WANDERER'S SOJOURN INTO DWELLING:

Citing Diasporic Consciousness and the Other with/in the Archi*texture* of Home

by Sarah B. Gelbard, B.Arch.St.

A thesis submitted to The Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARCHITECTURE
M.Arch. (Professional)

Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario
September 2007

| © COPYRIGHT SARAH B. GELBARD, 2007

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-33726-4

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-33726-4

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

The Jewish narrative, at once eternal and mobile, provides a flexible and living foundation, opening a place of discourse and continuity — uniting its diasporic people. Located in the between, the Diasporic Wanderer recognizes himself both as Other and as being among the Other. In contrast to the Gentile Home, constructed by the domination and exclusion of the Other, the Jewish Home is the recognition and welcome of/in the Other. This hypothesis is translated into the design of a Book-(im)mobile that travels the intersection of *meuble* and *immeuble* described by Lévinas. Inscribing itself temporarily through an architectural discourse and reinstating continuity with/in the Other, the Book-(im)mobile challenges the traditional architectural metaphor, exposing the tension between permanence and stability in the building/ground relationship. Diasporic consciousness, alterity, and the textual traditions of Talmud and *misdrash* provide the framework for reconciling the ambiguous relationship between the archi*text* and architecture of Home.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to my advisor Professor Stephen Fai for encouraging me to ask the hard questions even if it means getting my hands dirty. I would also like to acknowledge the rest of the faculty of the Carleton School of Architecture who have continually challenged me to be critical and who have instilled in me an appreciation for the well-crafted.

I am greatly appreciative of the resources, encouragement and opportunities made available through the Max and Tessie Zelikovitz Centre for Jewish Studies. Special thanks to Professors Barbara Gabriel and Deidre Butler for their enthusiasm, contributions, and insights.

To my fellow studio mates throughout the years; It is very difficult not to be inspired and creative when surrounded by such a masterful and imaginative group of friends. Thank you and best wishes.

Thanks to my family for their support, love, and encouragement. And finally to Mekki MacAulay Abdelwahab for continuing to motivate, inspire, and challenge me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	iii	Acknowledgements
	iv	Table of Contents
	v	List of Plates
	vi	List of Figures
	2	Bereshit, an Introduction
Book 1	7	The Alterity of Home
	9	The Wandering Jew: The non-Home of the Other
	12	Exile and Diasporic Consciousness: The Other Home
Book 2	18	At Home With/In the Other
	20	The Architecture as/of Text
	24	Dwelling, the Other and Lévinas
Book 3	31	Metaphors and Materiality in Architecture
Book 4	38	Translated Routes and Roots
	40	Between Architext and Architecture
	50	Early Zionist Foundations
Book 5	61	The Wanderer's Sojourn into Dwelling
	63	Siting Architecture in Transience
	65	Citing Transience in Architecture
	76	Return to Beit, a Conclusion
	93	Primary Sources
	94	Additional Sources and Works Cited
	98	Glossary of Hebrew Terms
	101	The Hebrew Alef-Beit: Forms, Names and Meaning

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1	82	Geometric construction of plan and “site”. Graphite rendering.
Plate 2	83	Aerial perspective of “extruded” façade. Digital model.
Plate 3	84	Aerial perspective of “pivoted” façade. Digital model.
Plate 4	85	Aerial plan. Graphite rendering.
Plate 5	86	Plan. Graphite rendering.
Plate 6	87	“Extruded” elevation. Combination graphite rendering and digital model.
Plate 7	88	Rear elevation and section. Combination graphite rendering and digital model.
Plate 8	89	“Pivoted” elevation. Combination graphite rendering and digital model.
Plate 9	90	Collapsed “pivoting” elevation. Combination graphite rendering and digital model.
Plate 10	91	<i>Meuble</i> “closed” configuration of (a) extruding, and (b) pivoting sides separate from the reading garden/“site”. Physical model. (wood, plastic, metal, and card).
Plate 11	92	<i>Immeuble</i> “open” configuration of (a) extruded, and (b) pivoted sides docked at the reading garden/“site”. Physical model. (wood, plastic, metal, and card).

LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig. 1.1 16 *Jésus et le juif*. Painting. By Reuven Rubin. 1919. Le mythe du juif errant. Paris: Musée d'art et d'histoire du Judaïsme, October 2001-February 2002.
- Fig. 1.2 16 *The Wandering Jew*. Woodcut. By Gustave Doré. 1856. Source: Sue, Eugene. The Legend of the Wandering Jew. London: Addey and Co., 1857.
- Fig. 2.1 29 Comparison of the floorplan of the (A) *Mishkan*; (B) Solomon's Temple; and (C) the page layout of the Talmud. Illustration. By author. Based on (A) Exodus 24-31; (B) Kings I 5-8 and Chronicles II 2-6, and (C) author's geometric analysis (Fig.5.2).
- Fig. 2.2 29 Forms and values of the letter beit. Table. In John Parsons. *The Letter Bet/Vet*. Hebrew for Christians. < www.hebrew4christians.com > . Aug 2007.
- Fig. 4.2 47 Archway at the opening of an existing fence to reinstate continuity of the London Eruv. Photo. "Rabbinic Urbanism in London: Rituals and the Material Culture of the Sabbath." By Jennifer Cousineau. *Jewish Social Studies* 11.3 (Spring/Summer 2005), 48.
- Fig. 4.1 47 A shared courtyard in Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem. Photo. [dkimages.com](http://www.dkimages.com). By Dorling Kindersley. < <http://www.dkimages.com/discover/Home/Geography/Asia/Israel/Jerusalem/Jerusalem-030.html> > , Aug. 2007.
- Fig. 4.3 48 Indiana Sukkot Project. Photo. "A New Design for an Ancient Tradition." By Joe Dowdle and Andrea Swartz. *Journal of Architectural Education* 53.1 (September 1999), 47.

- Fig. 4.4 48 *Sekbakh*, the *sukkah*'s roof, constructed from various fruits and palm leaves. Photo. By Laziz Hamani. Source: Ouaknin, Marc-Alain. Symbols of Judaism. New York: Barnes and Noble, 2000. 72.
- Fig. 4.5 48 *Sukkah* on the MIT Campus in front of Saarinen's Chapel. Photo. By author. 2003.
- Fig. 4.6 49 *Mezuzah* showing the inner parchment with the *Shema*. The *Shaddai* is visible on the front of the *mezuzah* and on the reverse side of the parchment. Photo. By Laziz Hamani. Source: Ouaknin, Marc-Alain. Symbols of Judaism. New York: Barnes and Noble, 2000. 29-31.
- Fig. 4.7 56 Planning of Cooperative Houses. Sketch. By Arie Sharon. Source: Nitzan-Shiftan, Alona. "Contested Zionism – Alternative Modernism: Erich Mendelsohn and the Tel Aviv Chug in Mandate Palestine." Constructing a Sense of Place. Ed. Haim Yacobi. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2004. p.28.
- Fig. 4.8 56 Engel House, 84 Rothschild Boulevard, Tel Aviv. Ze'ev Rechter, architect. Photo. Tel Aviv, la ville blanche. Le mouvement d'architecture moderne. Centre de design de l'UQAM, 9 Sept. - 9 Oct. 2005. < <http://www.uqam.ca/nouvelles/2005/05-151-photos.htm> > . Aug. 2007.
- Fig. 4.9 57 Weizmann House in Rehoboth. Erich Mendelsohn, Architect. Photo. Source: Heinze-Greenberg, Ita. "I am a Free Builder: Architecture in Palestine 1934-1941." Eric Mendelsohn. Ed. Reginal Stephan. New York: Monacelli, 1998. 208.
- Fig. 4.10 57 Weizmann House depicted as the Ark atop the mount after the Great Flood. Sketches. By Erich Mendelsohn. Source: Heinze-Greenberg, Ita. "I am a Free Builder: Architecture in Palestine 1934-1941." Eric Mendelsohn. Ed. Reginal Stephan. New York: Monacelli, 1998. 211.

- Fig. 4.11 58 The Hadassah University Medical Centre on Mount Scopus. Erich Mendelsohn, Architect. Photo. Source: Heinze-Greenberg, Ita. "I am a Free Builder: Architecture in Palestine 1934-1941." Eric Mendelsohn. Ed. Reginal Stephan. New York: Monacelli, 1998. 230.
- Fig. 5.1 70 Book-(im)mobile and site elements. Diagram. By author.
- Fig. 5.2 71 Geometric analysis of the Talmud page layout. Diagram. By author.
- Fig. 5.3 71 Abstraction of facing Talmud pages. Diagram. By author.
- Fig. 5.4 72 Exploratory model of pivoting extension. Photo. By author.
- Fig. 5.5 72 Analysis of pivoting extension. Axonometric Drawing. By author.
- Fig. 5.6 73 Paired structure on pivoting side. Details. By author.
- Fig. 5.7 73 Docking post. Detail. By author.
- Fig. 5.8 73 Extruding structure. Details. By author.
- Fig. 5.9 74 *Chet*, the eight gates. Illustration. By author.
- Fig. 5.10 74 *Zayin*, the seven bays. Illustration. By author.
- Fig. 5.11 74 *Gimmel*, the three pairs of pivoting pages. Illustration. By author.

BERESHIT, AN INTRODUCTION

Beginning with the second instead of the first recalls the hidden but omnipresence of the Unknown who precedes Creation. The Talmud begins on the second page. The Torah begins with *beit*, the second letter of the *alef-beit*. As the first Other, *beit* acts as an intermediary between the known and the unknown. Located at and as the beginning, *beit* represents not only Creation, the separation of dualities, but that by means of which all was created – The Architect's Plan – the Torah.

Beit is Home.

Since their exile, first from Judea in 586 BCE by the Babylonians, and then from Jerusalem by the Roman Empire following the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, the Jewish Diaspora have settled in communities around the world carrying with them a rich tradition of home and cultural identity. Regardless, the Jewish people are historically portrayed as a homeless nation. The legend of the Wandering Jew, and of a people in perpetual exile, haunt and contradict the traditional Western understanding of the foundational role of place and Home in creating a cultural identity. Yet, it is specifically this contradiction that is at the centre of the myth. When reinterpreted as a hegemonic construct, rather than the intrinsic existential condition of the Diaspora, the homelessness of the Wandering Jew, through its negation of home, reveals instability and insecurity at the foundation of the Western construct of Home.

The rabbinical interpretation of the wandering of the Diaspora is that of a sojourn, a being on-the-way. By the-way, Home becomes the reinstatement of continuity between the seemingly contradictory dualities of existence – interior and exterior, good and evil, familiar and strange. Stability is established by continuing the dialogue with the unknown Other. The value of multiplicity located in the intertext and revealed by the exegetical tradition of *midrash*, is attributed to the very beginning of the *archi text*. *Beit*, therefore defines home as the relationship with/in the Other.

Emmanuel Lévinas provides a modern interpretation of this phenomenon, defining Home as the appearance of a place where the self recollects in interiority and simultaneously positions itself in a relationship with exteriority. Home is fundamentally an ethical event which welcomes and is welcomed by the Other. This understanding of Home appears in a diverse range of architectural objects and practices of the Diaspora, though often overlooked or considered too intangible, transient, or temporary to be classified as architecture.

Architect Erich Mendelsohn once phrased his desire to create a grand tradition in 'Jewish Architecture' as the anticipation “for the dignity of [the Jewish] people to finally come to expression in its architecture.” The work by Mendelsohn and his contemporaries during the Early Zionist period underlines the challenge of defining “Jewish Architecture”. Despite the rich and significant architectural contributions by the Early Zionists, many scholars and critics have since come to criticize them and their followers for reverting to a political mobilization of architecture as a tool for domination rather than one of cultural expression. Both the successes and failures of the architecture of the Early Zionists provides interesting insights that question the role of architecture as a traditional and fundamental expression and signifier of cultural identity and demonstrate how it risks being (mis)constructed as a statement of territoriality and dominion. Furthermore, it reflects the confusion and ambiguity

created between the existential home and physical house by the architectural metaphor. The grand hope that Home can cure the malaise of an alienated post-industrial world, suggested by modern philosophers including Heidegger, Herzl, Freud, Said, and Lévinas, has proven to be a troublesome reference for architects attempting to navigate between the metaphor and the practice of architecture.

By recognizing the traditional value attributed to the transitional state of being “on the way”, the Diasporic consciousness neither imagines nor maintains the theoretical or architectural condition of Home as necessarily *im-meuble*. The architectural proposal of this thesis considers this condition and the architectural and philosophical precedent by abstracting the condition of the Diaspora and its relation to Home(land) into the analogous relationship of the book to the library.

Traditional texts, rabbinical exegeses, and the writings of several modern Jewish scholars, including Martin Buber, Emmanuel Lévinas and Jacques Derrida, inform the siting, programming, and design of *beit ha-sefer* (the Hebrew term for library, literally translated as “house of the book”) as a Book-(im)mobile, or wandering library. As an analogue for the conflicting conditions of the “sojourn into dwelling”, the Book-(im)mobile simultaneously welcomes and is welcomed by the Other, suggesting an erasure of boundaries, at least temporarily. It animates the ability of

architecture to reveal the overlap between dualities, effacing the constructed boundaries in order to reaffirm the essential continuity of existence.

The intention of this thesis is to go beyond the definition of Jewish Architecture as an architecture specifically built by Jews or for Jews, and to examine how an understanding of Jewish/Diasporic interpretations of Home contributes to the field of architectural theory and practice. By re-translating the rich and complex literary and philosophical tradition of Home back into architecture, this thesis suggests moving beyond the metaphor of architecture, and re-establishing the continuity and reciprocity inherent between the theory and the practice of architecture already contained in Hebrew by *beit*.

BOOK 1 THE ALTERITY OF HOME

And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the homeborn among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.

Leviticus, 19:33-34

The definition of Home in Western philosophy is founded upon the tenants of Platonic binary tradition. Ideologically, identity is formulated by means of (counter) relationships and defined boundaries – the absolute negation and exclusion of the Other. When dwelling is understood as a demarcation of the space separating the fundamental dualities of existence, Home and identity are thus created through the artificial elevation of the self in contrast to the (fictional) Other. Etymologically, the Jew or *Ebreo* (the stranger) is immediately established as the negative polarization of the Gentile (one having a nation). This act of hegemonic negation, both literary, political, and spatial are evident in the formation of the myth

of the Wandering Jew as Other. In order to affirm and reinforce their own territorially imagined home and nationality, Gentile society constructs its opposite Other in the Wandering Jew, a homeless and nationless caricature.

A result of their separation from the centralized existence of the Temple, the wanderings of the Diaspora established a distinct understanding of Home, one formulated, and dependent on, the existence of and relationship with the Other. Without necessarily severing connection to the land, the Diaspora establishes continuity not rooted to a specific place, but to the experience of a multiplicity of places. Home and identity are established through the continuity of the sojourn that carries and recognizes the familiar in the foreign. The exploration of these two conditions reveals a seemingly fundamental intersection of alterity and Home in the definition of a communal identity and provides insight into the apparent relationship established between them.

THE WANDERING JEW: THE NON-HOME OF THE OTHER

A recurring figure throughout medieval Christian folklore, the ‘Wandering Jew’ is believed to have originated from the Gospel texts.¹ In Matthew, immortality is to be granted to the devout followers of Christ: “Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.”² The translation from these original texts into the tale of a Jewish shoemaker cursed to wander endlessly for taunting Christ for resting with his cross is both curious and troublesome. In this version, the Jew calls out, “Go on quicker, Jesus! Go on quicker! Why dost Thou loiter?”, to which Christ prophetically replies, “I shall stand and rest, but thou shalt go on til the last day.”³ Rather than immortality being granted to his beloved disciples, that they might live to see his return, immortality is transformed into unrest, a punishment for those who deny his divinity.

Among the critical influences of the Wandering Jew is the ideological framework which extends the individual character of a Jew into a representation of the Jewish people (Fig. 1.1). The image of an Other is allowed to represent all others, and consequently, everything that is not us.⁴ In the formation of the myth, however, the process is inverted. In the thirteenth century, the multiple forms of the various

myths and characters surrounding immortality and the Second Coming began to be amalgamated into a single figure named Cartophilus, and into its more commonly recognized form, Ahasverus, in the sixteenth century.⁵ Gradually, the selective combination and editing of pieces and characteristics from several sources form a representation of a single monstrous character/caricature.

The alterity of Ahasverus is represented as both eternal, *der Ewige Jude*, and wandering, *le Juif Errant*. He is without time and without place. Though arguably suffering from an excess rather than a lack of these two qualities, the Wandering Jew is perceived of as existing outside of history – the intersection of time and place – and therefore outside of society. The recurring interpretation of his immortality-as-punishment is sharply contrasted with the assumed gifts of (Christian) mortality. Denied participation in this world, he is similarly denied entry into the next. Significantly, the image of wandering becomes interchangeable with homelessness, referring to the lack of both rooted existence and nation (Fig. 1.2). By denying the Jew the possibility of being at home in his wandering, Gentile society attempts to affirm their own territorially defined preconception of home and nationality.

Within the greater context of Gentile nations, the seeming unification of the People implicated by the formation of the Nation, was fundamentally an exclusionary

rather than inclusory force – one overly concerned with delineating its boundaries culturally, linguistically and geographically. For example, the value of the fixity of language, identified by Benedict Anderson as a key factor in the historical formation of nationally-imagined communities,⁶ is symptomatic of a greater ideological acquiescence towards the normative and the perceived stability it affords – the alleviation of fears of indeterminacy, openness and the Other. In *Imagined Communities*, Anderson discusses the formation of nationally-imagined communities as predicated on centralized foundational truths and values used to differentiate one group from another, while normalizing internal deviations.⁷ The initial random nature of the centre, however, renders it the most unstable part of the system resulting in the need to constantly legitimize and maintain its position.

Anderson argues that the historicized legitimacy of the nation, once established, must be maintained by a central power, artificially supporting its own foundational myth of the imagined/narrated nation. Though this process is largely unselfconscious, one can, however, conclude that the perception of the intrinsic value of that which defines nation, the social ordering it reflects, and its bases for national recognition, is often a misrecognition of the self-referential hegemonic construction of the nation.⁸ In this system, stability is dependent on the reinforcement of its foundational definition of sameness. Difference must remain firmly located outside.

The alterity of the Wandering Jew is set in absolute contrast to the Gentile value of rootedness and stability of the People as territorially defined – where continuity of the Nation is achieved by maintaining control over the land on which it was founded. The homelessness of the Wandering Jew establishes and simultaneously threatens to reveal the instability and insecurity of the foundation of the Western construct of Home as the intersection of place and (national) identity.

EXILE AND DIASPORIC CONSCIOUSNESS: THE OTHER HOME

In Genesis Abraham is commanded to “go forth from” (*lech lecha mei*) his home without direct knowledge of where he must “go forth toward” (*lech lecha el*).⁹ A recurring trope in the Torah, setting forth – the leaving behind/heading towards – marks a period of change and cleansing before entering into a new existence. The sojourn is therefore believed to be among the defining conditions of Jewish, specifically Diasporic, life and tradition. The French philosopher Maurice Blanchot gives the following insight into the meaning of Judaism and the emphasis of being what he calls “on the way”:

What does it mean to be Jewish? Why does this state exist? It exists so that the idea of being 'on the way' as a movement, and a just movement, may exist. It exists so that along the way and by the way, the experience of that which is strange and unknown may coalesce around us and be experienced in an irreducible way. It exists so that we learn how to speak through the authority of this experience.

To be 'on the way' is to be perpetually ready to move on; it is a requirement to pull oneself up and away, an affirmation of the truth of nomadic existence. In this way, the Jew differentiates himself from the pagan. To be a pagan is to fix oneself to the ground to a certain extent, establish oneself through a pact with permanency which authorizes the sojourn and certifies the certitude of territory.

Being 'on the way', is already the meaning of the words heard by Abraham: 'Leave your birthplace, your kin, your home.'... this wandering represents a new way of relating to the truth.¹⁰

Though exiled from the place of its originary roots, a sense or memory of that place is perpetually carried into another. "Coming from someplace" implies that one is also actively "going towards someplace". The tension and sojourn between these two places is where the Diaspora dwells.

As the iconic wanderer, compelled to go looking for "something else somewhere else", the Diaspora develops a unique relationship with the Other. Value is placed not in the (some)thing or the (some)where but in the else, in the pursuit of the Other. Edward Said proposes that "alterity is an organic byproduct of any

diaspora.”¹¹ As outsiders, they are forced to engage with the Other, developing an identity in relationship with/contrast to the Other.¹² In *The Mind of Winter:*

Reflections on Life in Exile, Said writes:

Most people are principally aware of one culture, one setting, one home; exiles are aware of at least two, and this plurality of vision gives rise to an awareness of simultaneous dimensions, an awareness that – to borrow a phrase from music – is contrapuntal. For an exile, habits of life, expression, or activity in the new environment inevitably occur against the memory of these things in another environment. There is a unique pleasure in this sort of apprehension.

According to Said, the exile holds the potential to be creatively and constructively critical of both the Home they no longer inhabit and the one they inhabit temporarily, especially when one chooses exile.

Located at the unique vantage point between places, the stranger is at once able to recognize himself both as Other and as among the Other. This existence excludes the possibility of an absolutizing narrative and a national consciousness in the conventional Western sense. In contrast to Home constructed by means of excluding the Other and domination, Home is experienced only through and by means of its recognition of/in the Other. This is what Daniel Boyarin describes as the Diasporic consciousness: “a consciousness of a Jewish collective as one sharing space with others, devoid of exclusivist and dominating power.”¹³

Boyarin argues that this consciousness arises out of the Diaspora's perspective as Other, enabling them to question, and subsequently, to displace myths of autochthony in the formation of identity. Boyarin further argues that the self-critique of autochthony present in the *Tanakh* constructs the “Jewish narrative of the Land”, while simultaneously promoting, rather than repressing, the memories of perpetually having come from somewhere else. Boyarin promotes a Jewish identity formulated “not as a proud resting place... but as a perpetual, creative, diasporic tension.”¹⁴

The gift of separation is the freedom to choose (for the self) and the ethical compulsion behind the choice (for the Other). This is what Martin Buber refers to as the “organic memory” of the Jewish people and the key to entering into its community/space.¹⁵ It is the dynamic and conscientious renewal of the covenantal relationship by every generation and every individual which in turn connects them to the continuity of history and community. Social relations are part of the reconstruction of unity, man's existential purpose on earth, towards which the Torah (G-d's blueprint) leads. Home and identity are created through participation in the “process of (re)creating a culture”. The individual must choose to participate with the Other and is subsequently measured in relation rather than by contrast. The wandering of Diasporic life is not a punishment but a responsibility and blessing, and the way the Jewish people come to dwell in/with the world through the Torah.

Fig. 1.1: *Jésus et le juif.*

Fig. 1.2: *The Wandering Jew.*

Notes: Book 1

- 1 Brichetto, 2006. 4.
- 2 Matthew 16:28, King James Bible.
- 3 This exchange is sometimes quoted: "til I come again" in reference to the Second Coming. Goldstein, 1985. 534.
- 4 Some versions of the myth link the character to Pontius Pilot's porter, a Roman rather than a Jew. Arguably, the confusion and interchangeability of the identity of the perpetrator emphasizes that the character is, above all, meant to represent the Other, the non-Christian. See Remy, 2003.
- 5 Goldstein, 1985. 534.
- 6 Anderson, 1994. 94.
- 7 *ibid.* 94-95.
- 8 This is in reference to Lacan's term "méconnaissance" and its part in the Mirror Stage where the formation of the ego is a process of misrecognition and alienation of the subject from his/herself.
- 9 *Lech Lecha*, the third portion of Genesis, (chapters 12-17) begins with the history of Abraham and G-d's promise to make him the father of nations: "Now the Lord said unto Abram: 'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great.'" Gen. 12:1-2.
- 10 From Blanchot's essay "Les indestructibles" as quoted in Ouaknin, 2000. 30.
- 11 As quoted in Magid, 2006. 203.
- 12 *ibid.* 203.
- 13 Boyarin, 1993. 713.
- 14 *ibid.* 714.
- 15 Luz, 1995. 76.

BOOK 2 AT HOME WITH/IN THE OTHER

A new conjecture in being – accomplished by the sojourn in a dwelling and not by an abstract thought.

Lévinas, *Totality and Infinity*

Through the separation from its homeland, the Diaspora presents the possibility that Home and community can be independent of the where: “It is in the character of their race. . . at home nowhere and everywhere.”¹

The translation of the Divine dwelling place from the centralized architecture of the Temple into the *architext(ure)* of the Torah and Talmud challenges the stability of the immovable rock. Instead, the Jewish narrative, at once eternal, mobile, and resistant to completion, provides a flexible and living foundation opening a place of discourse and continuity across time and space — uniting a diasporic people.

Intricately interweaving duality, separation, and the familiar, the literal and symbolic value of Home locates itself in relationship with/in the Other. An embodiment of *midrash* or rabbinic tradition of polysemy and multiplicity, Home is a model by which the constructed seeming incompatibility of the dualities embodied by the traditional Western understanding of Home – interior and exterior, good and evil, familiar and strange – coexist without contradiction. The foreign, *das unheimlich*, welcomes and is welcomed into the familiar, *das heimlich*.

THE ARCHITECTURE AS/OF TEXT

The Talmud was structured on the memory of the destroyed Temple – one of the rare cases in human history where a demolished monumental building set the stage for the creation of a monumental text.

Schwarzer, The Architecture of Talmud

The Temple, as the place where G-d dwelt among the people, was itself a translation and appropriation of an older architecture – the *Mishkan* (tabernacle).² Built according to the plans given by G-d in the Book of Exodus, the *Mishkan* (literally the “place of Divine dwelling”) was a portable place of worship carried by the ancient Hebrews during the time of wandering before settling in Jerusalem. In the 10th century BCE, King Solomon built the Temple upon Mount Moriah, traditionally held to be among the foundational sites of Israel where Abraham was to sacrifice his son Isaac. With the destruction of the Temple, however, the assumed permanence and stability, once substantiated by stone and grounded in site, were challenged.

In the struggle to re-institute continuity among the already fragmenting exilic people, the patriarchs redefined what united them as a People, what would later become known as Rabbinic Judaism. Under this new conception of Israel, the foundations of the place of Divine dwelling were not rooted in the site but rather in

the cite – an architecture that precedes architecture – the Divine plans or blueprints of the Torah. Permanence and continuity were therefore located and maintained in the portability and flexibility of this *architext*:

The Torah declares: I was the instrument that the Holy One, blessed be He, used when He practiced His craft. It is customary that when a king of flesh and blood builds a palace he doesn't build it himself but he hires an architect; even the architect doesn't build it solely from his head, but he uses plans and blueprints in order to know how to lay the rooms and to arrange the doors. So too, the Holy One, blessed be He, looked into the Torah and created the world.³

Resulting from the elevation of text as primary materialization of Divine presence, the transcription of the *Mishnah* (the Oral Torah) would embody a nearly inseparable series of literal and symbolic translations from the architecture of the Temple to the architecture of the Talmud. In the Talmud, the *midrashim* (exegetical texts), which surround and are generated from the *Mishnah* act as guides, suggesting means of entry and navigation through the infinitely dense central text:

The Mishnah's entrance is found not outside its walls but within itself and Jewish life. It is architecture of complex plans and sections and yet obscure elevations; it is a city of G-d coterminous with the Jewish people's earthly existence.⁴

The complex interaction and delineations between centre and periphery present in the structure of the Talmud are rooted in the Temple plans (Fig. 2.1).

Among the basic tenants of *midrash* hermeneutics, later expanded upon in Kabbalist traditions, is the belief in the omni-significance of every detail of the Torah. Scriptural polysemy, intrinsic to *midrash* is not, however, to be confused with post-structuralist indeterminacy. Multiplicity does not negate either unity nor closure. To the contrary, the intertextuality and seemingly disparate and contradictory passages of the Torah are believed to hold the key by which the overarching presence of the single Divine will of the Creator may be revealed. “The Talmud is an open door leading from the textual space of one book to the textual space of another. This intertextuality... confers on each text an infinite density.”⁵ At the very beginning of this mapping and interpretation of the multiple meaning of every word and letter is Home, *beit*.

In Genesis, Creation is presented as the separation of dualities and at its beginning is *beit*. As the first letter of the Torah, *beit* stands at and as the place of Creation, representing the entirety of the Torah:

And so the Torah said: 'By means of the beginning, G-d created the heavens and the earth,' and the word 'the beginning' always alludes to the Torah, as Scripture says, 'The Lord created me at the beginning of His course.'⁶

Literally, this fundamental separation is contained in the Hebrew word for house, *beit*. The second letter of the *alef-beit*, *beit*, like Eve, is the first Other. In Kabbalist

literature *beit* echoes its own creation and is infused with the meaning of otherness, duality, paradox, and the place of dwelling. The primordial separation of self from Other is therefore concomitantly attributed to the separation of space, a division of exterior from interior.

Beyond its literal meaning, the *gematria* (the revealed form or numerical and geometric value of Hebrew letters) of *beit* embodies a further understanding of Home. Composed by three parts, *beit* defines an interior and separated place (Fig. 2.2). Its openness to the left however, faces and presents itself to the rest of Creation, i.e. the rest of the *alef-beit*/Torah. *Beit* chooses to define its separation in relationship to and with the Other. Meanwhile, the unknowable Other that predates Creation and the Torah, the first One – *alef* – remains hidden but implied despite its absence. Once again, the root of this phenomenon is present not only in the physicality of *beit* but also in the function and meaning of the letter. As a prefix, *beit* is used both as “in” and “with”. Through the simultaneity of meaning, interiority is therefore perceived to be interchangeable with, and presupposing of relationship.

DWELLING, THE OTHER AND LÉVINAS

Heidegger and many of his contemporaries, including several Zionists, attempt to reconcile the artificial dualities and boundaries dwelling has projected onto the self and the world from its self-centered position.⁷ As a result, dwelling remains an exterior relationship, though one that man has taken control of and dominated as an object that he can compare himself against. Out of this tradition of a diametrically formulated ideology dependent on the measurement of self against the Other (discussed in Book 1), the presence of Home is established and defined in its opposition to, and often negation of, the Other.

Freud's analysis of *das unheimlich* reveals the curious intersection of the homely and familiar with the concealed, that which is “withheld from others”: “Thus *heimlich* is a word the meaning of which develops in the direction of ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*.”⁸ Literally “the unhomely”, *das unheimlich* is perceived to be the intrusion of the unwelcomed Other into what was perceived to be the expected security and impenetrability of Home. In *The Architectural Uncanny* Anthony Vidler concludes that:

As a concept, then, the uncanny has, not unnaturally, found its metaphoric home in architecture: first in the house, haunted or not, that pretends to afford the utmost security while opening itself to the secret intrusion of terror, and then in the city, where what was once walled and intimate, the confirmation of community...has been rendered strange by the spatial incursions of modernity...

In both cases, of course, the "uncanny" is not a property of the space itself nor can it be provoked by any particular spatial conformation; it is, in its aesthetic dimension, a representation of a mental state of projection...⁹

In this context Home is essentially rendered into a wall lacking in dimension or openings, denying the possibility of passage or interaction between the two sides of the divide. The Other remains mysteriously, and often forcibly, concealed behind the impenetrable line separating interior and exterior, good and evil, familiar and strange.

Approaching dwelling from a Jewish perspective, Emmanuel Lévinas identifies the role of the Other in the construction of Self and Home as a positive welcoming. Rather than an exclusion of the Other through linear divisions, the Jewish Home includes and presupposes the presence of the Other through its fundamental interiority. Lévinas criticizes the ontological, solipsist approach of his contemporaries, insisting that dwelling is fundamentally an ethical event:

The world in which reason becomes more and more self-conscious is not habitable... The return of self, this gathering or appearance of place in space, does not result,

as in Heidegger, from the gesture of building, from an architecture that shapes a countryside, but from the interiority of 'the House'... for the essential moderation of feminine existence living there, which is habitation itself.¹⁰

It is not surprising that Lévinas describes the feminine as the essential Other which presupposes the Home.¹¹ In Genesis, Eve is interpreted as the primordial separation of self. Her separation from Adam marks the entry of the first Other into the solitude of an infinite space. Through this first act of separation, intimacy and interiority come into being. Eve is the offering of a human welcome which Lévinas argues presupposes all habitation:

It [the masculine essence] lives outdoors, exposed to the fiery sun which blinds and to the winds of the open sea which beat it and blow it down, in a world that offers it no inner refuge, in which it is disorientated, solitary and wandering, and even as such is already alienated by the products it had helped to create, which rise up untamed and hostile. . .

She [the feminine essence] answers to a solitude inside this privation and – which is stranger – to a solitude that subsists in spite of the presence of G-d; to a solitude in the universal, to the inhuman which continues to well up even when the inevitable uprooting of thought, which dominated the world, to return to the peace and ease of being at home, the strange flow of gentleness must enter into the geometry of infinite and cold space. Its name is woman.¹²

Contrary to the definition of the *unheimliche* as the intrusion of the Other, here it is the very presence of “the strange” which returns the self to the familiarity of Home.¹³

Lévinas describes interiority as the opening of a place in the infinity of space which, only through this act of separation, comes to be defined as exteriority. Like its windows and doors, Home, however, is defined equally by its separation as by its potential openness — it presupposes both the separated self and the presence of the Other and thus the question of dwelling is an ethical/relational, rather than an ontological/divisional, event. Lévinas proposes a definition consistent with, if not directly derived from, the continuity of space and the complex interrelation of centre and periphery implied by Talmudic tradition.

Jewish life and Home are perceived of as a series of both temporal and spatial thresholds, especially true in the Diaspora. The threshold becomes the architectonic expression and representation of the potential for infinite extension that simultaneously affords the privacy and security of interiority. Like the sojourn of the wanderer, the threshold becomes a recurring and important trope. Martin Buber writes that human existence takes place in an infinite, continuous threshold where man leaves behind the natural separation of *I-It* (one based on self-centredness and ego) and enters into the natural combination of *I-Thou*:

He knows that his mortal life swings by nature between Thou and It, and he is aware of the significance of this. It suffices him to be able to cross again and again the threshold of the holy place wherein he was not able to

remain; the very fact that he must leave it again and again is inwardly bound up for him with the meaning and character of this life. There, on the threshold, the response, the spirit, is kindled ever new within him.¹⁴

Drawing from the rabbinical tradition, Buber expresses the possibility for multiplicity united through relationship (*I-Thou*) rather than a division of space through artificial demarcations of difference (*I-It*).

[O]nly through this act is cosmos, an apprehended world, a world that is homely and houselike, man's dwelling in the world, made possible again and again. Only now can man, confident in his soul, build again and again, in a special conception of space, dwelling for G-d and dwelling for men, and fill swaying time with new hymns and songs, and shape the very community of men.¹⁵

Buber's use of the threshold to symbolize the transitional state of humanity offers an optimistic explanation whereby the self finds his place by re-entering or re-newing a unified relationship with G-d which necessarily and fundamentally includes the relationship with the Other.

Fig. 2.1: Comparison of the floorplans of the:
(A) *Mishkan*
(B) Solomon's Temple
(C) the page layout of the Talmud.

2	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁	𐤁
Gematria	Pictograph	Ktav Ivri	Ktav Ashurit	Book Type

Fig. 2.2: Forms and values of the letter *beit*.

Notes: Book 2

- 1 Goldstein, 1985. 541.
- 2 Both the symbolic and physical elements of the Mishkan were integrated into the construction of the First Temple. Schwarzer, 2001. 475.
- 3 *Midrash Bereshi Rabba* as quoted in Stern, 1988. 149.
- 4 Schwarzer, 2001. 479.
- 5 Marc-Alain Ouaknin as quoted in *Schwarzer*, 2001. 481.
- 6 Stern, 1988. 149.
- 7 Heidegger defines dwelling in the sense of “measure-taking” of the between by means of which man comes to dwell on the earth. Dwelling, therefore, is understood as a demarcation of the space separating the fundamental dualities of existence. This definition of Home reflects the Platonic separation of body and soul where the soul is elevated to a dematerialized divine self imprisoned in this world by the body. See Heidegger, 1951.
- 8 In his essay “The Uncanny”, Freud maps the etymology of the term in several languages, noting the intersection of the familiar and the strange both linguistically and psychologically. See Freud, 1919.
- 9 Vidler, 1992. 11.
- 10 Lévinas, 1990. 33.
- 11 See “Judaism and the Feminine”. In Lévinas, 1990. 30-38. and “Habitation and the Feminine”. In Lévinas, 1998. 154-156.
- 12 Lévinas, 1990. 32-33.
- 13 It is worth noting that in Hebrew *beit* also refers to family and the familiar.
- 14 Buber, 1951. 53.
- 15 *ibid.* 54.

BOOK 3 METAPHORS AND MATERIALITY IN ARCHITECTURE

The figure of architecture is used to establish the neutrality of the philosophical gaze at the world, but when philosophy is obliged to look at architecture itself through its architect's eye, the scene becomes much more complicated and is marked by certain symptomatic displacements, contradictions, evasions, and denials.

Mark Wigley, *The Architecture of Deconstruction*

Language is the House of Being. In its home man dwells.

Heidegger, *Letter on Humanism*

Historically, the Jewish People identified with a multiplicity of places, carrying a sense of the familiar into the foreign, and navigating between seemingly contradictory states – interior/exterior, permanent/transient, mind/body, local/foreign. This is what Daniel Boyarin has called the “Diasporic consciousness” of the Jewish People. In this context Home is understood as a mediator in a nuanced existence between the perceived and constructed dualities of life, and facilitator of transition – a journey rather than a rooted existence. This does not, however,

preclude a connectivity to place. The symbolic relocation of dwelling in text does not necessarily condemn Home to an immaterial, indeterminate, or aspatial construct.

Home does not become a purely metaphysical or metaphorical experience.

In practice, the Jewish Diaspora have continuously settled in communities and established roots in their new Home(lands). Though traditionally represented as wandering strangers, the Jews of the Diaspora are not condemned to live in a past time and place removed from the physical realm and located exclusively in memory. Though often overlooked because they do not meet the expected (grand) presence or scale of architecture, Diasporic architectural practices and objects founded on/rooted in text are often profoundly material.¹ The inherent multiplicity and openness of the re-construction mediates and establishes continuity between the seemingly disparate material/spiritual, literal/metaphorical realms, suggesting a (potential) continuity between, rather than division separating, space.

The homelessness of the Wandering Jew must be recognized as a hegemonic and symbolic construct. As such it reveals the instability and insecurity at the foundation of the Gentile (often mis-)construction of Home. In his essay “...*Poetically man dwells...*”, Heidegger recognized the importance of looking at the condition of the exile, stating that:

In his exile from home, the home is first disclosed as such. But in one with in and only thus, the alien, the overpowering, is disclosed as such. Through the event of homelessness the whole of the essence is disclosed. In this disclosure unconcealment takes place. But this is nothing other than the happening of the unfamiliar...

...We are alienated from the ground precisely by thinking of it as secure.²

Not surprisingly, the ideological framework that establishes the separation of mind and body assumes a similar division between the existential dwelling (home) from the architectural (house). As a model for building knowledge and the intangible, the ambiguity of the translation between philosophy and architecture inevitably returns to haunt architecture's tangibility. The appropriation of architecture as metaphor by Western philosophy is therefore often problematic for the architect attempting to re-translate philosophy back into architecture. Since Plato, philosophy has criticized architecture for its inability to attain the richness and potential of its own metaphor.³ But, one must remember it is not the architect's metaphor of architecture; it is the philosopher's metaphor of architecture. Contained, or rather hidden, within that appropriation of architecture as metaphor, are the inevitable transformations inherent of any translation. Consequently, when the metaphor is reflected back onto the "operation of architecture" it appears disturbingly incompatible and unfounded.

The destabilization of foundational truths and the initial ideological structure of nation reveal the seemingly unavoidable overlap between the metaphor and the practice of architecture. In *The Architecture of Deconstruction*, Mark Wigley investigates Derrida's argument that the metaphor of architecture is the fundamental condition of Western philosophy and thought. Western constructs, he argues, are dependent on the (assumed) stability of their original foundation. To that end, all subsequent structures serve to bury or veil the instability of the foundation itself:

The tradition [of architecture as metaphor] depends for its strength on this veiling of the extent to which architecture is, in the end, a certain effect of the pervasive, ongoing, and irresolvable internal conflict that covertly entangles all the lines it appears to so unproblematically draw...⁴

Deconstructivist theory suggests that stability is not only potentially, but traditionally, founded on unstable ground without necessarily resulting in collapse, and is therefore often dependent on its ability to veil and negotiates its internal conflicts to thrive:

...Architecture is no more than the strategic effect of the suppression of internal contradiction. It is not simply a mechanism that represses certain things. Rather, it is the very mark of repression.⁵

Despite his skepticism, Derrida expresses at least an initial excitement that architecture simultaneously possesses the model and the means for reinstating stability even after it has been undermined: "...it is a disruption of the line between discourse

and materiality whereby the sense of a material object is understood to be a discursive effect.”⁶ Here, rabbinical exegetical tradition influences, at least in part, Derrida's critical position on the traditional Western model of suppressing internal contradictions in order to maintain the illusion of a stable foundation. Architecture should be founded on revealing its own seeming contradictions. Only then can it go about reconciling differences through an understanding of multiplicity and continuity, ultimately reinstating the security of its foundation.

Throughout their displacement, the Jewish Diaspora carry the memory, objects, and traditions of Home, facilitating the re-placement of Home in a strange land. Permanence is achieved through the connectivity between temporary homes by the objects and traditions of Home, and the intersection of the familiar and the strange. The Diasporic consciousness conditions one's experience of dwelling as an overlay of the current environment with a remembered one. A complex interweaving of the symbolic and literal value of text, rather than a particular spatial or territorial condition, becomes the tool for the creation of transitional/sacred space. Home depends on the possibility that an ambiguous space, created through juxtaposition, opens up a productive and potentially transcendent place of discourse. It is this ambiguous intersection between form and text that imbue Home with divine/sacred meaning, allowing it to be translated and transplanted from one place to another.

In Hebrew, there is no linguistic differentiation between “house” and “home”. Both the symbolic and literal meanings are simultaneously attributed to Home – *beit*. The co-incidence of (symbolic) meaning and (physical) form is arguably largely due to traceable roots of the Hebrew *alef-beit* to its pictographic origins. Writing is derived from the world, but perhaps only because the world itself was created by means of the Divine plan. The symbolic is an extension of the physical and vice versa. In this context, the translation between text and architecture is not strictly metaphorical. The qualities of one are not attributed to the other but essentially are, and always were, the other. The translation neither creates, nor veils conflict because the architecture as text (material as symbolic – e.g. the Temple) is simultaneously text as architecture (symbolic as material – e.g. the Talmud). *Beit* both is and represents Home. It acknowledges an inherent reciprocity and continuity between text and architecture that is the first act of Creation.

Notes: Book 3

- 1 Book 4 will examine three examples of Diaspora architectural practices and elucidate on their textual foundation and role in locating Home.
- 2 As quoted in Wigley, 1995. 114.
- 3 Karatani, 1995.
- 4 Wigley, 1995. 209.
- 5 *ibid.* 209.
- 6 *ibid.* 30.

BOOK 4 TRANSLATED ROUTES AND ROOTS

Constructed primarily out of the texts of the Talmud, the *eruv*, the *sukkah*, and the *mezuzah* reflect and reveal an inherently spatial, symbolic, and literal understanding consistent with previous discussions of Diasporic consciousness, Home, and the sojourn of being “on-the-way”. The re-collection of these and other fragmented cultural and tectonic memories of house images carried by the Diaspora locate a foundation of Jewish architectural tradition rooted in text, rather than a particular spatial or territorial condition.

In his zealous appeal to have the Jewish people become a nation “among nations”, Theodor Herzl sought to shed the wandering persona and re-establish the Home(land). The Jewish Home as a central theme of Zionism was quickly translated into a desire to define a Jewish (national) Architecture. Zionist identity and sense of Home were to be given a new and modern form in the material and spatial realm.

Longing to forget the “subordinate life of exile”, the Early Zionists failed to (or chose not to) acknowledge the rich architectural traditions developed and maintained by Diasporic life. Similarly mobilizing architecture to re-unify the Diaspora, the goal of the Cultural Zionists, however, was to rebuild the identity and image of the spiritual and symbolic Home by recognizing the inherent ability of the Diaspora to relocate the familiar in the foreign by the relationship of Home to the Other.

Inevitably, in each of the following examples, the distinction between the literal and symbolic, and the political and cultural quickly become ambiguous and inseparable in the translation from text into architecture. This ambiguity fosters the potential to bestow a complexity and richness to the intricately considered and crafted object, transforming the material into the sacred. The act of construction becomes one of (re)creation. Conversely, the relationship risks confusion and mistranslation, resulting in a structure entirely dependent on the appropriation of (symbolic) stability.

BETWEEN ARCHITEXT AND ARCHITECTURE

The “architectural” structures or practices drawn from Talmudic tradition and ritualized across the Diaspora are often overlooked in discussions of Jewish Architecture. In-formed by the plans/words of Divine Creation, the *eruv*, *sukkah*, and *mezuzah* express an implicit transitional state through their respective constructions as extended, temporary, grounded, and fixed. Rooted in the commandments of the Torah, the detailed instructions for the construction of these architectures, however, are located in exegeses and *halakhic* texts. The density of symbolic reference and precision accorded to the construction of these objects is more accurately described as a conscious and studied extraction and re-assemblage of symbolic and transcendent values, derived from the Original architectural plans - the Torah.

The eruv – extending and mixing domains

Thus saith the Lord: Take heed for the sake of your souls and bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem: neither carry forth a burden out of your house on the Sabbath day.

Jeremiah 17:21-22

Eruv literally means “mixture” and refers to procedures developed by the rabbis to overcome undue burdens otherwise imposed by strict observance of certain Jewish laws. The term *eruv*, however, is most commonly applied to one specific condition, the *eruv chatzeirot*, “mixed (ownership of) domains”. Perhaps one of the most challenging observances of the Sabbath is the restriction on carrying – “removing an object from one domain to another.”¹ By applying this interpretation to the verse “Let no man go out of his domain on the seventh day,”² the rabbis apply specific definitions of domain (*reshut*) and what constitutes the space between (or outside) domains.³ The Talmud therefore describes four types of related spatial conditions: the “public domain”, the “private domain”, the “unfrequented place”, and the “free place”. The transfer of objects from one spatial context into the next is therefore permitted by means of spatial integration and the dissolution of boundaries between spaces.

Contemporary *eruvim* have been established based on the extension of the definition of domain as an enclosed area, i.e. fenced or walled in. Here the perimeter is perceived as the principle material manifestation of domain.⁴ This practice has permitted entire neighbourhoods to be categorized as *eruvim* by establishing a continuous perimeter, primarily by surveying, integrating and reinforcing pre-existing structures such as telephone lines, fences, and walls (Fig. 4.2). Traditionally, however, *eruvim* were limited to the much smaller scale of families in adjoining homes or

sharing a courtyard (Fig. 4.1). Though defined in spatial terms, these *eruvim* were constructed symbolically by the sharing of a loaf of bread or *matzah*⁵ and reciting: “my *reshut* is given to you, my *reshut* is relinquished to you.”⁶ The domestic space of the individual Home extends into the conceptually domesticated space of the courtyard, in effect effacing the distinction between one Home and the next.

The *eruv chatzeirot* extends beyond the practicality of facilitating conveyance of objects on Shabbat. It conveys a specific perspective of Home and the distinction between public and private as always being in relationship with the Other. When the individual waives possession or dominion over place, he does so in order to welcome and be welcomed Home. “The *eruv* emerges as a theory of community, of collectivity, of neighborhood as a unified community with collective intent.”⁷

The sukkah - spatio-temporal relations between dwelling and remembering

Ye shall dwell in booths seven days; all that are homeborn in Israel shall dwell in booths; that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt.

Leviticus, 23:42-43

The *sukkah* is a temporary structure built for the festival of *Sukkot* (Fig. 4.3). During the seven days of the festival (eight days in the Diaspora), the children of Israel are commanded to dwell in booths as a reminder of the period of wandering following the Exodus. The holiday is coupled with the harvest, and is also known as *chag hasif* (the Feast of Ingathering/Harvest), or simply *chag* (the Festival).⁸ The *sukkah* is therefore intended to serve an additional and practical purpose of setting up a shelter among the crops, and is often decorated with various fruits and stalks (Fig. 4.5).⁹ In modern urban life, the *sukkah* is an interesting mnemonic intersection of nomadic and agrarian, wandering and rooted histories. As a model of the archetypal dwelling, the *sukkah* prompts a questioning of what it means “to dwell” and how the temporary and the seemingly conflicting symbolic nature of the structure informs the debate.

Maimonides writes: “One should regard his house as a temporary home and the *sukkah* as his permanent home.”¹⁰ The implied stability of the “permanent” dwelling is juxtaposed with the “temporary” structure of the *sukkah*. As a harvest festival, *Sukkot* is often described as a thanksgiving for the bountiful crop but also for the bounty of one's regular, settled life. The rabbis, however, suggest that this period of separation is one of purification, recalling the forty years during which the Israelites wandered the desert before settling in Canaan. Removed from the vices and corruption the Prophets associated with urban civilization, the reproduction of

nomadic life during *Sukkot* is believed to destabilize the norm and provide a frame of mind by which one's regular life may be viewed critically.¹¹

Spatial separation facilitates the temporal displacement of remembrance and critical distance from the self. *Sukkot* is not only a recollection, but also a celebration of the precarious, the uprooted, and the destabilized. The most significant element of the *sukkah* and the one accorded the most specific conditions, is the *sekhakh* (the roof of the *sukkah*) from which the whole structure derives its name. Notably, it is to be made exclusively of “uprooted” materials “grown from the soil” such as wood or reeds (Fig. 4.4).¹² The *sukkah* is an invitation to go beyond, a dwelling in the process of being built. Impermanence is not understood as the lack of permanence but rather as a condition which exceeds it, a meta-permanence.

The mezuzah – passage by the way

And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thy house and upon they gates

Deut., 6:9

The *mezuzah* consists of a small piece of parchment upon which a *sofer* (scribe) copies the first paragraphs of the *Shema*.¹³ The parchment is rolled up and the *Shaddai* is printed on the inverse, i.e. the visible side.¹⁴ The scroll is then enclosed in a small tube or box affixed to each of the right-hand door-posts in the home (Fig. 4.6). The *mezuzah* serves several purposes and contains multiple meanings. The marking of one's doorpost, identifying it as a Jewish home, is comparable to the marking of the posts and lintel with ram's blood in Egypt so that the tenth plague would pass-over the house.¹⁵ The *mezuzah* is therefore often interpreted as a protector. The choice of text, however, elicits another interpretation.

The passages contained in the *mezuzah* are a promise to conduct oneself ethically both inside and outside the home. The *mezuzah* effaces the artificial boundary condition of the wall: "The rite of the *mezuzah* is an invitation to perpetual motion."¹⁶ Its placement on the doorpost is therefore a reminder of the continuity (in both space and time) of G-d's commandments. In addition to its location, the *mezuzah* as sacred object acts as a threshold. Architecturally, the *mezuzah* as threshold is an interruption and therefore recognition of the artificial division of wall. It is a restoration of the natural continuity of the ground plane and a framework for the dialogue between separate but continuous spaces.

The simultaneity with which the meticulously scribed passage is made present in its concealment, prominently displayed but hidden, is considered both transcendent and erotic. The “visible-invisible” and the “readable-unreadable” is a recurring trope of Jewish thought and tradition. The leaving of one's home, marked by the passage (the act and the text) of the *mezuzah*, affirms the perpetual journey, the continuity and overlap of departures and arrivals.

Fig. 4.2: Archway at the opening of an existing fence to reinstate continuity of the London Eruv.

Fig. 4.1: A shared courtyard in Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem.

Fig. 4.3: Indiana Sukkot Project.

Fig. 4.4: *Sekhakh*, the *sukkah*'s roof, constructed from various fruits and palm leaves.

Fig. 4.5: *Sukkah* on the MIT Campus in front of Saarinen's Chapel.

Fig. 4.6: *Mezuzah* showing the inner parchment with the *Shema*. The *Shaddai* is visible on the front of the *mezuzah* and on the reverse side of the parchment.

EARLY ZIONIST FOUNDATIONS

And where will our presence be desired so long as we are a homeless nation?
But we shall give a home to our people...

Theodor Herzl, *Der Judenstaat*

At the First Zionsist Congress, 1897, Theodor Herzl proclaimed: "We are here to lay the foundation stone of the house which is to shelter the Jewish nation." Like most nationalist movements, significant focus was dedicated to the solidification of identity through a clear architectural language. Herzl foresaw a rejuvenation of the people through a direct physical connection to the "soil of Israel" (*Eretz Yisrael*).¹⁷ In *Der Judenstaat*, the Zionist manifesto for a Jewish State, a significant portion of which is dedicated to the new architecture, he continues that: "...we shall build as men build now. Indeed, we shall build in a bolder and more stately style than was ever adopted before, for now we possess means which men never yet possessed."¹⁸ At the core of the Political Zionism's ideological framework was a belief that the "malady" suffered by the landless Wandering Jew was caused by a fundamental disconnection of the People from the land.

Like Martin Buber's hope for the Jewish People, Erich Mendelsohn believed that Jewish architecture could act as an important mediator between the Orient and

the Occident: “having already acquired all the wisdom and all the skills of the Occident without losing its original Oriental character.”¹⁹ This would necessarily require a recognition of its dual or intermediary identity and relationship with the Other: “to the first, [Jews] do not yet belong; to the second they do not belong any more.”²⁰ Furthermore, it would call on rabbinical and cultural traditions and the complex interweaving of the symbolic and material properties of architecture.

The pragmatic demands of working the land and its inherent equalizing force were the basis for the new identity embraced by the Political Zionists. Many of the young architects of the *Chug*, the Tel Aviv architectural “circle”, shared this pioneering zeal and saw the Zionist movement as fertile ground to implement the theories of pragmatic functionalism being taught in the technical academies of Europe where many of them were educated.²¹ Arie Sharon, head architect of the *Chug*, is often credited for his coupling of the Bauhaus vernacular with the *kibbutz* life-style. The functional considerations of *kibbutzim* were readily accommodated by the Bauhaus' characteristic plain cubical, white housing blocks adorned by balcony, *brise-soleil* and *piloti*.²² Julius Posener similarly reformulated the architectural laws of modernism to adapt and to emphasize the culturally neutral conditions of the local climate (Fig. 4.7). For example, the horizontality of the modernist strip window were translated into long balconies stretching the length of the facade in order to reduce the

amount of glazing, and provide adequate shading from the desert sun (Fig. 4.8). The withdrawal from cultural reference, often attributed to the modernist rejection of history, was a withdrawal or separation from their “subordinate life” in exile in favour of progress and an egalitarian society.

Mendelsohn, however was highly critical of the *Chug's* architecture, which he saw as based solely around the functionalist demands of agriculture, security, hygiene, poverty, and society. He considered this a “material arrogance”.²³ As a result, a majority of the Jewish settlers, still tied to their notions of Home in the German suburban *Siedlung* and Eastern European *Shtetle*,²⁴ felt alienated by their new homes. Despite this realization and criticism, the *Chug* maintained the Herzlian myth that the Jewish People were by nature at Home in their *Altneuland*. In a 1937 publication of *Habinyan*²⁵ Posener writes:

The land of Israel is not a foreign one in the eyes of the Jew. When he builds, he does not bring from the Diaspora the house of his fathers; on the contrary, the Jew wants to construct here, for the first time in his life, a house of his own, and moreover, this house should be the house of the country in which he is settling.²⁶

By rooting his architecture in culture rather than neutral factors of climate, progress, and technology, Mendelsohn sought to substantiate the modernist language and create an architecture as universal as the International Style that would not suffer from the

same problems of dislocation and displacement often attributed to the projects of his contemporaries.

Consistent with Cultural Zionism's desire to acknowledge Diasporic/rabbinical tradition, Mendelsohn grounds the symbolism of his projects through Biblical reference. This is strongly displayed in the Weizmann House, his first project in Palestine (Fig. 4.9). The location of the house, Rehoboth, was steeped in symbolic significance. The first town to be founded by the Jewish settlers, it was named after a passage in Genesis: “and he [Isaac] called the name of the well Rehoboth and he said, 'For now the Lord hath made room for us and we shall be fruitful in the land.'”²⁷ Mendelsohn employs not a hypothetical but a symbolic “purity” of the “ground zero of human [Jewish] reality”. Space has been made for the Jewish people in Palestine so that they might find a sense of place in the land. Furthermore, Mendelsohn applies a Delugian reference in his design for the residence (Fig. 4.10). Like the Ark, it symbolized the transplantation of the good from the old society into the new, and not its complete abandonment.

In order to make the transition, Mendelsohn respects the position of the Arab natives as having exhibited the rooted connection to the land he was searching to achieve. Mendelsohn is often credited for his sensitivity to the local conditions and

culture in his architecture. In a 1929 lecture on Palestinian national policy, Buber articulates this point:

We must never lose sight of the fact that with them, a rooted connection with the land has taken on a vital, even organic self-evidence that we do not even come close to possessing. They, not we, have something that can be called Palestinian form. The clay huts of the fellahin villages have sprung up from the ground; the houses of Tel Aviv are set on top of it.²⁸

Reference is made to the Arab dome in the Hadassah University Medical Centre on Mount Scopus (Fig. 4.11). Its playful and strategic defamiliarization comes from its displacement from its traditional structural role into a symbolic gesture in recognition of the Arab (br)Other.

Infused with notions of construction, building, foundations and, of course, Home (Herzl himself is often referred to as the *Architect of Zionism*), the reconstruction of the national Home(land) under Herzl's lead, therefore, attempted to appropriate the stability and security of the ground by constructing a permanent and founded claim to the land through its architecture. It revealed, however, the internal contradictions it attempted to veil in the assumed direct translation between the metaphor of architecture and material architecture. By asking the Jewish People to leave their material Diasporic homes and return to their metaphorical Home, Political

Zionism was inherently dependent on the ideological division between the two conditions. Essentially a secular movement, it reflected a construct of Home more consistent with Western philosophies than Jewish tradition. Many scholars and critics have since criticized them and their followers for reverting to the tradition of architecture as a tool of political domination.²⁹ Consequently, the separation between the practical need for infrastructure and the symbolic “construction” of the nation quickly becomes ambiguous.

By contrast, the Cultural Zionists believed that only by returning to their cultural traditions could the Jewish People return Home, first spiritually, and then geographically. They recognized the importance of the Diasporic experience in facilitating the transition by translating the familiar condition of being foreigners in a strange home to the new condition as foreigners in their own (ancestral) Home. This included a respect for the existing condition and the ability to overlay the memory of another and the necessary relationship with the Other. Mendelsohn's architecture became symbolic of these cultural conditions rather than a philosophical metaphor as a stable foundation.

Fig. 4.9: Weizmann House in Rehoboth.

Fig. 4.10: Weizmann House depicted as the Ark atop the mount after the Great Flood.

Fig. 4.11: The Hadassah University Medical Centre on Mount Scopus.

- 1 Klein, 1982. 81.
- 2 Exod., 16:29.
- 3 *Reshut* refers both to a physically definable space (domain) and to the rights or accessibility to that space (dominion) See Fonrobert, 2005. 18.
- 4 Coussineau, 2005. 39.
- 5 Klein, 1982. 82-3.
- 6 Eruvin 5:18. As quoted in Fonrobert, 2005. 18.
- 7 Fonrobert, 2005. 16.
- 8 Klein, 1982. 156-7.
- 9 *ibid.* 158.
- 10 Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Mishnah Sukkot* 6:5-6.
- 11 Klein. 1982, 158.
- 12 Klein, 1982. 160.
- 13 Deut. 6:4-9 and 11:13-21.
- 14 *Shaddai* is the three letters which appear on the back of the *mezuzah* scroll ךדש – an acronym used to refer to G-d as the “Guardian of the Doors of Israel”.
- 15 Exodus 12:7.
- 16 Ouaknin, 2002. 28.
- 17 Herzl agreed with Heine's 1841 poetic diagnoses of the 'thousand-year-old hereditary malady' of 'Jewishness' which developed into several pseudo-scientific theories during the late 19th to early 20th century. During the 1930s, Theodor Lessing reversed the roles when he concludes that the Jews were immune to the social malaise of modern European societies and that it was actually the non-Jewish world that was sick. See Almog, 1991. 793-804. and Nitzan-Shiftan, 2004. 26.
- 18 Herzl, 1988. 94.
- 19 Julius Posener, “One family House in Palestine”, *Habinyan* 2 (1937) as quoted in Nitzan-Shiftan 2004. 33.
- 20 Nitzan-Shiftan 2004. 38.
- 21 Founded in 1932, the *Chug* consisted of young architects to promote the institutionalization of an international “modern architecture” in Palestine, which they achieved in 1948 when it was declared the official architecture of the new State of Israel. Nitzan-Shiftan, 2004. 19. Until 1939, 86% of the architects practicing in Palestine had received their training and degrees from foreign countries, of which nearly one quarter were from Germany. See Kunda and Oxman, 2004. 57 and Heinze-

- Greenberg, 1998. 205.
- 22 Nitzan-Shiftan, 2004. 28.
- 23 *ibid.* 42.
- 24 Heinze-Greenberg 1998. 205. and Rykwert, 1989. 94.
- 25 *Habinyan* was the *Chug's* exclusive publication promoting the modern architecture for the Jewish population of Palestine. Nitzan-Shiftan, 2004. 25.
- 26 Julius Posener, 'One family House in Palestine', *Habinyan* 2 (1937) as quoted in Nitzan-Shiftan, 2004. 26.
- 27 Rehoboth was the first town founded by the Zionist settlers in the 1890s, named for this passage in Gen. 25:22. See Rykwert, 1989. 94.
- 28 Published in 1940 in the political pamphlet *Palestine and the World of Tomorrow*. As quoted in Heinze-Greenberg, 1998. 206.
- 29 For criticism of the political use of architecture in Isreal see Eyal Weizman's *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture* (2003). Several recent interdisciplinary projects, however, have proposed that while one can not escape the political situation and realities of present Jerusalem, a dialogue which understands the city as existing beyond its political status is necessary. See MIT's interdisciplinary project *Jerusalem 2050* and architectural competition *Just Jerusalem*, and Michael Sorkin's book *The New Jerusalem: Sharing the Divided City* (2002) propose architecture as a primary means for healing the divided city.

BOOK 5 THE WANDERER'S SOJOURN INTO DWELLING

The primordial function of the home does not consist in orienting being by the architecture of the building and in discovering a site, but in breaking the plenum of the element, in opening in it the utopia in which the “I” recollects itself in dwelling at home with itself...

...Because the I exists recollected it takes refuge empirically in the home. Only from this recollection does the building take on the signification of being a dwelling.

Lévinas, *Totality and Infinity*

Emmanuel Lévinas' definition of habitation as the “being's sojourn in a dwelling” suggests a meeting between permanence and impermanence and the complex spatio-temporal relationship between the transient (*meuble*) and the stationary (*immeuble*). Deeply rooted in Jewish tradition, Home becomes the intersection of the transient self and the stationary archi*texture* where the self is free to recollect in its interiority and simultaneously position itself in relationship with the exterior elements. In this context permanence is not necessarily rooted to site or

location suggesting an architecture that is not dependent on appropriating permanence, and with it the perception of stability and continuity, from the site.

By incorporating the understanding of Home derived from the preceding analysis and study, the proposed architecture challenges the relative status of *meuble* and *immeuble* and the spatio-temporal relationships that traditionally link them to permanence and transience. Secondly, the Diasporic tradition of translating text, textuality, and texture into architecture will aid in forming the design. The library – *beit ha'sefer* (“house of the book”) – is to be reconsidered and reconstructed as a wandering library, or Book-(im)mobile, and as an architecture that represents and functions as the “opening of place is space”, re-establishing the continuity of Home that welcomes and is welcomed by the Other.

SITING ARCHITECTURE IN TRANSIENCE

Space is inscription rather than its site.

Writing does not have a site.

Sites are an effect of writing.

Wigley, *The Architecture of Deconstruction*

In its state of perpetual distribution and re-collection, a library's collection is both permanent and transient and maintains an identity as a unified whole. The architectural proposal therefore suggests that the Home to which the collection returns similarly exists in the tension between permanence and transience both in the siting and (re)construction of its architecture. The project interprets wandering not as placelessness or displacement but as that which is able to inscribe place in a multiplicity of spaces, if only temporarily.

Similar to a trailer-home or a house-boat, the Book-(im)mobile has no permanent site. Instead, it depends on the ability of its architecture to inscribe the effect of site temporarily during its stay at any given location. Upon the departure of its architecture, the site returns to non-site, but like all erasures, the absent architecture necessarily leaves some present trace and memory of what was once written upon its site.¹ However, the *beit ha'sefer* should not be confused with a self-

sufficient autonomous monadic wanderer. Though able to sustain itself temporarily, the wanderer is in perpetual search of the (welcomed/welcoming) Other.

For the Book-(im)mobile to open itself to welcome the Other requires the presence of an architectural gesture of welcome. A series of pre-existing, but essentially non-sites, in each of the local communities introduce this invitation with the installation of a reading garden occupying a 6m long by 2.6m wide parking space (fig. 5.1 d). This can range from the installation of eight docking posts (fig. 5.1 e and fig. 5.7) and a series of temporary risers on the site to a more permanent structure that can accommodate practical needs and connection to community infrastructure, e.g. hookup to electrical, phone, cable, water, and sewage.

The garden is intended to be a semi-permanent installation which continues to serve the local community after the Book-(im)mobile has moved on. Similar to a fairground, the garden returns to non-site when the event departs, but now one that contains the trace that continues to remember and anticipate the event. The garden is never itself a site, but an intermediary between sites, belonging to both the local and the transient. It only temporarily achieves the effect of site when both conditions are present (plates 10 and 11).

CITING TRANSIENCE IN ARCHITECTURE

A zone of indeterminacy in which the outside is nothing but the exclusion of an inside and the inside in turn only the inclusion of an outside.

Agamben, *The Open*

The architectural and programmatic design are derived and in-formed in part by several characteristics of the structure (figural, literal, and/or metaphorical) of the Talmud, which is itself a translation of the plan of the Temple and its reference to the *Mishkan*. The central text, surrounded by margins of exegeses that reveal entry and guide navigation (fig. 5.3), is referred to by the main structure out of which and into which the entry and circulation expand and collapse (Plates 1 and 5). The Book-(im)mobile is therefore only accessible in its open state, when supported by these peripheral spaces (Plates 2 and 3). In preparation for transit, the central structure re-collects the auxiliary extension back within itself, reinforcing its internal structure (Plate 10).

The central structure is therefore conceived of as the foundational element, the original condition of the architecture (fig. 5.1 b). Contained within the centre, rather than buried underground, the architecture alternates between the centripetal and

centrifugal but resists the hierarchical. The Book-(im)mobile establishes a relationship and interaction between centre and periphery rather than the division of up from down. The supporting peripheral spaces extend outward from the central structure by two different means; extrusion on one side, and pivoting on the other (Plate 7 and fig. 5.1 a & c).

First, the extruded side offers an initial gesture of extension which suggests the potential of infinite extensions. It establishes a continuity with/in the exterior that originates from the interior. This is achieved with a telescopic structure extracted from between the inner structural elements (fig. 5.8). In the closed formation, it occupies the space between the two I-beams that form the main cross-sectional structure in each bay.² When extruded, they act as a continuation of the central structure opening out onto and offering welcome to the Other (Plates 2 and 6). It is within this extension that the arrival and entry sequences are located. The second open condition is achieved by the wall panels on the opposite side (Plates 3 and 8). They are intended to imitate the configuration of the pages of the Talmud and to provide a micro-structure that acts as the key or legend to interpret the derived macro-structure. The panels elicit the relationship between both the recto-verso and the facing pages of a book (fig. 5.3).

When collapsed, the odd-even pages share the same relationship to one another as the recto-verso. When the book is opened, a space is created between the two, allowing them to first face each other, and then towards the outer world as reflections about a shared axis. Similarly, the side panels of the Book-(im)mobile pivot outwards to open up a space between and reveal the relationship between recto/verso and odd/even, i.e. the wood covered and metal covered sides of a single panel, and the stationary panels fastened to the central structure versus the panel which pivots outward (fig. 5.5). The multiple dialogues located in the exegeses of the Talmud enhance and continue the interaction across the pages. These peripheral texts that bridge, gate, support, and reveal the intertext become the structural elements of the opened circulation space.(Fig. 5.4) Meanwhile, the central texts contain the content being sought, in this case, the book collection.

In addition to its reference of the Talmud, the wandering library draws on *midrashic* hermeneutics and Kabbalist traditions in its complex interweaving of the symbolic and literal value of text and numbers, and their translation into material objects and space.³ Because of the importance attributed to *beit*, as previously explored, two appears consistently in the pairing of elements (fig. 5.6). In order to achieve its open configuration the Book-(im)mobile is constructed from two 14m long transport trailers that are able to collapse back onto and into each other to form a

single, standard trailer for transport (Plate 10). *Beit* also provides a figural model whereby the inscription of space is defined by three sides, leaving one open as an invitation to the Other, and avoiding an interruption in the continuity between interior and exterior.

Similarly, the organization of the structure into seven bays supported and defined by eight gates (fig. 5.9) was informed by the coherence of meaning that occurs at the intersection of a letter's form, its *gematria* and literal meaning. The Hebrew numeral for eight is the letter **ח**, *chet*. Formally, it is the combination of the two preceding letters, *vav* and *zayin*. It therefore represents a union of parts by “touching yet not touching”, a bridging of the space separating them. In turn these eight gates define seven interior bays (fig. 5.10). Seven is another prominent and important number in Hebrew. It contains the completion and totality of the seventh day, the totality of parts in the seven seas, seven heavens, and seven chambers of paradise. It is *Shabbat*, a day of rest that sustains and rejuvenates, and therefore also appears as the sabbatical and jubilee years, seven and seven-by-seven, respectively. Seven is the collection of its individual but interrelated parts, united by its overarching structure.

A final example is the three pairs of panels that open out to the back (fig. 5.5 and fig. 5.11), which are derived from the third letter of the *alef-beit*, **ג**, *gimmel*. Rabbi

Yehudah Loew tells us that: “the power of the number three is its ability to combine two contrasting forces—to bring about integration.”⁴ It therefore also means charity, the offering that creates a bridge between the self and the Other. The foot of the *gimmel* appears to be stepping forward, moving toward the Other. The mending of the seeming dualities that reinstates continuity, combined with the gesture of walking inherent in *gimmel* are, in the case of the Book-(im)mobile, intended as a recognition of the wanderer. This interpretation is further supported by its derivation from *gemul*, meaning both reward and punishment. While not intended as contradictory, the polysemy reflects the condition of free will, one's ability to go forth in the world. Finally, *gamal*, the camel, is that which sustains and carries the sojourner.

- a) pivoting extensions
- b) central structure
- c) extruding extensions
- d) reading garden
- e) docking posts

Fig. 5.1: Book-(im)mobile and site elements.

Fig. 5.2: Geometric analysis of the Talmud page layout.

Fig. 5.3: Abstraction of facing Talmud pages.

Fig. 5.4: Exploratory model of pivoting extension.

Fig. 5.5: Analysis of pivoting extension.

Fig. 5.6: Paired structure on pivoting side.

Fig. 5.8: Extruding structure.

Fig. 5.7: Docking post.

Fig. 5.9: *Chet*, the eight gates.

Fig. 5.10: *Zayin*, the seven bays.

Fig. 5.11: *Gimmel*, the three pairs of pivoting "pages".

Notes: Book 5

- 1 For discussion of the trace see Ginzburg, 1992.
- 2 This acts as reinforcement for the additional structural needs of the main body when in transit.
- 3 The following references to meaning, value, and interpretations of Hebrew letters from Raskin, 2003. See also appendix: The Hebrew Alef-Beit: Forms, Names and Meaning
- 4 As quoted in Raskin, 2003.

RETURN TO BEIT, A CONCLUSION

Though historically not able to resist their displacement, the Diaspora carried with them the means for *replacement*. The Jewish Home is deeply rooted and intrinsically tied to a re-collection of the fragmented cultural and tectonic memories of house images carried by the Diaspora, exemplified in the importance attributed to the architectural tradition present in the *eruv*, the *sukkah*, and the *mezuzah*. The intangibles of Home are not only transferred onto, but also already inherent in the tangible *choses meubles*, which Lévinas describes as the things one carries and deposits in the *immeuble*.¹ By lending materiality to memory, and vice versa, *les choses meubles* become both that which one can *prendre* (hold) and *comprendre* (understand), explaining the significance attributed by the Diaspora to architectural objects of the old Home that can be carried and affixed to or re-constructed in the new Home.

Now in a state of chosen exile, as argued by Edward Said, the *galut*, i.e. the expatriated exiles of the Jewish Diaspora, are in a position to build critical worlds, informed by their exilic experience as and with the Other:

...the expatriate builds worlds in and through that chosen homeless state, critical worlds carved by comparison out of a host culture they temporarily inhabit (even if that habitation lasts a lifetime) Often these worlds – created through fiction, poetry, philosophy, and art – come to inspire those at home to change how they envision their own identity and dwelling.²

The “plurality of vision” and “awareness of simultaneous dimensions” gained by the experiences of exile and relationship with the Other, have contributed to the Diasporic consciousness, its perceptions, and therefore in-form its (re)construction of Home as transcendent and ethical. However, architecture is not listed as one of the critical worlds built by the expatriate. This omission reflects a general anxiety towards architecture as an expression of Home, fearing it represents “too much stability” and simultaneously criticizing it for its contingency and inability to fulfill its metaphorical function.

In *Architecture as Metaphor*, Karatani explains the contingency of architecture is an effect of its inherent relationship with the unknowable Other:

No architect can predict the results of construction. No architect exists out of context... Plato admired the architect as metaphor, but despised the architect as a man because the actual architect and architecture are fully exposed to contingency. However, this state of architectural contingency does not imply that the actual architecture, as opposed to some putative ideal architecture, is secondary and in danger of collapse. Rather it implies that no architecture can determine a design free from the relationship with the other (the client). All architects face the unknowable other.³

Consistent with the polysemy of the archi*texture* of the Talmud, the contingency of architecture is not an unavoidable flaw that results in indeterminacy and instability. To the contrary, its openness to both alternatives and alterity continually re-establishes its continuity and permanence. Intertextuality and density of meaning are created out of the discourse with the Other, a discourse that is also present in *midrash*.

The exegetical process of *midrash* and the design process of architecture are analogous. The process of translation and re-creating demands a critical, consistent, and self-conscious manipulation of an internalized system that is only possible by bringing it (at least temporarily) into the open, looking at it from the outside, from the position of the Other. It is this process that permeates both text and architecture with an internalized coherency and accessibility. Lévinas' definition of interiority, the "gathering or appearance of place in space," though critical to being at Home, is only an appearance that cannot disrupt the actual continuity of space. The Home

welcomes the Other because it recognizes its continuity with/in the Other.

The chosen home is the very opposite of a root. It indicates a disengagement, a wandering which has made it possible, which is not a less with respect to installation, but the surplus of the relationship with the Other, metaphysics.⁴

Alternating between the *meuble* and *immeuble*, *closed* and *open*, the Book-(im)mobile navigates the tension between its internal contradictions. It sometimes reveals and sometimes conceals. In its *meuble* state, the Book-(im)mobile is no longer a home but the carrier of the Home-objects. Its mobility provides the potential and means by which it re-replaces itself somewhere else. The else, or Other, is the pre-condition necessary for the architecture to place itself temporarily. By inscribing itself in the site it opens itself into the Other, thus reinstating the continuity between the dualities of interior/exterior, local/foreign, self/other. The extension of welcome by and to the Other, simultaneously centripetal and centrifugal, results in Lévinas' "gathering or appearance of place in space".

By exaggerating the temporary and often random relationship between building and ground, the Book-(im)mobile transfers focus to architecture as mediator in the dialogue between centre and periphery. Inscribing itself temporarily through an architectural discourse and reinstated continuity with/in the Other, the Book-

(im)mobile challenges the traditional architectural metaphor, exposing the tension between permanence and stability in the building/ground relationship and travels the intersection between *meuble* and *immeuble*. Defining the *immeuble* as a vessel in which the essences of Home, carried by and inherent in *les choses meubles*, are deposited, Lévinas seemingly supports the ideological separation of mind and body, and therefore the existential home and architectural house. That is unless, the use of architecture by Lévinas is recognized as simultaneously metaphorical and literal. Since *meubles* are that which can be understood, *immeubles* are the unknown/unknowable. Architecture therefore becomes a *meuble* – that which carries the meaning of dwelling and is located in the unknown. Architecture returns Home to the beginning – *beit*.

Beit is placed in the omnipresence of the unknown Other and is therefore the beginning of all human relationships. *Beit* not only proposes but is the reconciliation of the seemingly contradictory *immeuble-meuble* and *meuble-immeuble* status of architecture as part of the wanderer's sojourn into dwelling.

Notes: Conclusion

- 1 Lévinas, 1998. 157.
- 2 Magid, 2003. 205.
- 3 Karatani, 1995. 127.
- 4 Lévinas, 1998. 172.

PLATE 1 GEOMETRIC CONSTRUCTION OF PLAN AND "SITE"

PLATE 2 AERIAL PERSPECTIVE OF "EXTRUDED" FACADE

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PLATE 3 AERIAL PERSPECTIVE OF "PIVOTED" FAÇADE

PLATE 4 AERIAL PLAN

PLATE 5 PLAN

PLATE 6 "EXTRUDED" ELEVATION

PLATE 7 REAR ELEVATION AND SECTION

PLATE 8 "PIVOTED" ELEVATION

PLATE 9 COLLAPSED "PIVOTING" ELEVATION

PLATE 10 MEUBLE "CLOSED" CONFIGURATION

(a) "extruding" side separate from the reading garden

(b) "pivoting" side separate from the reading garden

PLATE 11 IMMEUBLE "OPEN" CONFIGURATION

(a) "extruding" side docked at the reading garden

(b) "pivoting" side docked at the reading garden

Burber, Martin. I and Thou. 1937. 2nd ed. Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1958.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. "Judaism and the Feminine." Difficult Freedoms: Essays on Judaism. Trans. Sean Hand. London: Athlon, 1990.

—. "The Dwelling." Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1998.

Wigley, Mark. The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt. Cambridge: MIT UP, 1995.

Constructing a Sense of Place: Architecture and the Zionist Discourse. Ed. Haim Yacobi. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES AND WORKS CITED

A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture.
Eds. Raf Segal and Eyal Weizman. NY: Verso, 2003.

Agamben, Giorgio. The Open: Man and Animal. Stanford:
Stanford UP, 2004.

Almog, Schmuel. "Judaism as Illness: Antisemitic Stereotype
and Self-Image." *History of European Ideas* 13.6 (1991): 793-
804.

Anderson, Benedict. "Imagined Communities." Nationalism.
Eds. Hutchinson and Smith. NY: Oxford UP, 1994. 89-96.

Boyarin, Daniel and Jonathan. "Diaspora: Generation and
the Ground of Jewish Identity." *Critical Inquiry* 19:4
(Summer, 1993): 693-725.

Brichetto, Joanna. The Wandering Image: Converting the
Wandering Jew. Thesis. M.A. Nashville: Vanderbilt, 2006.

Cousineau, Jennifer. "Rabbinic Urbanism in London: Rituals
and the Material Culture of the Sabbath." *Jewish Social
Studies* 11.3 (Spring/Summer 2005): 36-57.

Davis, Diane. E. "Jerusalem/Al-Quds 2050: Vision for a Place
of Peace." 2005. Jerusalem 2050. MIT Department of Urban
Studies & Planning and the Center for International Studies.
September 25, 2006
< <http://web.mit.edu/cis/jerusalem2050/framework.html> > .

Derrida, Jacques. "A Letter to Peter Eisenman." *Assemblage*,
12 (Aug., 1990): 6-13.

Eisenman, Peter. "A Reply to Jacques Derrida." *Assemblage*,
12 (Aug., 1990): 14-17.

Fonrobert, Charlotte E. "The Political Symbolism of the Eruv." *Jewish Social Studies* 11.3 (Spring/Summer 2005): 9-35.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny, 1919." San Diego State University e-texts. August, 2007
< <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~amtower/uncanny.html> > .

Ginzburg, Carlo. Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1992.

Goldstein, Jan. "The Wandering Jew and the Problem of Psychiatric Anti-Semitism in Fin-du-Siecle France." *Journal of Contemporary History* 20.4 (1985): 521-552.

Heidegger, Martin. "Building, Dwelling, Thinking." 1951. Rethinking Architecture. Ed. Neil Leach, London: Routledge, 1997. 100-124.

Heinze-Greenberg, Ita. "I am a Free Builder: Architecture in Palestine 1934-1941." Eric Mendelsohn. Ed. Reginal Stephan. New York: Monacelli, 1998.

Herzl, Theodor. Der Judenstaat. 1896. New York: Dover, 1988.

James, Kathleen. "Conclusion." Erich Mendelsohn and the Architecture of German Modernism. Ed. Kathleen James. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Karatani, Kojin. Architecture as Metaphor: Language, Number, Money. Cambridge: MIT UP, 1995.

Klein, Isaac. A Guide to Jewish Religious Practice. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992.

Kunda, Sigal Davidi and Robert Oxman. "The Flight of the Camel: the Levant Fair of 1934 and the Creation of a Situated Modernism." Constructing a Sense of Place: Architecture and the Zionist Discourse. Ed. Haim Yacobi. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. Difficult Freedoms: Essays on Judaism. Trans. Sean Hand. London: Athlon, 1990.

——. Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1998.

Loach, Judi and Raquel Rapaport. "Buber on (looking at) architecture." *The Journal of Architecture* 5 (Summer 2000): 189-214.

Luz, Ehud. "Buber's Hermeneutics: The Road to the Revival of the Collective Memory and Religious Faith." *Modern Judaism* 15.1 (1995): 69-93.

Magid, Shaul. "In Search of a Critical Voice in the Jewish Diaspora: Homelessness and Home in Edward Said and Shalom Noah Barzofsky's *Netivot Shalom*." *Jewish Social Studies* 12:3 (Spring/Summer 2006): 193-227.

Mann, Barbara. "Modernism and the Zionist Uncanny: Reading the Old Cemetery in Tel Aviv." *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000): 63-95.

McEwan, Indra Kegis. Socrates' Ancestor: An Essay on Architectural Beginnings. Cambridge: MIT, 1994.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations*, 26 (Spring 1989): 7-24.

Nitzan-Shiftan, Alona. "Capital city or spiritual center? The politics of architecture in post-1967 Jerusalem." *Cities* 22.3 (2005): 229-240.

——. "Contested Zionism – Alternative Modernism: Erich Mendelsohn and the Tel Aviv Chug in Mandate Palestine." Constructing a Sense of Place: Architecture and the Zionist Discourse. Ed. Haim Yacobi. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

Ouaknin, Marc-Alain. Symbols of Judaism. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2000.

Raskin, Aaron L. Letters of Light. Brooklyn: SIE, 2003.

Remy, Arthur F.J. "Literary or Profane Legends: The Wandering Jew." The Catholic Encyclopedia. Volume IX. 1910. Trans. Douglas J. Potter. New Advent, 2003.
< <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09121a.htm#10> > .
October 31 2006.

Rykwert, Joseph. "Pioneering the Modern Movement in Palestine." *Architectural Digest* 46.10(1989): 82, 86, 94, 99.

Said, Edward. "The Mind of Winter: Reflections on Life in Exile." *Harper's Magazine* 269 (Sept., 1984): 49-55.

Schwarzer, Mitchell. "The Architecture of Talmud." *JSAH*, 60:4 (December, 2001): 474-487.

Stern, David. "Midrash and Indeterminacy." *Critical Inquiry* 15 (Autumn 1988): 132-161.

The New Jerusalem: Sharing the Divided City. Ed. Michael Sorkin. New York: Monacelli, 2002.

The Other in Jewish Thought and History: Constructions of Jewish Culture and Identity. Eds. Laurence J. Silberstein and Robert L. Cohen. New York: NY UP, 1994.

Vidler, Anthony. The Architectural Uncanny: Essays in the Modern Unhomely. Cambridge: MIT UP, 1992.

Wigley, Mark. The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt. Cambridge: MIT UP, 1995.

Wrestling with Zion: progressive Jewish-American responses to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Eds. Tony Kushner and Alisa Solomon. New York: Grove, 2003.

* All biblical references, unless otherwise noted, are quoted from: Pentateuch & Haftorahs. 2nd ed. Ed. J.H. Hertz. London Soncino, 1960.

alef	first letter of the alef-beit
alef-beit	the Hebrew alphabet
beit	second letter of the alef-beit, literally means house, in, with, has a numerical value of two
chet	eighth letter of the alef-beit, means gate
eruv	(eruvim, pl.) - a set of procedures that facilitate specific activities in Jewish law that would otherwise be forbidden. Literally means “mixture” and is most commonly used to refer to eruv chatzeirot (mixed [ownership of] domains) which allows for carrying of objects on the Sabbath
galut	an exile from the land of Israel, one who lives in the Diaspora.
gamal	a camel, related to the root for gimmel
Gemara	rabbinic analysis and commentary, generally referring to the Babylonian recension compiled c.500 CE. Together with the Mishnah it forms the bulk of the Talmud.
gematria	corresponding numerical value to the letters of the alef-beit, may also refer to the form and appearance of the letter
gemul	both reward and punishment, related to the root for gimmel
gimmel	third letter of the alef-beit, means to step forward

halakhic	the collective corpus of Jewish religious laws, literally “the path” or “the way of walking”. May be used to describe anything that is in accordance with the laws
Kabbalah	relating to the texts and practices of Jewish mysticism
matzah	unleaven bread eaten during Passover, symbolic gesture of sharing one's domain with a neighbour to form an eruv
mezuzah	a scroll with passages from the Torah affixed to the doorposts in Jewish homes, also refers to the doorpost
midrash	referring to the process or any compilation of exegetical or homiletical commentaries on the Tanakh
miqweh	ritual bath (miqwot, pl.)
Mishkan	the tabernacle
Mishnah	Oral laws originally transcribed around the year 200 CE by Yehudah Ha-Nasi
Mishneh Torah	a code of Jewish law compiled by Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon, a.k.a. Maimonides, considered to be one of the most important authorities (1170-1180 CE)
reshut	domain/dominion
se'ah	a measurement of volume used in the Torah
sekhakh	the roof of a sukkah
Shabbat	the sabbath, day of rest on the seventh day

Shaddai	the three letters which appear on the back of the mezuzah scroll שדי – an acronym used to refer to G-d as the “Guardian of the Doors of Israel”
Shema	a prominent prayer recited daily during morning and evening services
sofer	a Hebrew scribe
sukkah	a temporary structure, booth, or tabernacle where one dwells during the Jewish festival of Sukkot (sukkot, pl.)
Sukkot	the Jewish festival of booths, also the harvest festival
Tanakh	Hebrew acronym that refers to the three parts of the Hebrew Bible: 1) Torah, 2) Nevi'im (the Prophets), and 3) Ketuvim (Writings).
Talmud	the written collection of Jewish laws consisting of the Mishnah and Gemara and associated rabbinic exegeses and commentaries
Torah	the Holy Scriptures containing the Pentateuch or Five Books of Moses
zayin	seventh letter of the alef-beit

* Hebrew transliterations are consistent with the American National Standard Romanization of Hebrew, Council of National Library Association, 1975 as cited in:

Klein, Isaac. A Guide to Jewish Religious Practice. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992.

THE HEBREW ALEF-BEIT: FORMS, NAMES AND MEANING

FORM				#	NAME		SOUND		PICTOGRAPH	MEANING
Ancient	Middle	Late	Modern		Ancient	Modern	Ancient	Modern		
				1	al	aleph	a	silent	head of an ox	strong, power, leader
				2	bet	beit	b, bh	b, bh	tent floorplan	family, house, in
				3	gam	gimel	g	g	foot	gather, walk, carry
				4	dal	dalet	d	d	tent door	movement, hang, enter
				5	hey	hey	h, e	h	arms of man raised	look, reveal, breath, sigh
				6	waw	vav	w, o, u	v, o, u	tent peg	add, secure, hook
				7	zan	zayin	z	z	mattock	food, cut, weapon
				8	hhets	chet	hh	hh	tent wall	outside, divide, half
				9	thet	tet	th	t	clay basket	surround, contain, mud
				10	yad	yud	y, i	y	closed hand	work, throw, worship
				20	kaph	kaph	k, kh	kh	open palm	bend, open, allow, tame
				30	lam	lamed	l	l	shepherd staff	teach, yoke, toward, bind
				40	mah	mem	m	m	water	chaos, mighty, blood
				50	nun	nun	n	n	sprouting seed	continue, heir, son
				60	sin	samech	s	s	thorn	grab, hate, protect
				70	ghan	ayin	gh	silent	eye	watch, know, protect
				80	pey	pey	p, ph	p, ph	open mouth	blow, scatter, edge
				90	tsad	tsadey	ts	ts	man on his side	wait, chase, snare, hunt
				100	quph	quph	q	q	sun at the horizon	condense, circle, time
				200	resh	resh	r	r	head of a man	first, beginning, top
				300	shin	shin, sin	sh	sh, s	two front teeth	sharp, press, eat, two
				400	taw	tav	t	t	two crossed sticks	mark, sign, monument

compiled from information available Online at:
 Ancient Hebrew Research Center. (Aug. 2007).
 < <http://www.ancient-hebrew.org/> >

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-Noncommercial 2.5 Canada License.

To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.5/ca/>
letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 941