On Parti:
An Evaluation of the Failed
Notion of Design Beginnings

WILLIAM T. WILLOUGHBY
Louisiana Tech University

Introduction

As an educator, I try to guide students through a coherent method of design – I discuss *how* to design. In most cases I feel *the how* of design is more important than *the what*. Whenever I discuss *parti*, students are always left confused. *Parti* is a perennial stumbling block when I discuss a method for design. In my own design work and in the way I teach design studio – the resolution of a *parti* begins design. Call me retrograde, but words such as *essential*, *intentional*, and *conceptual* resonate with methodical importance in my design practices. But why is this rather commonplace approach so misunderstood by students?

This essay takes shape in three parts. In the first part I describe my personal approach to beginning architectural design. Next, I inquire into the original definition of *parti*; and then I pursue how each subsequent generation redefines the nature of design beginnings. Finally, with what is learned in the first two sections, I make cursory "stabs" at diagnosing why my discussions about *parti* seem to fail with most students.

Part One: My Approach

Before I pursue the question: *is the notion of parti still important? . .* Let me demonstrate how I use *parti* in design. I hope nothing presented here is controversial; in fact, I hope it sounds most ordinary. Of course, I don't always employ the same method every time I design; I *am* a designer you know, and what I present here is the approach I tend usually toward.

When I design, I begin by reviewing the design program. Sometimes, if the program is complex, I'll do an initial design in order to "get the elements of the program in my mind." This initial design – where I "work out" the program bolsters my confidence such that I know I can *at least* solve functional problems inherent to the program. This "throw away" exercise allows me to "fit the building in my head." With a sense for the size and proportion of the pieces of the program I **begin again.** I ponder the program a second time – this time searching my thoughts and my feelings for something *transcendent* from which to realize the building. Much like Louis I. Kahn, a great influence on my approach to design, I ponder the unmeasuable qualities of the building program. I'll ask myself, what is the nature of this building? What should it express? And, as usual to my

method, I draw a *plan* first – I attempt to capture the proper arrangement of rooms in plan such that the *form* in plan expresses the intent of the building. In sketching the plan, I try to capture a "realization about inseparable characteristics" innate in form to the building.[1] Typically, the plan is sketched in a small, simple drawing; this is my beginning. Plans lead, in sequence, to sketches in section.

Over the years, the word *esquisse* has entered my vocabulary. It was introduced to be by colleagues who graduated from the University of Pennsylvania (where the ghost of Kahn still lurks!). The *esquisse* is the sketched manifestation of the *parti*, a little sketch: typically a plan and section of a building. This little drawing is a simple strategy that predicts the outcome of final building design. The design typically develops like improvisation, oscillating between the freshness of the initial drawing and the compounding circumstances of the developing design. Louis Kahn called this the difference between *form* and *design* – form is *what*, design is *how* – *form* is **unmeasuable**, derived from realizations about things transcendent. While *design* is **measurable**, leading *form* to a measurable, attainable result.[2] As I develop a building design, I refer back and forth between the *esquisse* and the developing drawings. As the design drawings develop, I continue to sketch particular pieces of the building, developing the nuances of the design – providing additional qualities that compliment the overall intent of the building. According to Kahn, when design is complete, and the building is finally built, the beginnings of its original conception must be felt. This is the expression of architecture.

To further one more simple point, It's my argument that the beginning of design is *intentional*. As designers, we have something in mind, *before* and *during* the time when pencil meets paper and drawings are made. Intention is all we have as designers to offer coherence to the multitude of decisions that need to be made in the design of a building. A *parti* works outward from a specific intent, not inward from general qualities; this statement is an instrumental distinction. In this case, a *parti* is an initial, intentional, and predictive decision that all subsequent decisions can be measured against – and through arduous refinement into built form, becomes a personal offering to architecture.

Part Two: The Changing Notion of *Parti*

As you have no doubt surmised, I'm not "pushing the envelope" with any experimental inquiry into design. I'm not *closing* my eyes and *scribbling* a bunch of seismic lines while I ponder the arbitrary and then uncover my eyes and compose a building from this accidental scribble.[3] Instead, I employ the *intuitive* sense we all posses. The secret empathy for things that emit their essence by way of evident qualities that, to those who are sensitive, feel appropriate to the situation. I mean our intuitive ability to create places and things appropriate to the occasion, to rely on our developed practical and emotional sense for place-making (Aldo van Eyck called it a "part of our primordial equipment": to fashion spaces both "adequately and beautifully"[4]).

The term *parti* is still in use today – at least at all three of the universities I've been privileged to teach at. I wonder how has its meaning changed since *parti* was first uttered in the context of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts? I still possess handouts from my education at Kent State University. Here's how *parti* was originally introduced to me in a fourth year studio: "the minimum essential idea," that's it, nothing more. At Kent State University, the *parti* was introduced as a terminal tool for analysis. As a precursor to design in fourth year, students were asked to "pick apart" a building of a particular use-type.[5] The analysis followed along with the format established by the book *Precedents in Architecture*. Here's what it states about *parti*: "... the *parti* diagram which culminates and summarizes the analysis for the building. The *parti* is seen as the dominant idea of a building, which embodies the salient characteristics of that building. It encapsulates the essential minimum of the design, without which the scheme would not exist, but from which the architecture can be generated."[6]

To summarize the overall approach from my early education, *parti* had **three** mutually related meanings. It was a summary tool for analysis, constituting the salient points of analysis; it was a means to initially visualize, in a graphic format, a synthesis of a verbal statement of intent, program requirements, and site; and finally it was a revised graphic simplification of a developed design solution.

Parti: the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and Design Beginnings

I'll begin this discussion of architectural education in France before the split between the Ecole Polytechnique and the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. For the most part, I would like to describe only the *esquisse* portion of the *esquisse/rendu* design method taught as the "Beaux-Arts system."[7]

The roots of the educational system seem to be from Louis XIV's Academie Royale d'Architecture of 1671. Originally at the Royal Academy, lecture courses were open to anyone to attend, and later gradually became a true "school" with registered students, coursework, and specific qualifications leading to matriculation. Although, the first full-time school dedicated to the study of architecture appears to have been a private school headed by Jacques-Francois Blondel in May 1743. Notable students from his school, Ledoux and Boullee, became members and educators at the Royal Academy. Blondel, later, in 1762, was called to the Royal Academy to "direct and revitalize its teaching."[8] The Royal Academies where dissolved in 1793 by the revolutionary government. J-F Blondel, an excellent educator, wrote his *Cours d'Architecture* (1771) which lays out an exact system on how students should begin design.

First, detailed programs for buildings were dictated to students by the professors; subsequently, the students began by composing an *esquisse*, which became the basis for a finished drawing. To quote Blondel, "By program I mean the enunciation of a fairly detailed project, which the professor gives his students that they may understand his intentions, and the sequence they should follow in composing an *esquisse* under his supervision. The students then do a finished drawing without being allowed to depart from their first thoughts."[9] The *esquisse* was completed during a twelve-hour period – the students were encouraged **not** to hurry. Blondel suggested that they "pass a third of the time thinking over the problem in complete silence, and then to spend the same length of time trying several ways to fulfill the conditions of the program. The remaining four hours was, in his opinion, adequate time to translate their thoughts and make a precise *esquisse* to the required scale."[10]

Blondel's basic method was refined during Nineteenth Century and the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Not long after its establishment in 1795, it became clear that the Ecole Polytechnique couldn't satisfy the requirements of architectural education. The classes of the dissolved Royal Academy were reconstituted as an Ecole speciale D'Architecture. Later, in 1797, this became the state-run Ecole des Beaux-Arts, fully constituted around 1816.

Similar to Blondel, the method of design began with the administering of the program by the *patron*; the name for the studio masters used by the *aspirants* or students.[11] The program was issued in the morning of a twelve-hour exercise (called the *esquisse*). The students were to review the building program in a private alcove (*en loge*) at the Ecole. The students developed a plan, a section, and an elevation, which constituted a record of their concept for the building that they would later refine over an approximately six-week period, the carefully drawn *projet rendu*. The students left their *esquisse* at the Ecole and each kept a personal copy for reference back at their studio (*atelier*). The development of the *esquisse* was unassisted. Whereas, the student, with whatever means of assistance they chose, completed the *projet rendu*. The *esquisse* was kept on record to guard against the later influence or intervention of others – the *esquisse* assured the originality of the basic design concept.

The *esquisse* drawing was a tiny plan or plans at the center surrounded orthographically by sections and elevations. It was the early summation of the initial rough sketches where ideas

were initially tried out.[12] The *esquisse* was a kind of rough draft of a complete building – not a simplification as one might think it to be. The simplification or *parti* existed more as an **idea** than a **thing**. The *esquisse* reflected certain decisions made as a result of selecting a *parti*. Thus the *parti* was the basic strategy taken, an exercise of judgement about how to direct the outcome of the final design. The term *parti* had its firm and familiar roots at the Ecole by the late Nineteenth Century. From the French *parti* alone means: course of action, strategy, choice, decision; or as a shortened version of the phrase: *prendre parti*: to make up one's mind; to take on a course of action.[13] The *parti* was the strategy for arranging elements of the program. The twelve-hour spread of time necessitated the completion of four tasks. First, read and assess the building program; second, study alternative strategies to the program – in other words, determine the general range of the possible directions the design might take; third, select a strategy, make up ones mind; and four, draw the *esquisse*.

The *esquisse* served as an early document of the original conception of a building – in a certain way, it isolated the moment of conception. Louis Kahn speaks of this with an air of distance:

"For beginning design problems Beaux-Arts training typically presented the student with a written program without comment from the instructor. [The student] would study the problem, be given a period of a few hours in a cubical (*en loge*) during which [the student] would make a quick sketch of [their] solution without consultation. This sketch was filed as a basis for the elaboration of the problem which followed. Final drawings could not violate the essence of the initial esquisse . . . This particular aspect of Beaux-Arts training was probably the most controversial because there was no exchange between the advocates of the program and those who interpreted it, the architects. So the sketch depended on our intuitive powers. But the intuitive power is probably our most accurate sense. The sketch depended on our intuitive sense of appropriateness. I don't teach anything else . . . Today most schools are more Beaux-Arts than Beaux-Arts was, because the students look at examples . . . I don't think that appropriateness comes form examples of what has been done. They are a test of what is done, but not the beginning, the source. The *esquisse* gave this sense of source, because we knew little about how things were done. We couldn't go to the books and really research the problem before the *esquisse* was made. So I think the *esquisse* was valuable in giving a sense of what, out of the blue, a library should be, as though we had never seen a library."[14]

The Beaux-Arts approach emphasized the importance of the *creative moment*: that decisive moment in the isolated mind where the architectural work originates. Looking at the history of French philosophy. We see a powerful regard for the work-

ings of the mind: *Rationalism*. Rene Descartes "proved," as he sat by the flickering fire in his *private* study and figuring a piece of wax between his fingers, that the reality of the world was different that its appearance; because appearances can deceive and are ultimately uncertain. Certainty, which is the goal of knowledge, can only exist in the mind. Mistrust of the senses, leads to doubts, which leads to certainty of the self's ability to doubt (skepticism). Looking for certainty, Descartes' meditative journey led him to propose that "I am, I exist" which cannot be doubted.[15] Because in order to remove all doubt, or be certain, the doubter must cease to be.

Although abstract, Descartes' rationalism is essential to understand why the *esquisse* was proctored *en loge* and without sources for reference. The discovery of a solution, not from example but from intuition was the true generative spirit of architecture. Architecture was a physical extension of the designer's mind. From both the legacies of French philosophy and French government we see the tendency to elevate the importance of the individual mind, and make the pure idea absolute.

Curiously, the word *parti* replaced the earlier word *conception*. We see a move from intuition in the mind (conception) to a *choice of the mind* (prendre parti).[16] Quatremere de Quincy used the term *premiere idee*, a creation first and foremost of the mind. *Parti* though, is the first act of design, a *choice* – still mental and general in application. The drawing of the *esquisse* revealed the *parti*. When *parti* thoroughly entered the vocabulary of the Ecole, Georges Gromort in the 1940's wrote on the subject:

"In the genesis of the plan, the choice of the parti is of great importance – especially at the outset – than what I shall call the composition pure. The latter is mostly a matter of the adjustment of elements, while the parti plays the role of inspiration in musical composition and applies principally to the layout and relative importance given to elements."[17]

So, the *parti* is the mental importance placed upon the parts, it is the initial arrangement of the parts into a whole. Deciding on an arrangement is a different act than *composition*, which deals with aesthetic relationships – uniting the whole once the arrangement is determined.

Abstraction: Modernism and the Replacement of Parti with Analysis

What happened to the Beaux-Arts system during early Modernism? In general, the Bauhaus *Vorkurs* replaced the former method of architectural instruction. Architecture, once an affair of the elite mind coupled with graphic virtuosity, was supplanted by *building* as essentially a collective effort resulting from manual trades and practical value.[18] The word "Architecture" was avoided, and replaced with the modern equivalent, "New Building."[19] Aesthetics and ornamentation were replaced with "clear construction": industrial methods of production, standardization,

honest materials, construction, and structure. *Proportion* was replaced by *standardization* — decisions of measure were now based on a scientific understanding of the body (ergonomics, kinesthetics, and anthropometrics). The *studio* (atelier) was replaced by the *workshop*. *Expression* was replaced by *function*.

Architectural designs no longer relied on concepts aroused in the single mind, but relied on collaboration and the technical needs of society. As stated by Hannes Meyer, "Everything in this world is a product of the formula (function times economy); all art is composition and therefore unfunctional, all life is function and therefore unartistic."[20] Art was rationally distinguished from life. *Sentimental-objects* were replaced with *need-based objects*.[21] The term "program," which sounds like the order of scenes in a romantic opera was replaced with the more technical sounding word "problem," which sounds like a laboratory or a factory. *Programs* of the past, like libraries, museums, opera houses, government building, academies, religious buildings, were replaced with the *problems* of the future: power plants, factories, mass-housing, office buildings. Architecture became a problem to be solved by *overcoming* **constraint** and the dialectical *resolution of* **social concerns**.

Parti by intuition, as a form of design beginning was replaced by *solution from analysis*. The problem of the house – now a machine for living – was to be resolved in its functional improvement, its innovations for convenience, its potential for repetition and factory production. Alexander Klein introduced methods of functional analysis, previously ignored by architects. "'The functional house for frictionless living' was designed from researches carried out for a German Housing agency in 1928 by Alexander Klein, who compared his plans to the odious if typical 19th Century layout. Flow line diagrams revealed the superiority of Klein's improved plans."[22]

Thus, a building can *malfunction*; and once revealed by research and analysis, it can be improved. The *esquisse* is replaced with the *analytic diagram*, revealing functional problems and through rational dialectics, suggesting functional improvements. Abstraction and analysis replaced conceptualization as the beginnings of architectural design. For Modernism, *parti* was no longer a concern – problems *require* solutions derived by scientific fact, analysis, industrial production, and standardization of materials.

Analogy: Post-modernism and the Fragmentary Reintroduction of Parti

No wonder we're so confused. Modernism replaced the *parti*, a strategy conceived by intuition, with the *solution* derived from factual analysis. In Post-modern times, since Modernism made replacement possible, *allowable* — a *linguistic model* replaced the scientific methods of Modernism. The building was no longer derived from a *program*, or even a *problem*; it became based on a *narrative*.

The Modernist penchant for the problems of mass housing, factories and, office workplaces has been replaced by the private residence, the corporate headquarters, the resort hotel, and the retail/entertainment complex. A narrative requires a figural response – a literal sign applied to a functional box.[23] The sign offers allusions to literal sources that comprise a cultural myth (or cultural anxieties!). Buildings can be conceived much like automobiles: we expect them to work with efficiency and convenience – *but*, we also want their external appearance to have personality: sporty, sleek, basic, cute, or tough. And the ironic truth behind an analogy between automobiles and buildings reveals the fact: that Post-modernism is unabashedly a movement intimately linked to consumerism. The building is wrapped in advertisement (it calls attention to itself). Post-modernism's foremost interest is the surface – it is a **problem of surface**. We have the fictional box surrounding the functional box.

Post-modern design begins with an analogous reference. Post-modernism operates by *transposition*, an object that refers to something outside of itself. Reference, analogy, critique and precedent form the collective basis of Post-modernism. Even Modernism is fair game for quotation. A "strategy" need no longer be coherent or hierarchical. We expect to be and *choose to be* confronted with an agglomeration of fragmentary references. A building may have multiple strategies, opposing strategies, and certain digressions. We are left with a beginning where coherence isn't the aim – a beginning for design where uncertainty is "built-in."

Part Three: Conclusion, A Self-Evaluation of an Approach to Education

So, where are we now in this essay of design beginnings? Post-modernism leaves us methodically convoluted and contaminated by fragments. We see this even in our students' clothing. Nothing is new in their fashion except the peculiarity of the fragments they select. And their worlds are simulated: from TV, to blockbuster movies, to Sega Genesis, to the Internet. Music is no longer played – it's downloaded; phones are no longer tethered in-place by short cords – they're mobile. Our typical student is a refugee from consumer culture.

Contrary to inundation in advertised hype, I sit my students down in class and tell them architecture is about *stasis, basis,* and *essence*. I say architecture is about fitting physical things together in ways that make sense, that are consistent with a basic idea that should not change but remain where it was. *These students expect a rapidly moving target* (a "target" made of fashion and trend) – *they don't know what to make of it when something stands still* (a target made of substance and essence).

Call me *retardataire*, yet I contend that architectural education should be a form of *re-education*. Do our typical students come equipped with the ability to penetrate through surface appearance and discern what's critical, essential – its *parti*? It remains clear to me that our students are well trained in the art of consumerism. But *consuming* is a very different act than the act of making or designing. The decisions that go into *making* and *designing* are about conceptual coherence, and remaining *appropriate*.

If a concept and its attending *parti*, formed at the inception of a design, are appropriate to the project at hand, then they will remain evident in the finished building. As Louis Kahn said, "When the work is completed the beginning must be felt."[24] If a concept serves as the *essence* of a design, where all the parts serve that essence — then nothing in the composition should appear accidental. A design where the removal of any element would disturb its overall composition works when all parts serve a coherent and appropriate intent.[25]

But designing is the thinking and making of *something* – when it spirals out of control, it runs the risk of no longer being the thing you began with. Our students run this risk all the time — because what we do as architects and designers is ultimately *counter-culture*. When I began this essay, I hoped it would lead me to a new understanding, a reckoning with current cultural trends, and I would embrace the "will of the epoch." But if the goal of architectural design is to remain *timeless*, then I remain burdened by the basics of my approach. A case remains for the continued use of *parti* as an essential component of design beginnings.

The challenge of making timeless things in an age of *hyper-timeliness* is enough for our students; but the burden is also for us as educators, as scholars, and as designers. As educators we must be clear in our expectations about design beginnings. The typical student who enters architecture school is ill equipped with a sense of how to *begin* design. And it is up to us to be clear – *to raise the proper distinctions and outline a coherent and basic method to design.*

And the *parti* is still important: it should still serve to summarize a building's intent. As a design beginning, the *parti* is an intuitive gesture that incorporates the most fundamental characteristics of a particular architecture. The *parti* should begin with that intentional gesture-sketch, judged by in the mind of the designer as the direction that *must* be ta*ken from thereon out.*

NOTES

1   *The item in quotations is paraphrased from Louis I. Kahn, please see the various sources on Kahn cited here.*
2   When I first encountered this essay/interview with Louis I. Kahn, I was immediately charmed. I rely heavily on this essay for its practical and theoretical applications for my basic design method. Paraphrased from Jan C. Rowan's essay/interview "Wanting to Be . . . The Philadelphia School" *Progressive Architecture*, April 1961 (New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1961)
3   *A reference to Coop Himmelblau (Blue-sky Cooperative) and their method of explosive-like sketches drawn with eyes closed where they attempt to capture the unsuppressed subconscious on paper and in architecture.*
4   from Aldo Van Eyck, *"Wasted Gain,"* Sixty- third Commencement Address of the New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1979; from *Architecture in an Age of Skepticism*, compiled by Denys Lasdun (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984)
5   *Analysis had been introduced during the spring semester of our first year at Kent State University. Analysis then meant to isolate the*

compositional elements that comprised the formal structure of an assigned building.
6   Roger Clark and Michael Pause *Precedents in Architecture* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985) p.3
7   *an excellent essay by Peter Collins, "The Eighteenth Century Origins of Our System of Full-time Architectural Schooling," from JAE (Journal of Architectural Education), guest editors, Lawrence Anderson and Peter Collins, VolumeXXXIII, Number2, November 1979 (Washington DC, ACSA, 1979), p 2-3*
8   point taken from, *The Architect at Mid-Century: Evolution and Achievement*, ed. Turpin C. Bannister (New York: Reinhold Publishing, 1954), p. 83
9   Peter Collins, "The Eighteenth Century Origins of Our System of Full-time Architectural Schooling." Collins quotes Blondel's *Cours d Architecture*, p.4
10 *Peter Collins, "The Eighteenth Century Origins of Our System of Full-time Architectural Schooling," p. 4*
11 Richard Chafee, "The Teaching of Architecture at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts" from *The Architecure of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts*, ed. Arthur Drexler (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977) p.95
12 for an interesting explanation of the importance of the esquisse and its use as an initial study technique, please see Mark A. Hewitt, "The Imaginary Mountain the Significance of Contour in Alvar Aalto's Sketches," *Perspercta 25: The Yale Architectural Journal* (New York: Rizzolli International, 1989) p. 162-177
13 *taken by faith from David van Zanten's essay "Le System des Beaux-Arts," A.D. Profiles 17 (Architectural Design 11/12): The Beaux-Arts, guest ed. Robin Middelton (London: Architectural Design, 1978)*
14 from William H. Jordy's criticism in *The Architectural Review*, June 1974, Volume CLV, number 928 (London: The Architectural Press, 1974), p. 332; Kahn's intimacy with the Beaux-Arts System came from his education at the University of Pennsylvania. Kahn was a student of Paul Cret (1923-24), a French émigré, educated at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, first at Lyon and then Paris. Louis Kahn later worked for Paul Cret (beginning in1929), whom Kahn obviously admired.
15 paraphrased, without Scruton's usual corrosive interjections, from Roger Scruton's *Modern Philosophy: An Introduction and Survey* (New York: Penguin Books, 1994) p. 34; of course, multiple translations of *Meditations* by Rene Descartes were compared and consulted too.
16 inferred from Charles Van Zanten, Architectural Composition at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts from Charles Percier to Charles Garnier," from *The Architecure of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts*, ed. Arthur Drexler (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977) p.115
17 from Charles Van Zanten, Architectural Composition at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts from Charles Percier to Charles Garnier," from *The Architecure of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts*, ed. Arthur Drexler (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977) p.113-115
18 see Walter Gropius, *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965) p.19-39
19 see Christian Norberg-Schulz, "Meaning in Architecture," from *Meaning in Architecture*, ed. C. Jencks and G. Baird (New York: George Brazillier, 1970). The first few paragraphs of this essay

outline the many forms of replacement instigated by the early modernists on the words and methods of the past.

[20] *encountered in Christian Norberg-Schulz's essay "Meaning in Architecture." (from H. Meyer, "Bauen," Bauhaus, vol. 2, No. 4, 1928)*

[21] an argument outlined by Le Corbusier in the section "Type-needs. Type-furnitiure" from *The Decorative Art of Today* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987) 69-79

[22] Alexander Klein collaborated with Walter Gropius on the Wohnseidlung in Bad Durenburg, Germany 1928-1930. Citation from Robin Evans, "Figures, Doors, and Passages" from *Architectural Design/4/78* (London: Architectural Design, 1978)

[23] *Michael Graves, "Case for a Figurative Architecture," from Michael Graves: Buildings and Projects 1966-1981 (New York: Rizzoli, 1982) p. 11-13. In Graves' essay, literature becomes a model for architecture. And if architecture is a language (to paraphrase Graves) then it could be said to exist in two forms: a standard form and a poetic form. The standard form is the basic formal language of building: its pragmatic, constructional, and technical requirements. The poetic form is cultural, figurative, and associative. Thus architecture occurs when the standard and the poetic overlap, so to speak.*

[24] *cited from a photocopy of what appears to be the back cover of a little pamphlet on Louis I. Kahn, acquired from a former professor, Dr. Osyp Martyniuk; title, publisher, and date unknown.*

[25] compare with Alberti's notion of Beauty and Ornament. "Beauty is that reasoned harmony of all the parts within a body, so that nothing may be added, taken away, or altered, but for the worse." From, Leon Battista Alberti, *On the Art of Building in Ten Books* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989) p.156