LINGUISTICS AND ARCHITECTURE: A RE-REVIEW

Joshua Nash, PhD / Associate professor / Aarhus Insitute of Advanced Studies, Aarhus University. Introduction by Kaisa Hjort Kristensen.

Why look at linguistics and architecture? How can interdisciplinarity affect architecture and architects? Maybe other disciplines can push architecture in exiting new directions and extend the architectural vocabulary.

We have invited Dr. Joshua Nash, associate professor at Aarhus University in the field of linguistics, to contribute with his research in linguistics and architecture, language and culture, because we are interested in reconfiguring disciplinary boundaries.

In 2015 I reviewed Rod Barnett's (2013) volume, *Emergence in Landscape Architecture*, in the broad in scope landscape studies journal, *Landscape Research*. This was around the same time that I had begun publishing research melding linguistics with architectural history and theory. I had by that time had several theoretical articles combining linguistic analysis and the built well rejected by editors and reviewers in more than a handful of traditional and less conventional outlets. One of these rejected pieces was a review article of Hélène Frichot and Stephen Loo's (2013) edited work, *Deleuze and Architecture*, published on Edinburgh University Press. This review, in which even the journal *Deleuze Studies* published by the same press was not interested, and which draws largely on the linguistic and architectural undertaking in which I was involved in 2014 with several Australian architectural colleagues, amalgamates creative takes on linguistics, architectural spatial writing, pilgrimage-mobility, and ideas of language-meets-built crossover. Three reasons for these rejections: "The engagement with relevant theory and accompanying citations and references were not of the standard usually expected of academic journal articles; Were this intended as creative writing or creative nonfiction, the structure does not permit the kind of narrative flow or focus that would facilitate storytelling; The longer discussions of history and linguistics interrupt any narrative development."

I disagreed with the import of this reasoning. However, I was and remain in author position. Disagreeing with a reject verdict usually does little for the hope of getting things out. That said, I was not surprised by these comments or by the number of times this piece was rejected. It was quietly ambitious. Still, after rewriting the piece on several occasions in response to received comments, I am definitely disappointed that more details of my writings about the linguistics (and-but not necessarily the language) of architecture are not yet out in the world to the extent that I would like, as fringey as they may be taken within the respective fields within which they exist. This piece attempts to remediate this hitherto non-acceptance.

Along with a presentation and reconsideration of my review article and *Deleuze and Architecture* as a complete volume and my own linguistic-architectural work on the Muslim cameleers in the South Australian Outback, I first consider once again Barnett's *Emergence*, a key work in open minded approaches to landscape architecture, ideas of self in(volved in) architecture, and a call to task which queries what, how, and why landscape architects do what they do. In parallel, I return to several of my formative and even naïve thoughts about coupling linguistics with architecture using my non-published *Deleuze and Architecture* review article as a launching pad (I acknowledged yet another rejection of this piece today—24 May 2019). I intend my writing to be a polemic about two largely disparate fields: linguistics and architecture. While these fields may nominally have received some academic coupling, I argue that this nominal usage requires unpacking for linguistics to be a useful trope in architectural theory. For example, to speak of syntax and semantics in linguistics brings with it the requirement of knowing first how these levels of linguistic analysis work and subsequently how they can be applied to architecture. Few linguists look to architectural theory for assistance; even fewer architecture theorists know what a morpheme is and how morphemic analysis works. Or succinctly put: how linguistic is architecture?; and how architectural is linguistics? As a linguist and an architectural theoretician, I believe I am in a position to offer a well weighed enough critique of both of these positions. Linguistics and architecture. Language and culture. Barnett and Deleuze. First to *Emergence*.

Emergence (2013) in 2019

In my review (Nash 2015: 517) I summarise the volume:

> *Emergence* emerges. It emerges as a synthesised, theoretical conglomerate, almost as a living organism within the ecologies and ideas being described. Where other ideas split, *Emergence* integrates; wheras some theories cut, *Emergence* heals. While any philosophy can stand alone, *Emergence* melds. Barnett's treatise-cum-manifesto of a holistic approach to situating a theory of landscape architecture emerges out of and among a combination of disciplines and practices: ecology, field theory, chaos theory, urban planning, and even art and film.

It is here that I whiffed a hint of Barnett's idea, namely that he is not really about (landscape) architecture at all, but is offering a different lens through which to observe. Observe what? The world, ecological underpinnings of life, pleasure gardens, and the fringes of things:

> Here lies *Emergence's* most obvious strength and concomitant failing: eclecticism spreads the conceptual and fulfilled landscape architectural net wide which is exciting and challenging. However, at times, the net falls thinly, too thinly one could argue to warrant a major theoretical shift in the stodginess of the discipline. Still, Barnett duly acknowledges his encounters trace the barest outline of an approach' (p. 199); where some may consider many of the broached subjects and praxes are not at all relevant to or not even of peripheral significance to landscape architecture and landscape research. (Nash 2015: 518)

I did not necessarily agree with what I wrote here; the use of *may* was operative and somewhat removed me from personal responsibility. I think Barnett's tack was of great significance and continues to be a noble undertaking. Throughout his work, he accentuates the necessity and ability to be bold and to warrant a major theoretical shift in our thinking about ar-

chitecture, place, ecology, and self. To this run I add language. More specifically, I addend linguistics to reconsiderations of architecture et al. And here I define linguistics as the assumption that language can be studied scientifically as a system. Before I honour this addendum, let me indulge in what I have learned about architecture through my own travels, theory focused teaching, and critical writing in several fields in the social sciences. I hope Barnett and *Emergence* as an idea would agree at least to some extent with several of the positions I put forward.

Architecture is not really about building buildings. I argue (Nash 2015: 518) that "[Emergence] is a mission statement whose purport falls way beyond the *prima facie* ambit of landscape architecture into a philosophical and existential re-examination of the role and emplacement of humans within natural, urban, cultural and built ecologies." I still agree with Barnett and myself here, although four years later I would be happy to remove the modifiers *natural, urban, cultural* and *built. Emergence*, then, is all about ecologies. Sure, *Emergence* is about 'little a architecture' (the built) and 'big A Architecture' (thinking about the built) at the same time that it leans toward rustling and shaking around architecture as a discipline and querying what work the branch of knowledge as a membrane can actually do. Barnett muddies the water of architecture nicely, solution through which several of my students have not been able to see the light of day: "But I came to architecture school to learn to design and build buildings not to learn about history and theory and write essays," said some. "Well," I responded, "perhaps a technical college would have been more fitting for your desire instead of a university."

I really do not believe architecture as a mode, model, and process of thinking and acting has very much at all to do with designing and building buildings. It is a fluid and transparent overlay, a polarising veil through which we can use to make sense of the world and which we can use to help us make the required decisions we need to make. Architectural thinkings and their essential transparency of reasoning provide fantastic microscopes into any number of problem areas, for example,

how societies are structured, how people talk about other cultures, what materials actually are and can do, and the complex nature of ecological issues. Shifting these ideas to linguistics, I offer in transfer that architecture and its concomitant yet varied lines of thought can be brought to bear on researching, for example, how language as a system and languages more generally are structured (commonly labelled grammar), how discourse is organised (discourse analysis), and the structural nature of human speech sounds in context (phonology).

What does not appear here, and we are using tropes, metaphors, and analogies, after all, is anything about plans, sections, and elevations, eaves, architraves, and lintels, fenestration, overhangs, and setbacks. While these may be within the purview of the practical side of architecture, as they should, they are also-often present in the theoretical adjudication of architecture. Here I want to situate myself on a parallel track with Barnett as we travel forward to-through the world of thought. Thus spake Nash in concluding his review of Barnett:

Some viable philosophical destinations are anticipated, as are pertinent methods with which to arrive at these ports of call. However, I suspect, and I am sure Barnett would concur, when we arrive at our termini, whe ever these may be, we must be already primed to employ a different tactic in order for *Emergence* to persist and thrive and change, with or without us. (2015: 518)

Emergence, architectural theory, linguistics, and any other viable philosophical investigations and destinations in whichever field we find ourselves should not be limited or limiting. Like biology or cultural theory, mathematics or anthropology, architectural theory is a different category of layer, distinct sunglasses through which to perceive and take in the view in a different manner using a definite set of available and hopefully flexible tools.

Deleuze and Architecture and the linguistics and architecture of concrete AND dust in the South Australian Outback

I now wish to take Barnett and the basis of *Emergence* to task on a little jaunt in the South Australian Outback where I am employed in 2014 as a researcher to "look around, take in the view" (Nash 2018: 113). The view is of the present and absent built remains of the Muslim cameleers, immigrants who in a colonial landscape from the 1850s onwards constructed a physical-architectural and cultural life in their new land. Although Nash (2018) is now out—it was rejected five times before it found a home—my review article '*Deleuze and Architecture*, the conjoined, and the linguistics of concrete AND dust' is all but homeless. And the temporal nature of the review is becoming less relevant—the edited volume *Deleuze and Architecture* came out six years ago in 2013—even though to my knowledge not a single review of the work has been published. In addition to a conglomeration of lingo-spatial moves, here I envisage this revisiting of my review article in part as a re-review of *Deleuze and Architecture*.

From the outset, I claimed:

As a linguist, my architectural reading–writing is necessarily–also driven by an impulse towards phrasing my arguments within language(s) of written architeture(s), and the discipline of writing as contributing to creative (architectural, linguistic, worded, and spatial) practice. Here I implicate personal research on pilgrimage and Outback architectural-historical walkabout and the conviction that writing architecture and writing linguistics can be submitted and realised as actual (physical–corporeal) and idealised (thought–abstracted) linguistic and architectural pilgrimage. I strive for a reading–writing–interpretation of self-selected (specific) missioning to peculiar architectural and language–centred loci within critical linguistic spatial writing and site–writing.

Linking linguistics and language-as-grammar with architecture is nothing new. My position is that few linguists, if any, have looked to architecture for disciplinary assistance. While several architectural theorists have done things the other way around having drawn directly on

linguistics for aid, e.g. Jencks and Preziosi, we should remember that these scholars were not linguists by any stretch of the imagination. I feel that the *architecture is grammar* metaphor is commonly employed in a weak way because those who use it are not aware of what the tools of morphology, syntax, semantics, phonetics, and phonology within the study of linguistics and grammar can actually do. That is, scholars have used the *architecture is language, architecture is grammar*, and *buildings are words* metaphors primarily in nominal ways rather than in ways effective to the actual analysis of architecture through the possibilities linguistics offers and vice versa. After all, language is not linguistics. And as I am arguing, architecture is not (necessarily) building, nor do I believe that linguistics (essentially) has much to do with analysing language. Again, it is another membrane, lens, and tool to gain insight into the nature of things in the world.

In a similar way, having worked as a linguist for almost 20 years, I am starting to think, feel, and experience that my discipline is less about analysing language as a system and more about understanding the possibilities of what assuming one is working with a system can actually produce scientifically. That is, it appears that linguistics on a deeper level has little to do with language at all. I believe linguistics is more about setting up a system or assuming such a organisation can be set up, which itself is a large conjecture, and then seeing what work this assumption can do. Linguistics is linguistics. Doing and studying languages is *language-ing* (as distinguished from languaging in late modern sociolinguistics).

Emergence and *Deleuze and Architecture* are not exactly form-and-content bedfellows, but they certainly attempt to reconfigure disciplinary boundaries. The latter presents 16 chapters relating how the philosophical work of Gilles Deleuze applies and is applied to a myriad of concepts, from considerations of smooth and striated space, the process of folding, immanence, and the virtual in digital architecture to the manifestation of critical approaches to climacteric ecological, political, and social questions relevant to architecture and design. Such concerns include relationships between aesthetics and ethics, the fold

and care, incompletions and finalities. At the same time, the work is an attempt to demystify the philosopher's appearance within architecture circles. Through applied studies for architectural thinking and disciplinary formation in architecture using Deleuze's ideologies – from understanding walking as embedded practice within merged psychogeographies of urban and inverted space–time to a reconstitution of what constitutes a body and what a body can do – difficulties in accessing Deleuzean thought (for architects) are minimised. The result is a synthesised account "accessible not only to researchers and practitioners who are currently engaged in the field between Deleuze and Architecture [capital intended], and beyond, but also to students of architecture, design and art who are still wondering what all the fuss is about and still wondering what is the worth of reading Deleuze" (p. 9).

The short discourses consider how a Deleuzean philosophy is equipped to and does challenge architecture as a creative and productive discipline. This is where I aspire to add linguistics to this mix. In parallel, I want *Emergence* and linguistics-architecture silently to step up on stage. The chapters in *Deleuze and Architecture* further substantiate ways in which architecture contributes to philosophy and how the discipline and trade of architecture can come to understand the complex politics of space within the confines of a contemporary and often pell-mell world and cultural milieu. The contributors make up a team working toward a return to the initial push and excitement of the 1980s, where–when Deleuze's philosophy allocated the fuel for a renegade generation of architectural thinking, some of which led to the design of a global array of and within the contemporary built atmosphere. Deleuze's work has also alerted architecture to crucial ecological, political, and social questions the discipline needs to reconcile, and so houses scholars and practitioners with both philosophical pointers and practical recommendations for handling an evolving and advancing edification, amelioration, and betterment of (the) hitherto architectural order.

There is much on offer for the architectural historian, built theoretician, and cultural studies renegade in *Deleuze and Ar-*

chitecture. From Karen Burns's opening survey chapter, which presents the influence of Deleuze conjoined with the work of feminist theorists from the political point of view of minor architectural voices, to Simone Brott's more specific treatments of history as architectural subject and object, the editors' and authors' depictions of (historical) Deleuzean encounters with architectural theory should satiate the theoretician with fodder enough. A common issue with Deleuze is that his philosophies were adopted wholesale in architectural and design theory because they were so permissive and lenient. However, this collection seeks to set this record straight by submitting a broad set of theoretically and historically footed offerings, texts which weave a synthesised whole which serve as an adequate base upon which future theoretical literacy about Deleuze could conceivably build.

What is significant in accounting for this volume as a marriage of ideas and theoretical nudges is to discern how and where it is placed within an oeuvre of Frichot's and Loo's own philosophical work in general[2] and specifically Frichot's 'Deleuze and the Story of the Superfold' (chapter 4) and Loo's 'Abstract care' (chapter 14) as applied to 'Deleuze the architect–politician' and 'Deleuze the feminist critic'. It is here an integrated ensemble surfaces, one which is indicative of a general post–something–or–other mood within contemporary architectural theory. A Deleuzean account of a post–feminist and post–structuralist architecture–within–the–humanities takes us on a jaunt within a materiality of writing (architecture). As Cixous and Frichot lead us to believe, this 'childless' and solitary exploration of writing *is* architectural[3]; Rendell would also want us to have confidence in the synonymy of 'writing architecture' and 'architecture-writing'.[4] These are not just words bandied about but a lived experience of wording encountering architecting, the nominal becoming verbal, a predicated inchoative subject. I want to know how spatial and architectural excess and dearth can force their linguistic and written equivalents.[5] Boundaries are interchanged, and I, too, substitute the distant with the corporeal, the abstract with the real.

Parr writes in his chapter 'Politics +

Deleuze + Guattari + Architecture':

> When Deleuze entered architectural discourse and practice, a shift toward experimentalism and the logic of conjunction and connection that typifies a Deleuzian ontology pushed architecture in exciting new directions. (Parr p. 197)

This ubiquitous (en)folding, becoming, swelling, perforating, and smudging drives most of the philosophical and applied reflections in *Deleuze and Architecture*. The motif and noun fit to centre on is 'conjunction' and the role of conjunctions in 'together joining' writing architecture *and* architecture–writing. Conjunctions also impart ground upon which the philosophical moves in *Deleuze and Architecture* (the editors' work) can be applied to the applied (my work about the cameleers in the South Australian Outback).

Let us turn to this application of Frichot and Loo's treatment of Deleuze, this writing of architecture, the project made flesh, the deconstructed built, and a search for the built–unbuilt within linguistics and architecture(s). Cameleers played a vital role in the European discovery, exploration, and settlement of Australia's vast desert interior in the nineteenth century.[6] Quietly but indelibly, these peripatetic Muslim pioneers also constructed their own places and dwelling spaces within this harsh landscape, and made it home. Along with their cultural settling, one would also expect a degree of linguistic housing to have occurred, specifically in placenaming practices. While their concrete remains are scant and few, my assignment is uncovering much regarding that which is absent, and what (architectural and linguistic) absence discloses: the previously organised dust I discover in the course of my walkabout. The non–present Outback exhibit of nothings *and* the distancing of time–space from the evidence of the could–have–beens all conjoin in the present on the Deleuzian object of *exhaustion*:

> The combinatorial exhausts its object, but only because its subject is himself exhausted. The exhaustive and the exhausted [*l'exhaustif et l'exhausté*]. (Deleuze 1998: 154)

Let me tell you, I *was* stuffed (read: *exhausted, l'épuisé* [the exhausted, see footnote 1, p. 10]) when I returned from the Outback in July 2014. This was not, however, in the exhaustive sense of Deleuze. As Frichot and Loo tell us (p. 3), "being exhausted is much more than being tired".[7] Sure, the strong, built architectural residue fashioned in the late 1800s by the cameleers was as much in my view as the weak and absent residua of the unbuilt they never fabricated or erected. Scrutinising did wear me out, make me tired. Still, as the editors would have us believe, "[b]eing exhausted, however, arrives when we renounce preference, goals or choices regardless of the possibilities that lie in front of us" (p. 3). So while I was *exhausted* from architectural pilgrimaging, I posit I was not tired; exhaustion did not lead to tiredness. I do not reckon I became *le fatigué* (the fatigued) but simply remained *l'épuisé* (the exhausted):

> The tired (*le fatigué*) is someone who can no longer actualise the possibilities that still exist for them. The exhausted (*l'épuisé*), however, is someone who can no longer provide the conditions for possibilities. (Footnote 1, p. 10)

I searched the thought remnants of these explorer–builders, hoping to uncover something more than (the) concrete lees of primitive construction left after makeshift mosques and rural settlements had been deserted or rendered defunct. And, the tangible and non-present frames prompted deliberation on the relationships of (the) language of the weak, the linguistics of concrete(ness), the grammar of architecture, and the definite versus the indefinite. Through this journeying, and more concretely put, I experienced a different kind of exhaustion: I lost critical distance on the conditions for the possibilities I was witnessing and was exposed to. I sought connection elsewhere, in language, conjuncted.

Similar to Burns's treatment (Chapter 1 in Frichot and Loo's volume) of Bloomer's 'minor architecture' as "mobilised matter normally considered abject – bodily waste, dirt, animal enclosures, animal tracks/animal habitats – to construct a different architectural practice" (p. 18), my architecture-writing and architectural writing (practice) is analogous to Deleuze's idea of an–the execution "a minority constructs within a major language, involving a deterritorialisation of that language".[10] The architecture is non–major, non–canonical, so my writing implies "[t]he transfer of literary tactics into architecture revealed the complexity of the relationship between writing and making architecture/space. Writing interrupts conventional ideals of visual form" (p. 18). This case in point advances writing within metaphors which are to nurture links "between material considered to be dissonant or dissimilar" (p. 18). My minor literature, my minor language is a pidginisation and creolisation of linguistic and architectural territories, the verge of where an *and* begins and a *but* and *if* disappear. This minor(ity) architecture also necessitates a mobilisation and reinvention of the (minor) architectural canon alongside new ways of perceiving the non-canonical built in terms of minority cultures and absent linguistics.

The languages of the cameleers – they were linguistically marginalised, they spoke Hindi, Urdu, Baluchi, Pashto, Farsi – in contact with the colonial lingua franca, a developing Australian English idiom–cum–cant, were also pressured to the brink, the linguistic perimeter. Pidginised and conceivably creolised medleys evolved, forming paralleled linguistic and architectural parlance, hybridised states, creolisation. Financially limited because of their short term contracts, they never occupied nuclei of outposts but would convene their forced dispersal in makeshift and improvised fringe bivouacs. Like my exhaustion of the Deleuzean, I perceive an exhaustion of conjunctive and conjoining language within these pidginised and creolised architectural vocabularies. These vernaculars are impressed on architectural and linguistic landscape within encounters of *and–buts*, *what-ifs*, conditions–possibilities, and language–contact. I hope you are still with.

Like Catherine Ingraham, I pose the architecture incident on my walkabout as animal (mute, tongue–tied); a setup whose most prominent quality is its materiality, regardless of its state, not its ability to word, formulate, or utter.[11] In Burns's eloquent reading of Ingra-

ham: "architecture gives 'meaningful materiality' to the 'unsaid of culture' (p. 20)". The not–there of cameleer architecture, the dearth of cameleer names in the landscape – there are no very few placenames or street names equated to the linguistic continuation of the cameleer legacy. The personal names of the Muslim cameleers – Abdullah, Bejah, Khan – endure abstractly (singularly on gravestones) amid the contradiction separating the grounded dust fated relics (the now unbuilt, the thinked, the linguistic) and architectural realis (it is there, I know it because I can see it) in amalgamated linguistic terrain and architectural reach. I feel acquiesced in thinking of these micro colonies the cameleers occupied in this non-urban land. Still and again, I am exhausted. I have little more to give. And it is in this exhaustion, I hope I have made and used my conjunctions clear.

An appraisal of *Deleuze and Architecture*

Frichot and Loo's compendium–cum–conglomerate is impressive for several reasons. First, because where–while some writers have considered the relevance of Deleuze's thought exhausted vis-à-vis architecture, this alleged exhaustion gives rise not only to a pertinent re–application of Deleuze but to a soft disregard for the past. Such an accomplishment is both exciting and possibility–creating. Second, the editors have appeared to have exhausted the lower case application of *and* through a transformation to an upper case *AND*. While an architectural dad joke (read: groaner) could lead us to suppose the volume's writers moot Deleuze as having 'conjunctivitis' (i.e. Medicine: inflammation of the conjunctiva of the eye, also known as 'pinkeye', Here: the state of having exhausted the use of one's conjunctions, the result of which leads to upper–casing, camels and architectural pilgrims with dirty dust in their faces leading to pinkeye), what strikes me as more probable and profitable (cf. my initial claim of Frichot and Loo's 'conjunctive profiteering') is that the formation of exhaustive conjunctions in Deleuzean thought and practice was precisely what the

editors envisioned. Like the exhausted architectural detritus of the cameleers, which presented much, then quite little, and–then vice versa, this fused work takes up forgotten, philosophically abstracted diddly–squats, submits them as real and whole, and subsequently leads us to a regime of irreverence: a crusade away from buildings and thoughts of little or no interest to Deleuze AND Architecture, while being partial to that we want to see and know. *L'exhaustif* did lead us to *l'exhausté*; *le fatigué* was kept from *l'épuisé*. However, like the residua I found on my barren expedition, we are still left with something, some things which we can use to continue the exchange and possibly transform it into a tête-à-tête.

Like most readings of philosophy, my spooring of the spatial behaviour and architectural relics of the Muslim cameleers was and still is filled with unease, disconcert, and even fret. What happens when I find nothing, where do I turn, and what should I say? This is the real exhaustion Deleuze proposes as that to be experienced: 'someone who can no longer provide the conditions for possibilities'. Although I have labelled my vocation positively as 'pilgrimage to and through camel poo and dust', my verbal reactions to this nil are often expletives, something wholly malapropos. These utterances are as much my linguistic duds and utensils as the polite interrogatives which garb my wordage and questioning of those in

the know (informants). The secular mission is deserted (as in, it is in the sand and dust) and deserted (once I leave the company of others, there is no one else around, there is a lot of space). Here I find a sense of the sublime in architecture and language, some solace in the isolation. I can say what the hell I like. I dub the conjunction of such linguistic and architectural profanities and language and architectural abilities presupposing and involving movement *irreverential (linguistic) pilgrimage*. In the frustration, I utter one profanity after the other. One cannot but be a foreigner in these surrounds, a non-native artefact within the swear words of the 'oh my God, when the … are we going to find something'–ness of architectural fieldwork. I want to doubt Gilles would disapprove. I hope we are still on the same architecture–writing page.

The case study of the architecture of the Muslim cameleers, and the architecture–writing I embarked upon, lays bare several parallels between *Deleuze and Architecture* and spatial writing. I posit I have augmented Frichot's 'reading and writing relation' within an apprenticeship of writing:

> Sometimes we need to commence without having established all the credentials, all the paperwork that suggests we are fit to write. Sometimes we need the humility to begin writing without presuming the exhaustive availability of knowledge, and must instead feel our way amidst provisional bodies of knowledge.[12]

Let me confess and plead guilty. It is through my reading and study of Frichot and Loo's (and Barnett's) work that I have been able to propose, reinvent, and transform my own impressions of my own architecture–writing. The ideas have equipped me with a spatiality of ideas and a prospect of reconciliation. If this development is but the only outcome of the publishing of *Deleuze and Architecture*, which I highly doubt, then this book exists as worthy action.

Emergence, Deleuze, and a new position on linguistics and architecture

I have purposefully used some convoluted language to get some difficult points across. I have used artistic license, because I am able. I have been in this game for a while. And I have conjoined *Emergence* and *Deleuze and Architecture* because I read and reviewed them both (one out, the other continually rejected). There is always something to be gained from both personal and academic rejection. In this the scholastic case, I have re-packaged old and formative ideas-as-wine in new and revised pastures-cum-bottles. Barnett's *Emergence* is valiant work, just as Frichot and Loo's edition is sturdy theory applicable beyond and across disciplines. And, of course, it is a relief that the exhaustion of getting my tardy (not of my own volition) review of *Deleuze and Architecture* is now finally over.

To conclude, let me please indulge a little more in the sunglasses analogy in order to round off my argument bringing together linguistics and architecture, Barnett and Deleuze, essence and symbol. As I experienced when I was in contact with Barnett in what led to a democratic dialogue when I was reviewing his work, I have a hunch several will disagree with my perspectives here, as many have disagreed with Barnett. I cannot remember asking Frichot and Loo about how their editing was received. I have a premonition it was not read with the most open mind as they would have hoped, mainly because Deleuze is not exactly in vogue these days in modern day architectural theory circles. Whatever the case, these and my approaches are what could nowadays go for being interdisciplinary. Again, linguistics and architecture are not really the bedfellows we might imagine them to be. Still, to interdisciplinarity I wish to add the possibility of pan-disciplinarity and even extra-disciplinarity. That is, as Barnett and Frichot and Loo would want us to seek out and consider, what lies within an enmeshment of disciplines (*pan-*) and even outside the realms of disciplines at all (*extra-*)? Here I ask: what does it mean to our disciplines if we contend that linguistics is not really about language and the spoken just like architecture is not about buildings or the built? Where does this leave us? Are our disciplines motile and changing sunglasses and vantage points through which to look and not necessarily solid foundations upon which unchanging truths can be laid to rest? Are all branches of knowledge looking over their shoulders thinking others are doing better elsewhere? Do anthropologists think physicists have the game sown up? Do biologists believe it is the social scientists and artists who are asking the crucial questions?

To set about answers to these enquiries, let me briefly re-quote my own review of Barnett:

> [W]hen we arrive at our termini, wherever these may be, we must be already primed to employ a different tactic in order for *Emergence* to persist and thrive and change, with or without us. (2015: 518)

The case of the Muslim cameleers in the South Australian Outback has offered one terminus through which to reconsider the nature of the disciplinary meadows upon which we in related fields derive and sustain our livelihoods. By being brought closer together under a more critical and complex glare, linguistics and architecture can now sit better beside each other. And a re-reading, re-reviewing, and re-writing of *Emergence* and *Deleuze and Architecture* has been brought to bear on a more specific scene of thinkers and a receptive audience. It has been a pleasure to share my thoughts and re-thoughts with you. Thank you for listening, reading, and engaging.

Footnotes

2 See Hélène Frichot (2013) Persephone's Margin Call: Off the Page Toward Life in Space, Architectural Theory Review, 18:2: 175-188, for aspects of Frichot's philosophical thinking, and Stephen Loo and Undine Sellbach (2013), "A picture book of invisible worlds: semblances of insects and humans in Jakob von Uexküll's laboratory", Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities, 18 (1): 45-64.

3 See specifically Frichot's (2010) 'Following Hélène Cixous'.

4 See Jane Rendell (2010), Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism London: IB Tauris, for a detailed explication of Rendell's posing and coordinates of site writing and spatial writing.

5 Elizabeth Grosz's oft quoted Architecture from the Outside: Essays on Virtual and Real Space (2001, MIT Press Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, England) provides much content regarding 'Architectures of Excess' (chapter 9 in Grosz's volume), writing architecture, and relations between architectural subject(s) and object(s).

6 This is not the place to provide details of the role of the cameleers in the Australian colonial project, nor to supply details on the literature. The interested reader is referred to historical work by Jones and Stevens and initial architectural documentation by Scriver: Jones, P. and A. Kenny. Australia's Muslim Cameleers: Pioneers of the Inland, 1860s-1930s. Kent Town, SA: Wakefield Press, 2010. Originally published 2007; Scriver, P. (2004). Mosques, Ghantowns and Cameleers in the Settlement History of Colonial Australia. Fabrications 13, 1: 19-41. Stevens, C. (2002). Tin Mosques and Ghantowns: A History of Afghan Cameldrivers in Australia. Melbourne: Oxford University Press: Melbourne. Originally published 1989.

7 Deleuze, G. (1998), Essays Critical and Clinical, London: Verso, p. 152.

10 Jennifer Bloomer, J. (1992), 'Big Jugs', Fetish: The Princeton Architecture Journal, eds S. Whiting, E. Mitchell and G. Lynn, p. 86 (footnote 9), quoted in Burns's chapter, p. 9.

11 Catherine Ingraham (1991), 'Animals 2: The Question of Distinction (Insects for Example)', Assemblage, 14, 24–29, quoted by Burns's chapter, p. 20.

12 See specifically Frichot's (2010) 'Following Hélène Cixous', op cit., 315.

References

Barnett, Rod. 2013. Emergence in landscape architecture. London: Routledge.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1998. Essays Critical and Clinical. London: Verso.

Frichot, H. 2010. Following Hélène Cixous' steps towards writing architecture. Architectural Theory Review, 15 (3), 312-323.

Frichot, Hélène. 2013. "Persephone's Margin Call: Off the Page Toward Life in Space," Architectural Theory Review, 18:2: 175-188.

Frichot, Hélène, and Loo, Stephen. (eds.) 2013. Deleuze and architecture. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 2001. Architecture from the Outside: Essays on Virtual and Real Space. Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, England: MIT Press.

Ingraham, Catherine. 1991. "Animals 2: The Question of Distinction (Insects for Example)', Assemblage, 14, 24–29.

Jones, Philip, and Kenny, Anna. 2010. Australia's Muslim Cameleers: Pioneers of the Inland, 1860s-1930s. Kent Town, SA: Wakefield Press.

Loo, Stephen, and Undine Sellbach. 2013. "A picture book of invisible worlds: semblances of insects and humans in Jakob von Uexküll's laboratory", Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities, 18 (1): 45-64.

Nash, Joshua. 2018, 'Linguistic spatial violence: The Muslim cameleers in the Australian Outback', Refract, 1(1): 103-118.

Nash, Joshua. 2015, Review of Barnett (2013), Emergence in Landscape Architecture, Landscape Research, 40(4): 517-518.

Rendell, Jane. 2010. Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism. London: IB Tauris.

Scriver, Peter. 2004. "Mosques, Ghantowns and Cameleers in the Settlement History of Colonial Australia." Fabrications 13, 1: 19-41.

Stevens, Christine. 1989. Tin Mosques and Ghantowns: A History of Afghan Cameldrivers in Australia. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

post
human

BA
section I

POSTHUMAN
section II