THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Architecture

in a Hurry

Reading buildings and the ideas behind them

Max Brocklesby

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page

Architecture is the one art you cannot avoid. You can ignore paintings and skip concerts, but you spend almost your entire life inside buildings, moving through spaces someone designed, and most people pass through all of it without ever learning to see it. This book is about learning to see it: to look at a building and understand what it is doing, how it stands up, and what it is trying to say.

Start with the oldest and still the best framework, from the Roman writer Vitruvius. Every building has three jobs. It must stand up (firmness). It must work for its purpose (commodity). And it must please (delight). A shed that stays up and keeps the rain off has managed the first two. Architecture begins at the third, when a building does more than function, when it shapes how you feel as you approach it, enter it, and move through it. That is the line between building and architecture, and it is the whole game.

To read any building, you learn to notice a few things. How it holds itself up, and whether that structure is shown honestly or hidden behind a mask. The spaces it makes, because architecture is the shaping of emptiness, not the piling up of stone. Its proportions, which is why one building feels calm and right and another feels wrong without your knowing why. Its light and its materials, which do more to set the mood than any ornament. And its meaning, because every building is an argument in stone and glass about power, money, faith, or how we should live.

None of this needs training, only attention. The buildings are already all around you, waiting to be read.

One thing this short book cannot do is show you. Architecture is stubbornly visual, and words are a poor substitute for standing in a great space. So look things up as you go, and look up as you walk.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

You are, right now, inside a decision someone made. The height of the ceiling above you, the size and placement of the windows, whether the space feels calm or cramped or grand, all of it was chosen, and all of it is working on you whether you notice or not. Architecture is the only art form you inhabit, that surrounds you for almost every hour of your life, and it shapes your mood, your behaviour, and your sense of yourself far more than the art you hang on the wall. Most people never learn to read it, which means they spend their whole lives being affected by something they cannot see.

Learning to see it changes your daily experience in a way few other kinds of knowledge do. Once you can read buildings, the walk to work stops being a blank commute and becomes a running commentary: why that Victorian terrace feels solid and the new block beside it feels cheap, why the old bank was built to look like a temple, why one square draws people in and sits full while another stays empty and dead. This is not trivia. It is the difference between moving through your environment blind and moving through it with your eyes open, and it costs nothing but attention. The city becomes readable, and a readable city is a richer place to live.

There is a practical stake too, because buildings are the most expensive and permanent things societies make. A painting you dislike can be taken down. A bad building stands for a century, for-

cing itself on everyone who passes for generations, shaping the streets and lives around it long after the architect and client are dead. The decisions are enormous, the consequences are public and lasting, and they are usually made by a small number of people with very little input from the many who will have to live with them. Being able to judge those decisions, to say with some precision why a proposed development is good or bad rather than just liking or disliking it, is a small piece of civic power. Communities that cannot read architecture get the buildings imposed on them. Communities that can, argue back.

There is a deeper reason as well. Buildings are among the clearest records we have of what people believed and valued. A medieval cathedral, pouring the wealth and labour of a whole city into a soaring space full of coloured light, tells you what that society thought was worth everything. A twentieth-century glass tower tells you something else about efficiency, transparency, and money. A suburban house tells you what a culture thinks a family is and how it should live. To read a building is to read the mind of the people who built it, and to learn to do it is to gain a way into history, sociology, and human values that no textbook quite matches, because the evidence is standing in front of you at full scale.

Be clear about what this book is and is not. It will not teach you to design buildings, which takes years and a different kind of skill. It will not settle what counts as beautiful, because reasonable people disagree and taste is real. What it offers is literacy: the vocabulary and the frameworks to look at any structure, from a

cathedral to a car park, and understand what is going on and why. That is a smaller promise than knowing how to build, and a larger one than it sounds, because once you can read buildings you cannot switch it off, and the built world, most of which you had been ignoring, comes permanently into focus.

The rest of the book is how to do it.

The Core Ideas

1. Firmness, Commodity, Delight

The oldest framework in architecture is still the most useful, and it comes from a Roman military engineer called Vitruvius, writing around the time of Augustus. A building, he said, must satisfy three things: firmitas, utilitas, venustas. The seventeenth-century English version is the one worth memorising: firmness, commodity, and delight. Every building you will ever look at can be interrogated with those three words.

Firmness is the demand that it stand up and stay standing. Commodity is the demand that it work for its purpose, that a house be liveable, a hospital efficient, a theatre able to seat and sightline its audience. Delight is the demand that it please, that it do something to the eye and the spirit beyond mere function. Ask of any structure whether it stands, whether it works, and whether it pleases, and you have begun to read it.

The third term marks the border of the whole subject. A garden shed satisfies firmness and commodity: it stays up and keeps your tools dry, and nobody calls it architecture. The architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner drew the line in one famous sentence: a bicycle shed is a building, Lincoln Cathedral is a piece of architecture. Both enclose space and both stay up. Only one was built with delight in mind. A structure crosses from mere building into architecture at the point where someone decides it should not only

work but move you, where the way you feel approaching it and standing inside it becomes part of its job. Engineering gets you firmness and commodity. Architecture is what happens when delight is added to the brief, and added not as decoration laid on top but as something worked into the whole conception.

See the three as forces in tension rather than a list to tick off, because pushing hard on one tends to punish the others. A building that chases delight while neglecting commodity is the beautiful house that is misery to live in, all glass and drama and nowhere to put anything, freezing in winter and roasting in summer. A building that serves only commodity and firmness is the grim functional box that does its job and depresses everyone who uses it. Even firmness can be overdone, hoarding so much mass that the building becomes a bunker. The art is in the balance, and the character of any building is largely the story of which term its makers favoured and what they sacrificed to do it.

This also gives you a fast way to tell architecture from its neighbours. The sculptor Richard Serra makes vast, structurally daring steel enclosures you can walk into, and they are beautiful and they stay up, but you cannot live or work in one, so they remain sculpture: firmness and delight without commodity. Remove the commodity and the thing floats free of use into pure art. Architecture is the discipline that refuses to let go of use, that insists on serving a human purpose while reaching for beauty, and the permanent difficulty and glory of the field is that it must do both at once.

A fair objection, which the tradition itself has raised, is that the triad is old and perhaps dated. Modern engineering has made firmness so achievable that some call it trivial. Others insist that in a functional age commodity should rule and delight is vanity, while at the opposite pole some hold that beauty is the only question that belongs to architecture at all, with structure and planning handed to engineers. These are real arguments, and the balance between the three terms has shifted in every era. But as a tool for looking, the triad has never been bettered. Stand before anything built and ask: does it stand, does it work, does it please, and what has it traded away to manage all three. You are now reading architecture.

2. Structure: How Buildings Stand Up

Every building is engaged in a quiet, permanent fight with gravity, and structure is how it wins. A building gathers up its own weight, plus the weight of everyone and everything inside it, plus the shove of wind and the load of snow, and carries all of it safely down to the ground. Understanding the few basic ways of doing this unlocks most of architectural history, because the story of building is largely the story of new structural tricks and the new kinds of space they suddenly made possible.

Two forces do the work: compression, which is squeezing, and tension, which is stretching. Materials are not equal at resisting them. Stone, brick, and concrete are magnificent in compression and feeble in tension: pile them up and they bear enormous loads, but

stretch or bend them and they crack. This single fact governs everything built before the nineteenth century. The older architect could pile and squeeze but could not stretch.

The simplest answer is post and lintel: two uprights and a beam across the top, the system of Stonehenge and of every Greek temple. It is sturdy, obvious, and crippled by one limit. A stone beam cracks under its own weight across anything but a short span, so the columns must crowd close together, which is why a Greek temple is a forest of columns with only narrow gaps and no great open room inside. Post and lintel cannot give you a large clear space, and for centuries that was the ceiling of the possible.

The escape was the arch, perfected by the Romans, and it is one of the great ideas in human history. An arch is a curve of wedge-shaped stones in which every stone is squeezed against its neighbours, so the whole works purely in compression, exactly what stone is good at. This lets it leap distances that would snap a stone beam, which is how Rome spanned its aqueducts and ringed the Colosseum. The catch is that an arch does not push straight down; it pushes down and outward, and that outward thrust will splay its supports apart unless something heavy holds them in. Stretch an arch into a tunnel and you get a barrel vault; spin it around a point and you get a dome, like the vast concrete dome of the Roman Pantheon with the single round eye of light at its crown.

Gothic architecture is what happens when medieval masons get obsessive about managing that outward thrust. By combining the

pointed arch, the ribbed vault, and above all the flying buttress, a strut that reaches in from outside to catch the thrust and walk it down to the ground, they moved the structure to the exterior and freed the walls of their load. A wall that no longer holds the building up can be dissolved into glass, and that is exactly what happened: the stone cage of a cathedral like Chartres exists to hold enormous windows of coloured light. The whole daring structural system was in service of a spiritual effect.

The last revolution is the frame. In the nineteenth century, iron and then steel gave builders a material strong in both compression and tension, which let them build a skeleton, a cage of slim columns and beams that carries the entire load. Once the frame holds the building up, the wall has nothing to do but keep the weather out, so it becomes a thin skin, a curtain hung on the structure, and that curtain can be glass. The glass tower, impossible in stone, is the direct child of the steel frame. Steel's strength in tension also allowed the cantilever, a floor or balcony that projects into thin air with no support beneath its far end, as at Frank Lloyd Wright's Fallingwater, whose terraces hang out over a waterfall in a way no stone building could survive.

When you read a building, one of the sharpest questions is whether its structure is shown or hidden. A Gothic cathedral flaunts its skeleton, and you can trace how every force travels to the earth. A Renaissance palace hides its structure behind a smooth, calm mask of masonry. Modernism often made a virtue of showing, none more gleefully than the Pompidou Centre in Paris, which turns itself inside out and hangs its structure and pipes on the

outside in bright colours. Shown or concealed, honest or masked: once you look for it, the structure is half the meaning of the front of any building.

3. Space: The Real Material of Architecture

Here is the idea that separates people who look at buildings from people who understand them: architecture is not the stuff, it is the space. The walls, floors, and roofs are only the means. What the architect is making, and what you use, is the emptiness those solids enclose. You do not live inside the bricks. You live inside the room, the void the bricks define, and the void is the point.

An old image catches it exactly. Laozi, in the Tao Te Ching, notes that a clay pot is useful not for the clay but for the hollow it forms, and that a room is made useful by the empty space within its walls and by the doors and windows cut into them. The material exists to shape a usable emptiness. Architecture, on this understanding, is the art of enclosing space, and the solid parts are instruments for carving air into rooms, halls, courts, and streets that people can occupy.

This flips the way you should look. The temptation is to treat a building as an object, a sculpture admired from outside and judged by its facade like the cover of a book. But the deepest architectural experience is almost always internal: what it is like to be inside, to move through a sequence of spaces, to feel one room release into another. This is why the floor plan, that seemingly technical diagram, is the truest portrait of a building. The plan is

the map of its spaces and of how you move between them, and a great plan is a great building in a way a handsome facade alone can never be.

Space acts directly on the body, below the level of conscious thought, and architects have always exploited this. The most reliable trick is compression and release: squeeze people through a low, dark, tight entrance and then burst them into a high, bright, expansive room, and the second space feels twice as glorious for the contrast. Gothic builders did it, funnelling you through a modest door into a nave that soars. Frank Lloyd Wright did it constantly, pinching his entrances almost uncomfortably low so his living rooms would feel like a great exhalation. The Pantheon does something else again: it hands you, all at once, a single perfect void under a dome, and the entire architectural event is the shape of that emptiness and the light moving through it. The stone is merely what keeps the space from collapsing.

The modern era added a new spatial idea: flow. A Victorian house is a set of separate boxes, cellular rooms strung along corridors, each sealed by a door. Modernists like Mies van der Rohe dissolved the boxes and let space run continuously, defined not by walls that seal but by free-standing planes that suggest and guide. In his Barcelona Pavilion there are almost no rooms at all, only elegant slabs of marble and glass hovering in a continuous space you flow around rather than pass through door by door. This open, flowing space became a signature of modern life, for better and worse, and you can watch the argument between the cellular and the flowing play out in almost any building of the last century.

Reading space is the most physical of the architectural skills and needs no vocabulary, only attention to your own body. Walk through a building slowly and notice what the spaces do to you: where you feel pressed down and where released, where drawn forward, where made small or lifted or held calm. That reaction is not vague subjective mood. It is the architecture working on you exactly as intended, playing your nervous system through the medium of enclosed emptiness, and learning to notice it is learning to read the thing itself rather than its cover.

4. Form and Function: The Argument at the Centre

No phrase in architecture is more famous or more misused than form follows function. The American architect Louis Sullivan coined it in 1896, and it became the rallying cry of the whole modern movement, so it is worth knowing what it did and did not mean. Sullivan's target was the nineteenth-century habit of dressing every new building in the costume of an old style, wrapping a modern office block or railway station in Greek columns or Gothic tracery that had nothing to do with what the building was or how it worked. Against this he argued that a building's form should grow out of its purpose: a tall office building should look like the proud new kind of thing it was, not a classical temple stretched vertically.

As a liberation this was thrilling. It gave architects permission to throw off fancy dress and let a building be honestly itself, its shape arising from its use, its structure, and its materials rather

than from a pattern book of dead styles. The trouble began when Sullivan's followers hardened the idea into law. If form follows function, they reasoned, anything that does not serve function is waste, and ornament, having no function, is not merely unnecessary but dishonest, even immoral. The Viennese architect Adolf Loos gave this its most quotable form in his essay Ornament and Crime, casting decoration as a primitive vice a civilised age should outgrow. Mies van der Rohe distilled the whole ethic into three words, less is more, and the mainstream of twentieth-century architecture set about stripping buildings down to structure, function, and unadorned surface.

There is a large problem with taking the slogan literally: it is not true, and Sullivan himself did not behave as though it were. His own buildings are wrapped in some of the most gorgeous ornament of their age, lush foliage cast in terracotta and iron. Function, it turns out, does not dictate form. The same function can wear countless forms: a concert hall can be a plain acoustic shoebox or the billowing titanium sculpture of Frank Gehry, and both work. Form frequently does not follow function at all, as with the great white shells of the Sydney Opera House, which are magnificent, structurally heroic, and have little to do with the practical needs of an auditorium. And function is a moving target, since buildings routinely outlive the purpose they were built for, so that a church becomes flats and a power station becomes an art gallery, at which point form starts dictating the new function rather than the reverse.

The reaction, when it came, was fierce. By the 1960s the architect Robert Venturi was answering Mies with a deliberate inversion, less is a bore, arguing for a richer, messier architecture that welcomed complexity, contradiction, ornament, history, symbolism, and wit back into the field. This was the beginning of what got called Post-modernism, and whatever its excesses, it restored something the functionalist purists had banished: the idea that a building is allowed to be decorated, allowed to refer to the past, allowed to be about more than its own efficient operation.

For reading, the value of this argument is a set of questions you can put to any building. Where does its form come from? Is the shape driven by what the building does, by how it is built, by a style pulled off the shelf to signal something, or by an architect's ambition to make a striking object regardless of use? Almost always it is a mixture, and identifying the mixture is most of what reading a building means. The honest functional box, the plain shed with a decorated front, the pure sculptural statement, the historical costume: these are different answers to the oldest live question in the field, and once you can name which answer you are looking at, the building has told you a great deal about the people who commissioned and designed it.

5. Proportion, Order, and the Human Body

You have stood before buildings that felt calm and correct without being able to say why, and others that felt subtly wrong though nothing was obviously broken. The usual explanation is proportion:

the relationships between sizes, of height to width, of window to wall, of a part to the whole. Proportion is the least visible and most powerful of architectural effects, and learning to read it takes you a long way.

The Greeks turned proportion into a system with the classical orders, the single most influential invention in Western architecture. An order is not merely a type of column but a complete set of proportional rules governing the column, the capital on top of it, and the horizontal entablature it carries, a kit of ratios that guarantees a particular harmony. There are three Greek orders, and telling them apart is basic architectural literacy. Doric is the sturdiest and plainest, sitting straight on the floor with a simple cushion for a capital, and it carries the Parthenon. Ionic is slimmer and more elegant, its capital rolled into a pair of scrolls. Corinthian is the slenderest and most ornate, crowned with a basket of carved acanthus leaves. The Romans added two more, a plain Tuscan and an elaborate Composite, and these five orders became a shared language architects spoke, argued with, and revived for two thousand years.

Behind the orders lies a belief that good proportion is not arbitrary taste but is rooted in number and in the human body. Vitruvius set a man inside a circle and a square to show the body's ideal proportions, the image Leonardo later made famous as Vitruvian Man, and treated those bodily ratios as the source of architectural harmony. Renaissance architects went further and tied proportion to music, arguing that the same simple ratios that make two notes sound harmonious, the octave, the fifth, will make two dimensions

look harmonious in a building. Palladio designed his rooms around these harmonic ratios, so that a beautiful room was, in a real sense, a visible chord. Whether or not the musical theory holds, the underlying instinct is sound: buildings that please tend to have coherent, relatable proportions, and buildings that jar have usually broken one.

Two related tools finish the kit. Scale is the relationship of a building to the size of a human body, and it is pure psychology. A doorway sized to a person feels welcoming; a doorway three times human height, as on a palace or a government ministry, makes you feel small and the institution vast, which is precisely why powerful bodies build at that scale. Reading scale tells you how a building wants you to feel about your own importance the moment you approach. Rhythm is the repetition and spacing of elements across a facade, the regular beat of columns or windows, and the variations played against that beat, a grander bay in the centre, a flourish at the ends. A good facade has a rhythm you can almost count, and much of the pleasure of classical architecture is musical in exactly this way.

Even the machine age could not escape proportion. Le Corbusier, high priest of the building as a functional machine, spent years devising the Modulor, a proportional system based on the human body and the old golden ratio, precisely because he knew that abandoning historical style did not mean abandoning harmony. So when you read a building, trust the feeling of rightness or wrongness and then hunt for its cause. When it feels resolved, look for the repeating ratios and the steady rhythm holding it together.

When it feels off, you can usually find the culprit: a window too large for its wall, a top too heavy for its base, a rhythm clumsily interrupted, a scale that lies about what the building is.

6. Light and Material

Le Corbusier defined architecture as the masterly play of masses brought together in light, and he put light in the sentence for a reason. Light is not a finishing touch applied to a building; it is one of its primary materials, as real as stone, and the way a structure gathers, admits, and withholds light does more to set its mood than any amount of ornament. A space is remade by its light, glorious under one sky and dead under another, and the great architects have all been, in effect, sculptors of light using walls as the chisel.

The clearest case is the Gothic cathedral, whose entire structural adventure existed to serve a lighting effect. All that daring with buttress and vault was undertaken so the walls could be replaced with stained glass, turning the building into a stone lantern for coloured light, as at Chartres or the Sainte-Chapelle, where the walls seem to dissolve into shimmering panels of red and blue. The Pantheon, by contrast, admits light through a single round opening at the top of its dome, so that a shaft of sun swings slowly across the interior through the day like the hand of a vast clock. In our own era Louis Kahn treated light as the true subject of architecture, shaping the silver daylight that washes down the curved concrete vaults of his Kimbell Art Museum until the light itself be-

comes the thing you remember. Notice where a building's light comes from and what it does, and you have caught half of what it is up to.

Material is the other half, and every material carries meaning before a single decoration is added. Stone speaks of weight, permanence, cost, and authority, which is why the powerful and the eternal-minded have always built in it. Brick is domestic, warm, and human, in part because it is made and laid by the hand and sized to it, so brick buildings sit closer to human scale. Steel and glass speak of lightness, transparency, and modernity, of mass dissolving into a taut bright skin. Concrete is the strangest of all, a liquid stone you can pour into any shape, capable of looking monumental and sculptural or raw and oppressive depending entirely on how it is handled.

From this comes a principle worth carrying with you: truth to materials. The idea, pressed first by nineteenth-century reformers and then by the modernists, is that a material should be used honestly and allowed to express its own nature, concrete looking frankly like concrete rather than painted to impersonate stone, wood behaving as wood. Louis Kahn turned this into a parable, describing how he asked a brick what it wanted to be, and the brick answered that it wanted to be an arch. Using a material against its grain, hanging thin sheets of stone as a cladding that pretends to be solid, or moulding plastic to mimic timber, is a kind of architectural lie, and learning to spot it is part of learning to read honestly. The raw board-marked concrete of the mid-century movement known as Brutalism, whose name comes from the French beton

brut, meaning raw concrete, rather than from the word brutal, was the most uncompromising expression of this honesty, and it remains one of the most loved and hated materials ever used, which tells you how much material alone can carry.

7. Meaning: What a Building Is Saying

Every building is an argument, and the last skill of reading is hearing the argument it makes. Architecture is the most public, expensive, and permanent art a society produces, which has always made it the favourite medium for saying something in the largest possible voice: about power, wealth, faith, and the kind of people we are or wish to seem. Learn to ask what a building is saying and to whom, and the built world turns from scenery into speech.

Power is the oldest message, and it has a reliable vocabulary: great size, strict symmetry, elevation on steps or a podium so you must look and climb up to it, and above all the borrowing of classical Greek and Roman forms. Ask why so many banks, courthouses, museums, and seats of government are dressed as ancient temples, and the answer is that classical form radiates permanence, order, and legitimacy, a claim to inherit the authority of Rome. A bank built as a temple makes a precise argument: your money is as safe here as an offering in the house of a god, so trust us. Once you hear it, you cannot walk down a nineteenth-century high street without noticing every institution making the same pitch in stone.

Faith speaks differently but just as deliberately. A cathedral pours the wealth and labour of an entire city into height and coloured light to produce awe, pointing the eye and the spirit upward toward heaven and using sheer scale to make the individual feel small before the infinite. Other traditions encode other beliefs in other geometries, the mosque and the temple shaping space and light toward their own visions of the sacred, and reading religious architecture means reading a whole cosmology built at full scale.

Ideology has used architecture as raw propaganda. Fascist and Soviet regimes reached for a stripped, oversized, relentlessly symmetrical classicism designed to dwarf the individual and glorify the state, as in Albert Speer's monstrous plans for Hitler's Berlin. Democracies have looked for opposite symbols. When the Reichstag in Berlin was rebuilt, Norman Foster crowned it with a great glass dome the public can climb, so that citizens walk in the light above the debating chamber and look down on their politicians at work, an architecture of transparency arguing, in glass and steel, that power should be visible and accountable. Money and civic ambition speak too, in the corporate headquarters built as a brand, or the spectacular museum a struggling city commissions from a famous architect to put itself back on the map, a gambit so well known it is named after its first success, the Bilbao effect, after Frank Gehry's Guggenheim transformed a declining Spanish port.

Buildings can also lie, and catching the lie is part of the skill. A cheap developer's block wearing a thin classical costume is borrowing a dignity it never earned; a slick traditional facade glued

onto an ordinary steel frame tells a story about craft and permanence that the structure behind it flatly contradicts. Reading meaning therefore includes reading for honesty, asking not only what a building claims but whether the claim is true.

So the final question to put to anything built is the richest one. What does this want me to feel and believe, who paid for it and why, and is its message honest or a costume? Ask it, and buildings begin to talk. The street becomes what it always secretly was, an argument conducted in stone, glass, and steel about power, money, faith, and how we ought to live, carried on continuously over the heads of people who never learned to listen. This book is an invitation to start listening.

How It Actually Works

Section 3 gave you the tools for reading any building. This section is the story those tools came out of: how Western architecture got from the Greek temple to the glass tower, what drove each leap, and how a building comes into existence, which is messier and more collaborative than the myth of the lone genius suggests. A warning before we start, and it is not a formality. This is the story of one tradition, the Western one, and it leaves out most of the world. More on that at the end, but keep it in mind throughout: what follows is a spine, not the whole body.

The classical root

Western architecture begins, or likes to think it begins, with the Greeks, and their contribution is the one you already met: the orders, and the temple that displays them. The Greek achievement was refinement rather than engineering. Working almost entirely in post and lintel, they took a simple structural system and perfected its proportions over centuries until a building like the Parthenon reached a poise that later ages treated as a standard of beauty itself. What the Greeks bequeathed was a vocabulary of columns, capitals, and proportion, and the conviction that these things could be got right or wrong by rule.

The Romans supplied the engineering the Greeks lacked. Taking the arch and running with it, they added the vault, the dome, and

above all concrete, and with these they could enclose vast interior spaces the Greeks could never have spanned. Where a Greek temple is admired from outside, a Roman building like the Pantheon is an interior, a single huge domed void, and that shift from sculpting an object to enclosing a space is one of the great moves in the history of building. The Romans also left the field its first surviving textbook, Vitruvius, and so handed the future both a working structural toolkit and a written theory. Everything that follows in the Western story is, in some sense, an argument with Greece and Rome, a series of revivals, rejections, and reinterpretations of that founding classical language.

The Gothic leap

For a thousand years after Rome fell, the boldest building in Europe was religious, and it culminated in the Gothic cathedral, which is worth pausing on because it is the clearest case of engineering driven by an idea. Gothic has a birthplace and almost a birthdate: the rebuilding of the abbey church of Saint-Denis, near Paris, around 1140, under an abbot named Suger who wanted his church filled with divine light. The desire was theological and the solution was structural.

The three inventions of Section 2, the pointed arch, the ribbed vault, and the flying buttress, worked together to carry the roof's thrust down through a slender external skeleton, which freed the walls from their load-bearing job and let them be replaced with glass. The result was the stone lantern, a building of coloured light

like Chartres, reaching heights and luminosities that would have been unthinkable a century earlier. What makes the Gothic cathedral so instructive is that the daring engineering was never the point; it was entirely in the service of an idea about God, light, and height. The masons pushed the technology of their age to its absolute limit, not to show off, but to build a fragment of heaven. Structure was theology by other means.

The Renaissance and the invention of the architect

In fifteenth-century Italy, the classical past came roaring back, and with it a new idea of who made buildings. The pivotal moment is Filippo Brunelleschi's dome for Florence Cathedral, raised between 1420 and 1436, an engineering feat so audacious, spanning a huge space with no way to build the usual wooden support beneath it, that it announced a new confidence and a new kind of maker. Renaissance architects rejected the Gothic as barbarous and consciously revived the columns, domes, and proportions of Rome, but they did something more lasting than copy antiquity.

They redefined the architect. In the medieval world buildings were raised by master masons, craftsmen risen from the building site. The Renaissance recast the architect as an artist and intellectual, a designer of ideas who worked with drawings and mathematics rather than stone and mortar, and who ranked with the painter and the sculptor rather than the labourer. Leon Battista Alberti, who wrote the first architectural treatise since Vitruvius and who was a scholar rather than a builder, embodies the shift: the archi-

tect now conceives, and others construct. This is the origin of the split, still with us, between designing a building and building it. The other towering figure, Andrea Palladio, distilled classical architecture into a system of harmonious proportion in his villas and his enormously influential book of 1570, and through that book Palladian architecture spread across Europe and later to America, shaping everything from English country houses to Jefferson's Virginia. The Renaissance gave the West the architect as we still imagine the figure: an artist of space, working by design.

Iron, steel, and glass: the great rupture

For all the stylistic changes from Greece to the Renaissance and the theatrical Baroque that followed, one thing held constant for over two thousand years: buildings were made of stone, brick, and timber, and were therefore bound by the limits of those materials. The nineteenth century broke that constraint, and it is the most important rupture in the whole story. The Industrial Revolution delivered new materials in quantity, first cast and wrought iron, then steel and large sheets of plate glass, and these materials could do what stone never could. They were strong in tension as well as compression, which meant builders could finally stretch, span, and soar without the old penalties.

The early monuments of this shift were built not by architects but by engineers, which tells you where the energy had moved. The Crystal Palace of 1851, a vast exhibition hall of prefabricated iron and glass thrown up in months by Joseph Paxton, a gardener by

background, looked like nothing in architectural history and pointed straight at the future. The Eiffel Tower did the same in 1889. Then came the material that reshaped the modern city: the steel frame, which arrived in Chicago in the 1880s and made the skyscraper possible. Once a steel skeleton carried the load, buildings could rise far higher than masonry allowed, and the exterior wall became a mere skin. The Home Insurance Building of 1885 is conventionally called the first skyscraper, though the claim is disputed and the true story is a crowd of experiments rather than a single invention. What is not disputed is the consequence. Height was unlocked, the wall was freed, and architecture had new materials whose nature no inherited style knew how to express. The stage was set for the biggest argument in modern architecture.

The modern movement and its crisis

Early in the twentieth century a group of architects concluded that the new materials and the new industrial age demanded a completely new architecture, one that broke entirely with historical styles. This was Modernism, and for fifty years it swept the field. Its logic ran straight from the last section: if steel and glass and concrete are the materials of the age, buildings should express them honestly, without dressing up in the borrowed costumes of Greece or the Gothic. Ornament was stripped away. Form was to follow function. Decoration was, in Adolf Loos's word, a crime.

The movement had its headquarters and its prophets. The Bauhaus, the German design school founded by Walter Gropius in

1919, fused art, craft, and industrial design and became the engine room of the new aesthetic. Le Corbusier declared that a house was a machine for living in and produced crisp white villas raised on slender columns, along with sweeping and, in retrospect, alarming visions for tearing down old cities and replacing them with towers set in parkland. Mies van der Rohe pursued an architecture of absolute refinement and near-absolute simplicity, less is more, that culminated in the glass towers which would be copied, badly, in every city on earth. By 1932 the style had been named the International Style and exported worldwide, a universal architecture of clean lines, flat roofs, white walls or glass skins, and no ornament, meant to work anywhere for anyone.

Modernism at its best produced buildings of real beauty and genuine moral seriousness. But it carried two flaws that eventually broke it. The first was human: the stripped, rational, machine-made spaces that looked so pure in photographs could be cold, hostile, and miserable to inhabit, and the movement's utopian housing schemes, built cheaply and at scale, often produced alienation and decay instead of the promised better life. The second was arrogance: the conviction that a single universal style, designed by experts, should replace the messy, various, historically layered city everywhere on the globe. The symbolic collapse came in 1972, when the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex in St. Louis, a textbook piece of modernist planning barely twenty years old, was dynamited as unliveable. The critic Charles Jencks seized on the moment and declared, with a precision meant to wound, that modern

architecture had died there. It was a polemical exaggeration, but it caught a real exhaustion.

After modernism: reaction, spectacle, and now

What followed was less a single successor than a scattering. Postmodernism, the first reaction, cheerfully broke every modernist rule: it brought back ornament, colour, historical reference, symbolism, and jokes, following Robert Venturi's retort that less is a bore. At its best it was liberating and witty; at its worst it produced flimsy buildings wearing cartoon classical hats, and it dated fast. Alongside and against it ran other currents. Brutalism had already pushed modernist honesty to a raw extreme in sculptural, board-marked concrete, producing buildings that are still fought over, loved as heroic and hated as grim. High-Tech, as at the Pompidou Centre, made a bold ornament of structure and services themselves. Deconstructivism, arriving in the late 1980s, fractured and tilted the box into unstable, dramatic shapes.

The most visible development of the last three decades has been the rise of the icon and the celebrity architect. Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, a shimmering titanium sculpture that opened in 1997, was so successful at putting a fading industrial city back on the map that it gave the phenomenon a name, the Bilbao effect, and set off a global scramble for spectacular signature buildings by a handful of famous names. Digital design tools made shapes possible that could never have been drawn or calculated by hand, and architecture grew more sculptural and more

extravagant. Running underneath all of this, and increasingly overtaking it in importance, is the one new imperative of our age: sustainability. As the environmental cost of construction has become impossible to ignore, the defining question of contemporary architecture has quietly shifted from how a building looks or what it means to how much energy and carbon it consumes, which may in the end prove a more radical constraint than any style war.

How a building gets made

Step back from the parade of styles, because there is a practical reality the story of masterpieces tends to hide: a building is not made by an architect alone, and most buildings are not made by architects at all.

A real building begins with a client, the person or institution with the money and the need, and the client, not the architect, sets the essential terms: what the building is for, how big, and above all how much can be spent. Architecture is not free art; it is a service performed for a paying patron within hard limits, and the client's brief and budget shape the result more than any theory. The architect designs, which means conceiving the building and, crucially, representing it in drawings, because the architect does not build. This is the split the Renaissance opened, and it is fundamental: unlike a painter, who makes the actual painting, the architect makes only the instructions. The building itself is realised by others. Structural engineers work out how it stands up. Services engineers thread it with the heating, wiring, water, and ventilation

that make it usable. A contractor and a small army of trades construct it. And the whole process runs inside a cage of planning permission, building regulations, and cost control that constrains every decision. The finished building is always a compromise between the architect's vision, the client's will, the engineer's limits, the budget's cruelty, and the law's demands, which is why so few buildings match the purity of the drawing.

And here is the fact that most books on architecture quietly omit: the overwhelming majority of the built world was never touched by an architect. The houses in most streets, the retail sheds and warehouses, the ordinary offices and speculative flats, are put up by developers and builders from standard patterns, to a formula, with cost as the ruling god and design an afterthought. Architecture in the celebrated sense, the deliberate, designed, delight-seeking building, is a thin and precious layer on top of a vast bulk of ordinary construction. This is worth holding onto, because it keeps the reading honest. When you learn to read buildings, you spend most of your time reading the unglamorous background fabric, and understanding why it is the way it is, driven by cost and formula rather than art, is as much a part of architectural literacy as admiring the masterpieces.

The world this book leaves out

Everything above is the Western story, and it is a provincial one. The tradition running from Greece through Rome, the Gothic, the Renaissance, and modern Europe and America is only one of the

world's great architectural cultures, and treating it as the whole is a distortion this short book cannot fully correct but should at least confess.

The omissions are enormous. Islamic architecture developed a sublime tradition of geometry, tilework, calligraphy, courtyards, and domes, and a mastery of interior light and water, that rivals anything in the West. Chinese architecture pursued a wholly different logic, timber-framed, modular, horizontal, laid out according to principles of hierarchy and cosmic order, sustained with remarkable continuity for millennia. Japanese architecture refined an aesthetic of timber, screens, and calculated emptiness, and a relationship between building and nature, that later taught the modernists some of their best ideas. India, the pre-Columbian Americas, and the many building cultures of Africa each produced sophisticated architectures answering to their own climates, materials, beliefs, and ways of life. These are not footnotes to the Western story; they are parallel and equally rich stories of their own, and several are older.

The reason this book follows the Western line is practical, not evaluative: it is the tradition that produced the vocabulary most readers will meet, the terms are the ones used in the English-speaking world, and a short book must choose a spine or explain nothing well. But choosing a spine is not the same as claiming it is the only one, and the reader who wants to become properly literate in architecture should treat this as a first language and go looking, deliberately, for the others. The principles from Section 3, structure, space, proportion, light, and meaning, are close to universal and

will serve you anywhere. The particular story in this section is one culture's path through them.

What People Get Wrong

“Form follows function”

The most quoted line in architecture is treated as a law of nature, and it is not even reliably true. As Section 3 showed, Louis Sullivan meant it as a liberation from historical fancy dress, not as a rule that function mechanically dictates a single correct form. It does not. The same function supports endless forms, a concert hall can be a plain box or a titanium wave, and countless admired buildings ignore the slogan entirely. Worse, the word function is slippery: it quietly expanded to cover not just practical use but psychological and symbolic use, at which point it explains everything and therefore nothing. Taken as gospel, the phrase did real harm, licensing a generation of stripped, ornament-free boxes on the grounds that anything beyond bare function was dishonest. It is a useful corrective and a terrible commandment, and the buildings that obey it most strictly are often the ones people like least.

“A building is its facade”

Most people judge a building by its front, the way you might judge a book by its cover, and it is the deepest habit to unlearn. The facade is one page. Architecture is the whole experience of moving through enclosed space, and a striking front can hide a miserable, ill-planned interior just as a plain front can conceal a superb one. The problem has worsened in the age of the photograph, be-

cause buildings are now designed, judged, and rewarded on the strength of a single photogenic image, which favours the arresting exterior shot over the far more important question of what the place is like to inhabit. A building that photographs magnificently and works wretchedly is a common and celebrated failure. Read a building by walking into it and through it, not by glancing at its face from across the street.

"They don't build them like they used to"

The belief that everything old is beautiful and everything modern is ugly rests on a statistical trick called survivorship bias. The old buildings you admire are the survivors, the best of their age, kept and cherished precisely because they were good. The thousands of mean, shoddy, forgettable buildings that every past century also produced were knocked down and forgotten, so you never see them. You are comparing the finest surviving work of three hundred years against the ordinary new work of today, which is not a fair fight. The past built plenty of rubbish; time cleared it away. That said, the myth contains a real grain: much contemporary construction, especially cheap developer housing and speculative commercial building, is poor, and modernism did inflict some bleak environments. The honest position is neither nostalgia nor its opposite. Every age builds a little treasure and a great deal of dross, and ours is no different.

“The architect built it”

We credit, and blame, the architect for the whole building, as though one visionary raised it single-handed. As Section 4 explained, the architect designs and draws but does not build. A finished building is the work of a crowd: a client who set the terms and held the purse, structural engineers who made it stand, services engineers who made it habitable, a contractor and dozens of trades who actually constructed it, all inside a cage of regulation and budget. The glamorous signature on the drawing often obscures the engineer who solved the hard problem and the client whose money and nerve made the thing possible. This matters for reading, because when you praise or condemn a building you are judging a negotiation, not a soloist, and much of what you are reacting to was decided by cost and constraint rather than by any single creative will.

“Old styles are real architecture, modern is a fad”

Traditional styles feel like the authentic article and modern ones like a passing aberration, but every style was once a shocking novelty, and most were hated on arrival. The Renaissance dismissed the now-beloved Gothic as barbarous. Parisians petitioned against the Eiffel Tower as a monstrosity. Buildings later treated as national treasures were reviled when new. Taste is not fixed; it moves, and today’s outrage is tomorrow’s heritage. There is also a twist the nostalgic miss: a modern building that honestly expresses its steel frame is arguably more authentic than a new

block wearing a thin classical costume glued onto that same frame, which is the true fake. None of this means everything modern is good. It means that age alone confers neither legitimacy nor beauty, and calling old buildings the real ones is a preference dressed up as a fact.

"Architecture is the famous icons"

Ask most people to picture architecture and they see the spectacular signature buildings, the swooping museums and twisting towers by a handful of celebrity names. Those are the least representative thing in the field. They are a thin, glossy, atypical layer floating on an ocean of ordinary building, and the architecture that shapes your daily life is the background fabric, the streets, the housing, the schools and shops and stations you move through without noticing. The cult of the icon can be an active distraction, and sometimes a vanity, rewarding the eye-catching photograph over the far harder work of making ordinary places good. A city of dazzling landmarks and dismal everyday streets is a failure, whatever the landmarks cost. Learn to read the background, because that is where most of architecture, and most of life, happens.

"Expensive means good"

Cost is mistaken for quality, so that a lavish, costly, materially rich building is assumed to be fine architecture and a cheap one as-

sumed to be poor. The link is weak. Some of the most moving architecture in the world is modest and inexpensive, a plain rural chapel, a well-proportioned ordinary house, the anonymous vernacular buildings that fit their place and materials perfectly. Some of the most expensive is bloated, confused, and dead, spectacle bought by the yard with no idea holding it together. Delight, the third Vitruvian term, is not purchased with money; it comes from resolution, proportion, fitness, and a clear idea carried through, none of which has a price tag. A large budget makes good architecture easier and bad architecture more expensive. It guarantees nothing.

Use It

You will not design a building after reading this, and that is not the aim. The aim is to change what you see, and this section is the practical method: a way of looking that turns any building, however grand or dull, into something you can read. Once it becomes habit it runs on its own, and the built world stops being scenery and starts being legible.

Walk the triad

Start with the three questions from Vitruvius, because they work on anything. Does it stand, does it work, does it please. Firmness you can usually take on trust, but ask how the building holds itself up and whether it shows or hides that. Commodity is a matter of watching: is the place pleasant and easy to use, do people move through it comfortably, does it do its job, or does it fight the people in it. Delight is the one to be honest about, because it is the whole difference between building and architecture. Does it do anything to you at all, and if so, what, and how. Three questions, asked in ten seconds, and you have the frame for everything else.

Read it in the right order: structure, space, light, then meaning

Look in a deliberate sequence and the building unpacks itself. First, how does it stand up, and is the structure honest or masked. Then, and most important, what are the spaces like, not the front but the rooms and the movement between them, where you are compressed and where released. Then the light and the materials, where the light comes from and what the materials are saying before any ornament is added. Only then, meaning: what the building wants you to think and feel, who paid for it and why, and whether the message is honest or a costume. Most people never get past the front door of this sequence, judging the facade and stopping. The order matters because it moves you from how the building is made to what it is for to what it means, which is the natural depth of any real reading.

Use your body as the instrument

Your most powerful architectural sense is not your eye but your whole body, and it needs no vocabulary, only attention. As you move through a place, register the physical effects Section 3 described, the pressing down and the lifting, the hurrying and the slowing, the moments of feeling small or at ease, and treat each one as a clue rather than a mood. When a space acts on you, stop and trace the cause: the height, the light, the proportion, the sequence you have just walked. Feeling first, analysis second. The

feeling is the reliable part, and learning to trust it is the single fastest way in.

Read the ordinary, not just the monuments

The temptation is to save this for cathedrals and famous landmarks, but the real skill is reading the everyday fabric, the street you live on, the station you use, the ordinary blocks you pass without a glance. Ask the same questions of them. Why does this terrace feel solid and that new block feel cheap, and what specifically produces the difference: the proportion of window to wall, the material, the rhythm, the way it meets the ground and the sky. Why does one street feel alive and welcoming and another dead. The background buildings are most of the built world and most of your actual experience of it, and learning to read them, and to say precisely why one ordinary building works and another does not, is worth more than any amount of admiring the icons.

Date it, and read the argument

As you get fluent, two richer moves open up. First, try to date a building from its evidence: the material and structure, whether it is load-bearing masonry or a frame, the style, the presence or absence and type of ornament. You will start placing buildings in their century and reading the history written on the street, the layers of different ages standing side by side. Second, read the argument each building is making. Every building is making a case

about wealth, power, belief, or the right way to live, and once you hear it you cannot stop. The bank dressed as a temple, the civic building straining to look important, the developer's block borrowing a dignity it never earned. The street becomes a conversation, mostly conducted over the heads of the people walking through it.

What this does not give you, and where to be careful

Be clear about the limits, because the lens can be misused.

It does not make you a designer. Reading and making are different skills, and knowing why a building works no more lets you build one than knowing why a sentence works makes you a novelist. This is literacy, not authorship, and it is valuable on its own terms without pretending to be more.

It does not settle taste. The tools help you understand and judge a building far more precisely than liking or disliking it, but reasonable, knowledgeable people still disagree about beauty, and no framework dissolves that. Use the reading to sharpen your judgement and explain it, not to declare other people's responses wrong. A confident vocabulary can curdle into snobbery, and the person who dismisses everything popular as beneath them has misused the education, not completed it.

And it can make you insufferable if you let it. The point of learning to read buildings is richer experience, not a licence to lecture. Hold the knowledge lightly, let it deepen your own looking, and share it only when someone wants it.

The one thing to keep

If you keep nothing else, keep this: look up. Almost everyone moves through the built world with their attention on the pavement and their phone, never registering the enormous, deliberate, expensive things towering over them on every side, things somebody designed, that are working on their mood and behaviour whether noticed or not. The whole of this book reduces to a single habit. Raise your eyes, slow down, walk into things, and ask what you are looking at and why. The buildings have been talking the entire time. This is just learning to hear them.

Terms

A glossary of the key terms used in this book, plus a few you will meet the moment you start reading buildings for yourself.

Firmness, commodity, delight. The three demands every building must meet, from Vitruvius: that it stand up, work for its purpose, and please. The oldest and still the most useful test to put to any building.

Post and lintel. The simplest structural system: two uprights carrying a horizontal beam, as in a Greek temple. Limited by the short span a stone beam can cross before it cracks.

Compression and tension. The two forces a structure must handle: compression is squeezing, tension is stretching. Stone, brick, and concrete are strong in compression and weak in tension; steel is strong in both, which is why it changed everything.

Arch. A curve of wedge-shaped stones that carries weight in pure compression, letting it span far wider than a beam. Pushes outward at its base, so it needs buttressing to hold it in.

Vault and dome. An arch extended into a tunnel is a barrel vault; an arch spun around a central point is a dome. Both let masonry roof large spaces.

Flying buttress. An external strut that catches the outward thrust of a vault and carries it down to the ground. The Gothic invention that moved structure outside and freed the walls to become glass.

Load-bearing wall. A wall that holds the building up, as in all masonry construction before the frame. Contrast with a frame, where a skeleton carries the load and the wall does not.

Frame. A skeleton of columns and beams, usually steel or reinforced concrete, that carries the whole load of a building. Frees the exterior wall to become a thin, non-structural skin.

Curtain wall. The thin outer skin, often glass, hung on a frame purely to keep out the weather. It carries no load, which is why the glass tower is possible.

Cantilever. A beam, floor, or balcony fixed at one side only and projecting out into space, unsupported at the far end. It relies on tension, so it belongs to the age of steel and reinforced concrete.

The classical orders. The complete systems of proportion governing a column, its capital, and the entablature above it. The three Greek orders are Doric (sturdy, plain), Ionic (scrolled capital), and Corinthian (carved acanthus leaves); the Romans added Tuscan and Composite.

Capital. The decorated top of a column, where it meets what it carries. Its form is the quickest way to tell one classical order from another.

Entablature. The horizontal band carried across the top of a row of columns, above the capitals. The upper half of the classical system.

Pediment. The triangular gable crowning the front of a classical temple, and later borrowed for porticoes, doorways, and windows.

Portico. A porch of columns supporting a roof, usually marking the grand entrance of a classical or classically inspired building.

Facade. The face of a building, its principal exterior elevation. Important, but only one page of the whole; a building is not its facade.

Proportion, scale, and rhythm. The three tools that make a building feel right or wrong. Proportion is the relationship between sizes; scale is the relationship between the building and the human body; rhythm is the beat set up by repeating elements, such as columns or windows, along a front.

Truth to materials. The principle that a material should be shown frankly for what it is rather than disguised as another: concrete looking like concrete, not painted to impersonate stone.

Vernacular. Ordinary building made without an architect, from local materials and inherited custom, fitted to its place and climate. Most of the built world is vernacular, and much of it is very good.

Modernism. The twentieth-century movement that rejected historical styles and ornament in favour of clean forms expressing function, structure, and modern materials. Its slogans: form follows function, less is more.

Brutalism. The mid-century style of raw, exposed, board-marked concrete. The name derives from the French beton brut, or raw

concrete, not from the word brutal, though it has never escaped the association.

Postmodernism. The reaction against modernism from the 1960s, which brought back ornament, colour, historical reference, and wit. Its retort to Mies: less is a bore.

Go Deeper

This book gave you a way of reading. What it could not give you is pictures, and architecture is a visual art, so the best next step is a book with images and then a walk. Below is where to go, and what each is for.

The perfect companion to this book.

Steen Eiler Rasmussen, Experiencing Architecture (1959). A short, wise, still-unmatched book on how we perceive buildings, through scale, texture, rhythm, light, and sound, rather than how they look in a photograph. It is exactly the skill this book has been pointing at, taught by a master, and it has not dated in over sixty years. Read it first.

The illustrated toolkit.

Francis D. K. Ching, Architecture: Form, Space, and Order. The standard visual primer, built from hundreds of beautiful hand drawings that show the elements and principles this book could only describe in words. If our lack of pictures frustrated you, this is the cure, and it has been required reading in architecture schools for over forty years.

The accessible read on why it matters.

Alain de Botton, The Architecture of Happiness (2006). A graceful, jargon-free exploration of how buildings shape our moods and sense of self. It is more mood than method and occasionally floats off into the poetic, so take it as inspiration rather than instruction, but few books do more to make you care about the question.

The source of it all.

Vitruvius, Ten Books on Architecture (first century BC). The oldest surviving book on the subject and the origin of firmness, commodity, and delight, and of the classical orders. Parts are technical and dry, but reading the two-thousand-year-old root of the whole Western tradition is worth the effort.

Notes and Sources

Architecture has a deep literature. The references below cover the foundational text, the standard datings, and the specific attributions used in this book. Where a claim is contested, that is flagged.

The Core Ideas

The Vitruvian triad. Firmitas, utilitas, and venustas are set out in Vitruvius, De architectura (first century BC). The familiar English, firmness, commodity, and delight, is Henry Wotton's rendering in The Elements of Architecture (1624). Pevsner's line distinguishing a building from a work of architecture opens his Outline of European Architecture (1943).

Structure. The post-and-lintel, arch, vault, and frame sequence is standard structural history. The Pantheon's concrete dome and oculus date to Hadrian's rebuilding, around 118 to 128 AD. Fallingwater, with its cantilevered terraces, was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1935.

Space. The observation that a room's usefulness lies in its empty space is from the Tao Te Ching, chapter 11. Mies van der Rohe's Barcelona Pavilion, an exemplar of flowing space, dates to 1929.

Form follows function. The phrase comes from Louis Sullivan's essay The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered (Lippincott's Magazine, 1896), where he wrote that form ever follows function.

Sullivan's own buildings are richly ornamented. Adolf Loos's Ornament and Crime dates to around 1910; Robert Venturi's Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture, source of less is a bore, to 1966.

Proportion and the orders. The three Greek orders (Doric, Ionic, Corinthian) and the two Roman additions (Tuscan, Composite) are described in Vitruvius. The figure of a man set in a circle and a square was famously drawn by Leonardo as Vitruvian Man. Le Corbusier's proportional system, the Modulor, was published in 1948 and 1955.

Light and material. Le Corbusier's definition of architecture as the play of masses brought together in light is from Vers une architecture (1923). Kahn's remark that a brick wants to be an arch is widely reported from his teaching. Brutalism takes its name from beton brut, raw concrete; the etymology is standard, though the precise origin of the term is debated.

Meaning. Albert Speer's plans for a rebuilt Berlin were prepared for Hitler in the 1930s. Norman Foster's glass dome for the rebuilt Reichstag opened in 1999. The Bilbao effect is named for Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, opened 1997.

How It Actually Works

Classical and Gothic. Vitruvius wrote in the first century BC. Gothic architecture is conventionally dated to the rebuilding of the abbey church of Saint-Denis under Abbot Suger, around 1140.

Renaissance. Brunelleschi's dome for Florence Cathedral was built between 1420 and 1436. Alberti's treatise was the first on architecture since Vitruvius. Palladio's Four Books of Architecture appeared in 1570.

Iron, steel, and the skyscraper. The Crystal Palace (Joseph Paxton) dates to 1851, the Eiffel Tower to 1889. The Home Insurance Building (William Le Baron Jenney, Chicago, 1885) is conventionally called the first skyscraper, though the claim is disputed among historians.

Modernism. The Bauhaus was founded by Walter Gropius in 1919. Le Corbusier's Vers une architecture appeared in 1923. The term International Style comes from a 1932 exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Demolition of the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex in St. Louis began in 1972; the critic Charles Jencks used it to date the symbolic death of modern architecture.

After modernism. Venturi's Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture dates to 1966. The Pompidou Centre (Piano and Rogers) opened in 1977. The Deconstructivist Architecture exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art was held in 1988. Gehry's Guggenheim Bilbao opened in 1997.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Vitruvius. Ten Books on Architecture (De architectura). First century BC. Trans. Morris Hicky Morgan. New York: Dover, 1960.

Le Corbusier. Towards a New Architecture (Vers une architecture). 1923. Trans. Frederick Etchells. London: Architectural Press, 1927.

Modern works

Rasmussen, Steen Eiler. Experiencing Architecture. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1959.

Ching, Francis D. K. Architecture: Form, Space, and Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.

de Botton, Alain. The Architecture of Happiness. London: Hamish Hamilton, 2006.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. An Outline of European Architecture. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1943.

Frampton, Kenneth. Modern Architecture: A Critical History. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.