper left of the lintel. Just as the Master Signifier (S₁) drives *Le Maître* (the Master’s discourse (Fig 7a), so the knowing subject of the university (S₂) is put in the driver’s seat in the discourse of *L’Université* (Fig 7b), but Lacan sees Universities as being underpinned in truth by the Master Signifier (S₁) of Capitalism. University knowledge is systematic and acts upon the cause of desire (a) to produce alienated and unknowing students and subjects ($) in the lower right below the bar.

**L’Hystérique** (Sée Figure 5 Row 4 Image c)

But what if ($), the alienated subject, were supported by the truth of surplus enjoyment (a) below, and given access to the driver’s seat, as in the discourse of *L’Hystérique* (Fig 7c). This might be imagined were homeless people to participate ‘in’ side the architectural studio, or else if the street ‘out’side were to become the architectural studio? How then would the alienated subject ($) act upon and call into question the Master Signifier (S₁) of capitalism, to produce alternative forms of knowledge S₂ beneath the bar in the lower right.

**L’Analyste** (See Figure 5 Row 4 Image d)

Finally in the subversive discourse of *L’Analyste* (Fig 7d), the architectural analyst may put Objet petit a (whatever cause of desire has been excluded or suppressed in the darkness of the apophasic discourse of *Le Maître*) in the driver’s seat. Architectural student analysts may be able gain the appropriate knowledge (S₂) to understand potential Objets petit a of other’s (e.g. homeless people) through conversing with them. The Objet petit a can then act across the lintel/limen of the arch to interrogate alienated people with regard to their alienation ($) – the split between the subject of their unconscious and the imagined others that constitute paranoid egos – the split that may be revealed through understanding the blurring out of different signifiers (S₁) - some paranoid neologisms like ‘thresholding’ - and other signifiers like ‘caring’ or ‘nurturing’.

**Conclusion:**

This paper has outlined how Wittgenstein, Aristotle, and Lacan from other disciplines like Philosophy, Classics, Psychoanalysis have approached the limen, boundary and limit condition. So Wittgenstein, the builder of the non-emotional Kundmangasse 19 home, later ‘under’ stood that the meaning of drawing boundaries could be interpreted differently by different people in different contexts. Aristotle sought to integrate psychological desires within the physical world. His *kataphasis* and *apophasis* logic of affirmative and denial was but one of other alternative interpretations of types of boundary opposition... Lacan built arches to open up different discourses of power translilng the boundary between the ‘un’conscious and the conscious to allow alternative desires and discourses other than only those of the Master to provoke our boundary leaping.

A Scottish salmon ‘wintles’ in and out, resisting the current, against the unthresholded poster or rubric for the ‘Transilient Boundaries in/of Architecture’ conference 2009 Architectural education, with the traditional focus on the liminal or boundary condition may leap or delve into other disciplines. This may broaden the focus on the limen, boundary or limit condition to include other discourses rather than only the contradictory oppositional categories that the privileged put in place without dialogue with the other ~thereby imprisoning themselves. Just as young children play freely beyond the boundaries of
the mind, so architectural education may transile and subsile into the 'un'conscious of the other to provide shelter where we may converse or dwell.

Contemporary post-graduate architecture students must draw on alternative causes of desire to resist being subjected to only the systemic knowledge of the university. Our conscious 'self' is constituted by 'the other' (the unified self we have lost) who may be inside or outside the Architectural studio. With less 'self'ishness as 'imperial architect's²', like the sile (Scots = newly hatched fish), each of us may, as Robert Burns suggested in 1786, 'wintle like a sàumont' (somersault like a salmon) against the systemic currents, in and out, across or 'under' disciplinary boundary structures with the help of other disciplines (Fig 1b).

Endnotes:

1 Age of Apophasis. - Perhaps the best, if not only known, of Aristotle's types of opposition from his 'Categories' are the 'contradictories' – the kataphasis or apophasis - the affirmative or the denial – Socrates is a man or Socrates is not a man. In logic these may be expressed by the formula "P v ~P". Kataphasis and Apophasis form two 'contradictories' [one proposition (P) is the negation (~) of the other proposition (P)]. One proposition must be true, and the other proposition must be false. It is impossible that there should be anything between the two parts of a contradiction. This constitutes the Law of the excluded middle. There is no grey/shadow in between the black and white of a digitally thresholded image.


L'interrogatoire a largement dépassé l'heure moyenne avant qu'il apparaîsse clairement qu'à la limite de ce langage don't il n'y avait pas moyen de la faire sortir, il en était un autre. C'est le langage, d'une saveur particulière et souvent extraordinaire, qui est celui du délirant. C'est un langage où certains mots prennent un accent spécial, une densité qui se manifeste quelquefois dans la forme même du signifiant, lui donnant ce caractère franchement néologique si frappant dans les productions de la paranoia. Dans la bouche de l'autre jour, a donc enfin surgî le mot galopiner, qui nous a donné la signature de tout ce qui nous était dit jusque-là. (Lacan, 1981. Page 42, para 2)

[The questions went well beyond the average time for it to appear clearly that there was no way of making her go beyond the limit of this language, that there was another. That is the language, which has a characteristic which is specific and often extraordinary, of the person who is delirious. It is a language in which certain words take on a special emphasis, a density that sometimes shows itself in even the form of the signifier, giving it this frankly neologic character that is so striking in the presentations of paranoia. Out of the mouth of our patient of the other day, finally emerged the word galopiner (homeless street urchin), which gave us the characteristic of everything that had been said to us up to then].

3. The Homeless. This conference paper is part of a thesis entitled: The ‘Other’ side of Architecture: thresholding the shadow of the homeless.

4. Enclosure: Karl Marx discusses the en(in)closure movement to increase the profits and power of the privileged and evict the ‘under’ privileged in Volume 1 of Das Kapital in 1867.

5. Our ‘conversation’ The verb ‘to converse’ used to mean ‘to dwell’ in the Heideggerian sense. Thus here the paper seeks to initiate an on-going conversation with readers from architecture and other disciplines about these issues. Readers are encouraged to reflect upon Figure 5 in a way analogous with the paper entitled ‘Conversations with Graphics:’ implications for the design of natural language/graphics interfaces (Nielson and Lee,1994).

6. Abgrenzen ‘Die Philosophie soll die Gedanken, die sonst, gleichsam, trübe verschwommen sind, klar machen und scharf abgrenzen.’ ...Philosophy should make clear and 'delimit' sharply the thoughts which otherwise are, as it were, opaque and blurred.

7. This last interpretation of Wittgenstein’s later writing is from John Lee. This interpretation is insightful both professionally and personally.

8. This phrase was suggested by a post-graduate student from an ‘other’ discipline within the School of Arts, Culture and Environment at the time of the Conference.
This paper is dedicated to: Darren Dal a homeless ex soldier who slept in the threshold of the Architecture Discipline of the University of Edinburgh ~ and to all Edinburgh international post-graduate architecture students who have difficulty getting a Schengen visa. ~ and to all non Edinburgh, non international, non post-graduate, non Architects, and non students who have difficulty gaining a Schengen visa ~ and to all those people: men, women and children who do not wish a Schengen visa, but proudly open their own doors and boundaries to ‘converse’ about their home and culture.
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