“Van Gogh, living and working within calling distance of Cézanne at this time, speaks of him as if he were a painter of another place and time”\(^2\). This sentence circumscribes our subject which, as it seems, contains one of the most important features in order to understand places where human beings get settled to found their homes. After having passed on to their children, having constituted the town, they invent names for the location and, sometimes, take care for constitutive political rights to which, as residents, they are willing to be subject. If this passage describes a commonplace about social history – recent interpretation of political theory takes this standpoint, but it distinguishes if afterwards there is a sort of division of political power or not\(^3\) –, it at the same time is the surface of another one. What is a ‘calling distance’ - in German one would have to say ‘eine Rufweite’? It signifies that there is a measurement of space and location dependent on the ear. It’s an earshot that provides the unity such as the feet or an inch. However, since the antiquities man never has used that one for really measuring space, contrary to several animals like the old dolphins who love to communicate their maritime precincts while sending sounds through the water membrane which operates as an overall prolonged echo-organ. Of course, remembering this key-word, the membrane, and the other one, given as grids and paving within the title, we, human beings, have a predestination to rely on our eyes. These, forming a unit, deliver succinct spatial information which is commonly known as perspective\(^4\). However, once again, if this organic precondition has made us believe in the outer space, it at the same time has made us neglect the inner one\(^5\). The distinction, therefore, has prompted this essay to quest for the relationship any Baukultur, and in particular that one of the modern city, implies in regard of the outer and inner space, where this one, the inner space, has to be implemented by the same token as the outer one and where Baukultur, in a preliminarily broad sense, means all the styles that are expressed by cultural buildings, they might be of private, municipal or otherwise official nature. Even if it has to be explained in the following what the inner space means we nevertheless want to introduce it by a question. So if we think, simply in a form of analogy, of the “Europäischer Binnenmarkt” (which is verbally the European interior market) = Single European Market\(^6\), is it true to conceive the corresponding inner space as a single one, too?

The sentence of the art historian Bernhard Myers serves for interpretation of the characteristics of a personality, Cézanne. If we leave this aspect, in order to resort to a form of abstraction which the older classical thinkers like Kant loved for being able to show something pure and persistent\(^7\), we shall inherit a certain generalisation. As just has been seen, it should make us realize and astonish – in order to grasp and to acknowledge that space, spatial distance, does not just belong to the outer space where our homes and the roads are spreading but also to a corresponding inner one. To that sphere which our somewhat recessed heritage, the 19\(^{th}\) century, would have called the Innerlichkeit (innerliness) which, by now, is the hallmark of absolute subjectivity too. Considering politics, which, due to constitutional frameworks and denseness subject to allowing the reality of the individual, never can be disregarded, this affiliation is the basis of one of the utmost constraints of modern democracy. On one side it provides for the realms of secured privacy and personal integrity which are resistant to any public interference, and on the other side it lacks objectivity, a sense of ‘being-
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there’ or intersubjectivity everyone would have to recognize and confer to public probity. Communication, natural condition, and legal guarantee are not, as they ought to be, in a complete and perfect congruency and transparency or, to say it in terms that also architects are familiar with, in real perspectivity. Nevertheless, a German historian of philosophy, Walter Schulz, tried to show that rationalism, having its sweeping root in Saint Augustine, and since Descartes was engaged to get this erratic sphere into grips. Even if we have to re-grasp the classical philosophers who are matching infinity and finiteness and provide for the unity ofapperception, we have to follow thinkers like Kierkegaard, Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and eventually Jaspers. Philosophy in the Changed World, Schulz has named his book who apparently did not notice, that the designated distance reality has when being seen as an outer or an aggregate inner one is appertaining to the hinges of the world. Whatevsoever, at the end of part two which bears the title “Verinnerlichung” (internalization) we do not know if actually the distance that separated Cézanne from Van Gogh, is a real one.

So after having drawn a line somewhat swiftly, which circumscribes an area to be filled with interpretation and understanding, a second question possibly arises: Why a calling distance belongs to the inner space? Is it all to be thought of as music, as we understand the melodies and sounds with our inner ear? It should not. Once again, we would have to look for the arrangement of buildings, or solids, in an array forming a real distance or stretch that would be a witness for any inch that does begin outside the limits of that place, the I, the person who measures, believes that it is. The clue, however, in advance guides back to classical philosophy. It was Kant who taught that any sensation of the outer space is coinciding with the inner one. Relying on the difference between outer and inner sense, he further fixed it as being the medium of time. However, since the implied borderline cannot be regarded as an absolute one, the essence of the outer space does not totally escape from its meaning if consciousness, the bearing medium of both, concentrates on its inner and alternate »hemisphere«. In addition, if we are reflecting the initial sentence, we should not take its meaning for a simple psychological fact. Quite on the contrary, if any subject is occupying a place, and if it is possible to say that the distance two subjects have in a sense which is different from the buildings or homes they are living in, then this distance will belong to an alternate space. It should be a real one, though not in the sense of such secondary or actually unreal incavation: Beltrami and Helmholtz (in the peculiar sense of empirical-unempirical space) around 1860 learned to switch from the Euclidian dimensions into a concrete geometry under the name of the pseudo-sphere. Rather it is that space that as an immediate extension would result if we look for the persistent inner distances that must accompany the outer ones. In a certain sense this thought recalls Bergson who believed, the inner sense as temps durée is non-measurable so that a complementary outer line has to fulfil this function. However, if the relation really is complementary, even more equivalent, and he taught it, then there must be a sense of heterogeneous distance belonging to duration. Therefore, if we investigate and implement for all beings, they might be alive, historical or the coming future ones, a real position that necessarily represents their inner distance and, possibly, a sort of coincidence, then we should produce a form of a matrix: A grid, that signifies our permanent location in another though crucial sense that is absolutely not dependent on the earth or universe location any person is occupying as being, e.g., a resident or a traveller. Moreover, there, within the grid should rest the possibility of moving essentially (change) or accidentally (simple movement), too.

This should be sufficient because, apart from the following subsequence, we do not want to get too deep into the philosophical realms. It should be quite clear that, taking the initial sentence for a task that any architect has to reflect, the grid just designed actually is a real one. Kant, to achieve some final safety on this point, at the end of his dissertation De Mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis made a remark. He taught us that the commercium of the soul and the body implies that there is no real location for the soul.
Quite on the contrary, the soul’s place in the world, as in itself not being material, is solely hinging upon the location of the body. In this sense Plato argued in his *Timaios* reasoning in relation to a proportional theorem, and also Epikur who dissolved the soul built from “finest particles in the aggregate [entirety] of the corporeal form”\(^{15}\), or Aristotl whose concept of entelechie as an instance of antique thinking Leibniz profoundly incorporated into his mature philosophy up to his *Monadology*: “It would be possible to say”, he purports, “that even the soul is its immediate internal object; but only insofar it contains the ideas or something which is corresponding to the things”\(^{16}\). Within this context, however, that means to reinstall a sort of asymmetry as the ideas do not work on each other and the centre of their location is, putatively, without spatial determination. By the same reason Kant claimed that the cause of the world cannot be the Weltseele (the world’s soul or animus mundi), and its location has to be seen in the same manner as the location of the non-material individual soul: As forming a virtual one (§§ 19, 27, or “tamen hypotheticet et mediata”, § 30).

Taking together, however, this solution leaves a crucial problem insofar it has to encompass the universe, mankind, and any soul, or any membrane that, endowed with a soul or centre of evident aliveness, should consequently be coupled with virtual expansion. The cause of the world, he says, is “außerweltlich” (outside of the world). However, the same characterisation should never be adequate for the soul too. It must be an entity interior, or in some well founded sense of proportionality, internal of the world which he acknowledges, pointing to the “commercium with the body”\(^{17}\). So virtuality delivering the Weltseele, or the individual soul, seems to entail a contradiction. On one hand, it approximates an idealisation if not to say a projection (in the psychological or anthropomorphological sense which, in turn, recalls Feuerbach even if the Weltseele is not God), and on the other hand it comprises the most stable and ultimately fixed entity of occidental philosophy, reason as a faculty of the soul, Descartes in his recognised Excellence placed on the highest throne – undoubted evidence of an uttering *Je pense donc je suis* to be equivalent with absolute certainty\(^{18}\). It is the pronouncement, l’énonciation, which, according to Michel Narcy, is fully responsible for holding the opposition against both the decay of identity belonging to Protagorean thought of equal importance of all opinions and the mere similarity a memory of correspondent items includes that might be evolving itself with the technique of the arts, too. Pending the meaning of I within the paralogisms the utterance claim is equally salient in Kant as, according to Bird, ascriptive and referential features of speech fall apart from the sphere of transcendent al apperception Kant later had in mind\(^{19}\): The condition of self-reference (Strawson had underlined) as proof of empirical value is not identical with the transcendental claim that strikes the balance of Kant’s philosophy.

To leave such virtual-hypothetical thinking, which obviously distorts the natural symmetry since on the one hand it believes, the centre of consciousness as being alive has a mere ideal form of existence, and on the other makes a tacit implication for a virtual stretch of expansion that might, even must interconnect them, we have to investigate into the membrane. As housing the soul, it is real in a twofold sense belonging to both the body and the core of consciousness, and as such it is provided with an energetic source (as the Aristotelean stream of tradition believed also). So it is not totally without stuff (*Stoff* as also material). But if this soul is capable of the pronouncement to be a thinking one, it just has proved its real link: The isolation or hermetic situation of evidence, belonging to inner consciousness, is a failure, as the limit of the membrane is never an absolute one. (This, to speak in philosophical terms, is the straightforward essence of Kant’s antinomies). Modern physics does have problems, but also methods to realize the actual location of energetic corpusculars. In analogy, we do not want to say, that the soul as harbouring the source of the divergence between linguistic forms of the pronominal I and the transcendental, virtually the metaphysical, person is a corpuscular one. But in each case it should be located within real energetic expansion, different from the
 corporeal one\textsuperscript{20}. The true opposition of \textit{corpus et anima} therefore does not mean ‘locus intellectualis’ (which is not) against ‘locus corporeal’ (which is material). So a step towards the proof has been provided to understand our world-standing within a grid which is the basis of our overall – or aggregate – conscious, and spiritual, location. Of course, it is not absolute space interacting with mass gravity but a form of fundamental space belonging and adhering to our consciousness conceived from an overall internal expansion. And it coincides, but never is identical with the outer one so that their interference adherent to polarity should be conclusive. Moreover, as this interrelationship is forming the very content of genuine sensation, the architectural \textit{sensoria} – these, eventually, are the buildings to be drafted and felt within their settings – are falling essentially apart in order to rejoin by the same instant.

**Standards of Approximation, Necessities of Distance**

Sideling philosophical dialectics, by now the architectural task is sufficiently sketched out. It is not only our body architects should take into consideration, when they project the location of our housing. But, as soon as they project our soul as the centre of (ordinary) consciousness they, too, will not imagine the same space, even not the same characteristics of stretch and expansion. Considering branches of contemporary architectural drawing, a reflection of that space seems already virulent. However, saying that it has undergone a real sense of proper projection would be an exaggeration. To begin the necessary illustration and taking into consideration the architectural history of the second half of the last century, it seems quite clear that the \textit{umbauter Raum} (the enclosed or rebuild space) as related to the city has been subjected to profound revolution. In this view the skyscraper, the »Seagram Buildings«, is not just a large construction comprising a volume of the outer space but also, and in the same instance, a comprehensive design aiming at the organisation of the inner space. Notwithstanding any testimonials we are aware of as stemming from antiquity like the colosseum, the Roman catacombs or the pyramids, it is the modern increasing aggregation of mankind which provides the \textit{Anfangsgründe} (as the attitude towards the foundations has been called in the classical era\textsuperscript{21}), thus the need of reshaping the sense of architectural space: It \textit{has}, in its proper meaning, an impact on the interior space that not, having passed the entrance, once more is subject to mere externalisation.

Quite on the contrary, interior space as being evidenced through architectural investigation fulfills the sense, at least the intention, to express a form of collective internality or, in other words, a consciousness that is at once internal and general: A \textit{single} one, as has been questioned above, even if embracing a lot of individuals. So the overall glass sheath which arose with Mies van der Rohe and which nowadays seems such a familiar characteristic of contemporary city building is not just a common symbol of functional intelligence but also, in its core, the material proof of a membrane that quite necessarily has got an item, and issue, of experience and consideration. “Innen ist Außen ist Innen” (internal is external is internal), an architectural author recently has said, who believes that glass is the very material for the light upon which the organism has to rely. Seen by its aptness for architectural vision, glass architecture, he purports, should be able to fulfil the modern demand of “openness and communication capability”\textsuperscript{22}. But then, this openness and communication, as of being a real architectural feature, in order to reach concrete interpretation should not mean to make a continuous series of one’s passing the entrance, walking through the reception hall, huddling in the lift (or elevator) and eventually taking place at one’s desk in the office, a series, where always the outer space, its perception, is in the sense of reflection continuously bouncing off its internal counterpart. As there is no communication, no permeation between the parts, interiority as the centralization of internal space subsequently is transferred into absolute privacy or, to say it in
other words, into a form of non-existence preserved through both the regard and the habit of consciousness (that may approximate the sense of disavowal or tacit non-acknowledgement). So privacy and internality, on these peculiar grounds, achieve a new architectural significance their drafters are interactive with and responsible for. And if glass really is representative of a communicative material then the subject’s regions should get into a balance. Not only that it should signal its interiority as a sustained energy location within the resting outer place, that one which is already interior of the building borders and that one which comes in through the light and its content, but also that the architectural shape and design should provide for peculiar guidance to provide the location with all the, mingling or not, senses of openness, wideness, resort and, perhaps, even the snug or the PC cove. Orientation, as it is the very condition of spatial behaviour of the human mind, involves the inner sense that everywhere is performing the concrete counterpart upon which the architectural semantics just mentioned have to rely. To speak of ground and section is, necessarily, ambiguous and that means, irreducible. Extension and denseness are forming spatial concepts with a necessarily double meaning whose unit is not preserved by the interchange of space. The distance in one sense might be – sort of Cezanne-Van Gogh – a neighbourhood that on the other side comprises a large distance. And even if psychological features are involved to explain the difference of the personalities, the condition which calls for universal applicability must exceed them. So it is not the will, too, which is responsible for establishing the difference and its measure.

In consequence, the core of architectural space, by definition, is not the mere stratification of floors, equipped with a staircase to overcome gravity – which, on occasion, might remind us of a peculiar evolutionary outcome: The very property of the human stature to be erected and endowed with visuality (Herder, and the review of Kant)\textsuperscript{23}, not further analyzed on condition of projection here, but succinctly by Rudolf Arnheim\textsuperscript{24}. Also, it would not be helpful to look for the new brick (“la nouvelle brique”) that, forming the clue element of spatial organisation and developed on grounds of topological thinking, would allow the building of extended grids in a two, three or four-dimensional manner. Even if the necessary welding of nods is sometimes acclaimed as providing the measure “to compose all the organs of a light building” (D.G.Emmerich), its range, like any of the cardinal geometries, is limited to the outer space that\textsuperscript{25}, regarding the models, absorbs internality.\textsuperscript{26} Instead architectural space has to be conceived of as a design in with each location should indicate its balanced relation to the overall building. So far, such a penetration, or permeation, of architectural space we perhaps know best from modern museums, libraries, concert halls or, an interesting feature of the contemporary city life, the shopping mall that, involving multiple basement and cinemas, is a substitute of the old town plaza.

It does not fall short of the inquiry that with this same intention, and forming the fringe, the flair of the old fairgrounds is coming up or, quite on the contrary, impressions of a maze or a silent corner\textsuperscript{27}. Even if, cited from a book about the anatomy of the town, the “public space does no longer carry out the common history” so that, “on the most part, we have lost the feeling of a common fate”, then, on the other side, “we are still willing to linger among other people, at least to behold them during their taking a walk”\textsuperscript{28}. That lingering as it is existential and, probably often, silent communication seems to fulfil the core concept of internal space, its very condition and central meaning. And it shows that, being successful, it should prove the economical endeavour, too. There are already firms furnishing the interior space of business buildings – interior still in the outweighing traditional sense – with mobile working places endowed with the computer, a desk and an angled glass sheath that, belonging to the construction cell, is equipped with rollers in order to make the whole space of the office area permeable. The architect, Hadi Teherani, purports that it is the feeling of privacy, of having a place for oneself coupled with mobility and transparency which, compared with the beach chair, provides for openness and the crucial factor of emotional wellness\textsuperscript{29}. In fact, the
instrumental, quasi lensical way to connect outer and inner space provides for focussing the realms, and ranges, of consciousness as to its signification of the inherent membrane without, as it seems, any constraint. It can be left open if that in some sense playful organisation meets the existential need. However, the membrane as the centre of activity should not be mixed up with neutrality (as indifference or even non-existence). A town life, where architects are aware of the coupled meaning of the membrane that in the same way separates and trades the subject, cannot surrender itself to “the gift of sterilization” (Sennett)\textsuperscript{30}. Obviously, it would contradict its existential condition where the provision of privacy has to be as real as that of assembling: The pavement and lingering, the bar, the bath and plunging into the crowd are specific features of town life that represents interiority. Considering the avenue-boulevard or the shopping mall it, as it seems, still does not exclude being experienced by driving in a car\textsuperscript{31}.

In further consequence, if switching from outer to inner space involves a real projection even if their dimensions are, on the whole, of heterogeneous kinds, then it seems quite reasonable that an American landscape architect, William Morris, investigates into it, and tries to promote the sense of infrastructure. The subject being the citizen (citadin) and the statistical individual has to be interchangeable even if their simultaneous conjunction involves a far-reaching theoretical loop well known from, p.e. and in practice, recent ‘participatory budgeting’ on the community level\textsuperscript{32}. So instead of maintaining the traditional separation of utilities, working and housing, Morris claims that a superimposition, in the long run, is both affordable and economical, thus competitive with mechanical engineering\textsuperscript{33}. The effort, as one might conclude from description and diagrams, relates space to the subsoil canalisation and irrigation, to the perceivable road map, the factory sites and utility plants, further to gardens, the public greens and the forest as fencng the town. It should promote an overall sphere, where dots of the outer area consistently have a repercussion on dots of the inner one, and the reverse. Hence the so-called nature-culture interface, the more or the less, is getting into differentiation\textsuperscript{34} so that everywhere the spot, location, and distance achieve a forthright coupled meaning that still has to be called natural (or explicitly non-virtual): On the one hand, it comprises the functional array of all the outer items, their shaping and manifestation of self-enclosure, or their being designed to express self-being in a form of such one (as a museum box, a fortress, or an administration building), on the other, this same pertinent interface calls for subverting one’s inner location as sharing the place, or for being the real reason of one’s having the feeling that one’s interiority is involved as a real feature of the place. The alternation to be real, and not just an aesthetic, moral or psychological feature (as the traditional claim would be) should not be independent of architectural purpose. And one’s habit in leasing an office building or renting a flat will stand in the same focus of evidence, too.

For the moment, this coincidence cannot be carried out as a conclusive projection (in any Desarguesian, or Pascalian sense) that would take into account the human or animal consciousness subject to actual perception. Its determination, as being given, should not be doubted yet. Lingering or assembling (as soon as there is a function allied) is a well known feature of the public space that since antiquity has been forming a stream of architectural history. Alberti recommends a proportion of two times the length as to the width of a place, and reconsiders the height of the conjunct building(s): Too large, the plaza seems “void”. In the same sense Camillo Sitte as a critic of the urbanisation design of post-imperial Vienna rebukes that giant free areas, arising around the inner ramparts, as well as public buildings that are being constructed at the Ringstrafte have lost their fixed shape and adequacy\textsuperscript{35}. Otherwise, in America the relation of the lofty house and its conjunct plaza has led to a legislature that makes several prescriptions in consideration of enlargement of the pavements, the cafes and their clients, possible ornamentation such as little ponds and their planting, up to ‘rooms under the open sky’ whether embedded into the street scene or [designed] as intimate minia-
tura parks. This last suggestion, the concrete exchange of interiority, is also the topic of design of an example of an ambitious bank building stamped by the engineering of high-tech-architecture. The Foster Associates, Ove Arup and Partner delivered a construction to the building principal, the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank, that features “office packages” secured to an outward scaffolding that has the function to arc the common floors.

The commentary underlines the “conspicuous externalisation”, even if under the topic of functionalism savings of space and the construction period were taken into consideration. Aesthetics, too, if they have to rely on the triad of Commodity, Firmness and Delight, seem to get under scrutiny. Following an implication, William Hayes is referring to the credo of modern architecture that takes delight for granted if the condition of firmness and commodity is fulfilled. From the photograph and its description one should conclude that, considering the storage character, delight should relate far more to the user and (occasional) dweller than to the beholder, if it really is involved under the same category as the luxury construction. On the whole, this should hint upon both the semantics and shifting of existential meaning architecture has got in the contemporary realms of expressing the internal-external relationship.

To conclude the reflection of standards, it should be clear that in relation to the universality of the relation architecture requires a philosophy of housing that does not polarize or even overextend the family’s or occupant’s privacy. That, too, is the tenor of a recent account of modern standards in regard of quality demands. According to the author, H. Großhans, man as “standing in the midpoint of architectural effort” does no longer relate to “a flat as the epitome of being for oneself in privacy” (“Das ‘Wort ‘Wohnung’ wurde zum Inbegriff privaten Fürsichseins”) instead, he advocates the dynamic and variable conception of the virtual ‘cell’, the location, where subjects with starkly different social affinities may linger and communicate in order to avoid any conflict. Under such condition nation-wide building regulations, he purports, have to be regarded as “desperate, even counter-productive”. Even if there are minimum requirements, successful architecture as the comprehensive equipment for permanent dwelling does not rely on DIN-features that have to be conceived by square meters and additional terms designated to spell out the convenient modern “Gesellungsformen” (socializing forms that are apt to make up a group such as the single, the pair, family, the civil union and so on). In essence, and abstracting from any peculiar needs such as of the elderly, the sportive, the pastime craftsman and his or her private religious entreaction, the designer of modern architecture should “question the administrative provision” and, aiming at furtherance of communication and avoidance of conflict, should take into account the results of psychological investigation that tell several stories as to the dweller’s needs of being satisfied regarding his or her “safety, self-realisation and self-expression”.

The Philosophical Conclusion

In order to come to an end, and to reflect the question of real projection, we take a transient stand on the counter-side that should relate to the power of appearance. By doing this, we might remember the Japanese Tadao Ando who had the aspiration to realize a form of
asceticism that is being vested by the church room through transformation of its characteristics, closed walls, into the modern city life. As though forming an instance of more or less tacit reception, we find the following passage in a recent article by Herbert Muschamp (The New York Times):

“Little lofts. Little SoHo lofts that died and went to heaven. That is one entrancing image that the museum's exterior brings to mind. The contemporary city is a search for the philosopher's stone capable of transforming rust into the life of the mind”.

It is “a lunchbox for modern art”, the editor says for the sake of the building’s constructive idea to tower seven closed zinc skinned cases one upon the other. And he is wondering if, located at a busy Soho street corner, adjacency will be fulfilled. But he takes into consideration that, anew, “Sanaa's design can be seen as an expression of a continuing project to transform the aggressive energies of modern life into states of desire”.

Has opening, and openness, of a building, one of the most important features of modern architectural theory, to be regarded as an aesthetical one? Reflecting history with the help of Hayes, it should be secondary: Continuously to be resolved with delight and commodity. The answer of Sanaa, however, would perhaps not be the same. It is all the interiority which provides openness. Once, you have to come inside. However, then, we would have to rely on real polarity, and a shift that, on the whole, is settling with one, and only one, focus. Openness has evaded being subject to material walls. Taking up the ‘philosopher’s stone’, we might remember the German 18th century scholastic Christian Wolff who taught that, regarding the soul’s nature and essence, all the experience which is provided by the different human faculties should be taken as the touchstone. “A l'inverse, ce qui est ici enseigné n’est en aucune manière la pierre de touche de ce que l'expérience nous enseigne” [On the contrary, what is taught here in no manner is the touchstone of what experience is teaching us]. The location of ‘here’ signifies rational psychology, thus the general characteristics and the nature of the soul. That chapter, according to Thierry Arnaud, takes for proven that another experience is well confirmed. The formula of it reads in the following way that we are well conscious of ourselves and of other things. If it is true, immediately and even “irrefutably” true, then this formula proves the transparency of mind.

From the beginning, we have investigated into the relation that is upholding this truth, and we have taken for granted that the other things – in particular their architectural outfit –, and what might be the other subjects, too, recall immediately our interior consciousness. It seems quite reasonable that, regarding that epoch, Wolff’s metaphysics are standing under the influence of his predecessor, Leibniz, who in a peculiar sense both fortified and denied the claim we just named the transparency of mind. On one side, he taught that a monad that is a substance or an entity to embark life on its own force (vis) is an infinite, immediate and continuous reflection of the universe. On the other side, he taught that same entity, being quasi spiritual or mentally existent, is indivisible, has no spatial extension and also has no window to traverse its virtual borders. In confirmation, we uphold the infinite – actually indefinite – reflection, but by the same reason we contradict the view that the existential focus of mind, its interiority, has no proper spatial extension. Seen from his characteristics, where several times he defines space as “extensum purum absolutum [!]” and explains the finite surface, line and body as including an infinity of entities of the respectively next lower dimension, the point
given as *determinate* (if not finite) should, at least, comprise his own infinity, now the interior one. That Van Gogh and Cézanne are working in calling distance, that otherwise comprises “another time and distance”, does not simply prove a psychological feature, even if psychology, its emotional and intellectual content, is coincident with or, to say it in Aristotelean terms, is playing the role of a co-effective cause.

By its essence, this fundamental extension of consciousness is not the same as that of the outer space. But it is obvious that projection, which, as it seems, is one of the utmost important natural powers our mind is endowed with to make it apt to understand spatial distance, is also the most salient natural device to understand interiority. Therefore, we leave the historical discussion with, in particular, Leibniz, as he did not engage philosophy (and mathematics) with the concept, the meaning and consequences of projection, in spite of several instances he referred to the *point of view* in order to describe the metaphysical situation of a monad (as the substance or simple thing). It actually does not yield and rely on a projective relation, i.e. perspective, in compliance with the convenient university teaching, and interpretation, on both sides, that of Leibniz and that of perspective or perspectivity on the mathematical side. By the way, Wolff is silent on this issue saying that “yet [...] at the moment we do not want to determine in what the fact really consists that the internal state of the simple things relates to all [the others] in the world”. Therefore he does not render an answer to the epistemic question, too, how knowledge of all the substances is established if otherwise, according to Leibniz, all the experience of the world is secondary in relation to perception, i.e. phenomenal. Further, how consciousness would have to be imagined if, according to his formula, *other things* as (an) instance(s) of consciousness itself, thus “spiritual substance[s]”, are coincident with the perceiving one.

Taking projection as the clue, we fundamentally rely on an existential or immediate relation. There is no level of appearance required, no necessary *Schein* to ultimately and unavoidably impose upon the human mind that renders the world against, or across, consciousness as the common source of all the faculties (like seeing, the odour, audition, feeling, thinking, remembering, the wit and acumen). Hence, regarding the immediate reflection of the universe on the mind, we want to say, on one side, but not from beginning and not in its totality, it explains the denseness of interiority (what Hegel named the *Innerlichkeit*). But this presupposes that, as underlined above, the relation of outer space and interiority, as it involves the entire individual consciousness, includes the mental membrane. The core meaning of mind is, as being a consciousness, to be a membrane, too. So any perception is witnessing the, more or less, slight clash and mediation of this existential condition.

Finally, on these grounds the architectural explanation of interiority should become both tangible and possible. There really is no window in the sense of the grid, the Renaissance painters and architects applied to their drawings to become familiar with the transformation of projective shape. But that opening and widening of interior stretch, which describes denseness and the identification of placement where one feels to be as, taken together, the interior movements of consciousness, do not recall and stand in possible relation to the outward expansion of the world and its situation should provide the false assumption: Interiority, as dependent upon the membrane, in no sense of denseness and peculiar stretch is an absolute one. So it is impossible that there is no interior fundamental extension upon which these movements are taking place. In order to explain this necessary difference, let us take up an illustration. It stems from an advertisement. Think as the observer of a seaside situation, that is alike that one in the ending of Pascal’s treaty *De L’Esprit Géométrique*, where a vessel is vanishing into the horizon manifesting a sensation of real infinity. There is also a photographer who is playing your mediator. He is taking up a series of zooming clips (photographic positions) which render different distances of the overall seaside, which you are not able to
look through unless all the parts, i.e. clips with their appertaining shape as a peculiar section of the whole, are composed in order to form one single view. The claim is, each clip (photographic section or spot) substantiates the very range of the membrane (which, at least, is relying on the light wave, but energy as composing consciousness should not be restricted to its condition in the sense of relativity). And, second, the situation as a whole has to be traversed into immediate consciousness so that its interiority is also forming a substantial array of membranous evolution and constitution. So self-consciousness which is dependent on the latter renders distance and clearances, but under its ordinary stance it does not, unlike the last, constructive clip situation, provide an overall interior transparency. This, on the contrary, seems absolutely subject to contemplation, i.e. a sort of deliberate action as also a form of meditative suspension we got acquainted with at the beginning of this section. Regarding that issue, religion, with no further comment, goes to the limit: Absolute transparency, the temple, or absolute enclosure, the cathedral vault. In any case between, which is forming the condition of our town housing, we realize that each spatial situation built and located in the outer world has a natural influence on the interior stretch of consciousness that is necessary to form and to realize its membranous condition, quite similar to the frame a clip as a zooming photographic section provides. And as a relation that is part of the projective nature it is constituted by cardinal impression, before consciousness has begun to reflect from its own ground.

From this supposition we should sum up. If we regard outer space, the projective claim will be coincident with the interior stretch of the membrane, the meaning of distance we should provide our pure interiority with. While recounting the history of creation, even Plato thought of incidentally in Timaios57. As soon as the gods enclosed the inner fire of the human being in his eyes, he was impressed by inner movements and states of quietness (sleep). However, he had images whose modes of being engendered can be explained by mirrors and things that are alike (45d-46a). It is “easily to understand”, Plato says, that by reason of the “reciprocal unification of the inner and outer fire” and the fact that, “in addition, each time a unique fire originates on the smooth plane that has changed its form in many respects, all such things are necessarily mirroring each other, because the fire taking its departure from the face mixes itself up with that of seeing [i.e. the outer fire] at the plane of the shining and smooth” (46a-b). This passage, which also contains the influence of the light rays on the interpretation of reciprocal situation can be regarded as a Platonian source of projection58. But his philosophy has never made any diversion to the Euclidian meaning of geometry, and consequently space. History had to wait for the Renaissance, Desarguesian and Pascalian, and the geometries of the nineteenth century, in order to obtain mathematical explanation of projective space59. Now taking up again our example, and if we are not actual spectators, the condition of membrane does not end, so we are not confronted with “nothing”, as Kant purports two times in the transcendental aesthetics60. Quite on the contrary, we should conclude that in this case the evolution of the membrane totally depends on interiority. Its dimension, if any, and measure is starkly different. If “Van Gogh, then, was living and working within calling distance of Cézanne at this time, [but ] speaks of him as if he were a painter of another place and time”, it should be clear that he entirely relies on his interiority in a non-psychological sense (which, again, might be involved, too). That means, at least he did not handle the interior evolution of his membrane in such a way to let it be coincident with the outer one in regard to Cézanne. Thus, in analogy to the seaside situation an explanation is given where the cusps of the membrane stretch entail consciousness, awareness, and two persons, and the ratio of interior to exterior space is getting diaphane, that is a moment of transparency.

Epilogue
“The meanings are those of an accidental encounter with fragments of our awareness”. Taken as an aphorism, one perhaps would not devise the author, a man of literary studies, a writer, or a psychologist. The situation, however, deceives because it is an architect, Daniel Libeskind, who made this comment on his own works. Once, with a series of drawings named “chamber music”, he made the public acquainted with the possibility to reach multidimensional intuition and related drawing within the architectural legacy of representational equipment that comprises plan(s), dots and lines. Those music pieces do not design a common building, but the entanglement of compartments and situations that belong to. The space Libeskind bans on the drawing paper, or in real buildings, is, per anticipative declaration, not homogenous. But the heterogeneity, then, does not relate to projective space, to curvature or the hemisphere. It is stemming from the source, consciousness itself is providing for space so that even a dot, or a line, might, and really must, interpret space. At first, the meaning of space is coming from its interior vesting, and its commonness, or universality, is, as we know from his buildings, immediately connected with the volatility of space and its essential arbitrium. So space is settling with semantics, and it has lost its reliance on pure visuality. From the metaphysical standpoint which has been advocated here the membrane has altered. It has been withdrawn from the continuous border of outer and inner space to the border consciousness has in itself. Therefore, according to Libeskind, it must be at once satisfied, and sometimes merely drenched (in what sense so ever), with signification related to common history. Space, as he himself purports, therefore is phenomenal, more, in a sense well understood, “phenomenological”, and that means in its essence it has to prove the ‘shears’ of the “voluntary” and the “involuntary”. The grid, however, we referred to, and the corresponding transparency of mind, is not arbitrary. It by no means has altered its seat within the border-axis of outer and inner space to now become representative of the subjective reason which reflects or even projects common history as experience. Quite on the contrary, it claims for universality that has to be taken in anticipation.

1 * The author is thankful to Allison Ritchie for linguistic advice. He also is grateful to the chief editor, Angus Johnston, for several valuable hints to make this text ready for publication.


Henri Bergson, *Mélanges*, ch. III: *De la Nature du temps*, Paris: Presses Universitaires 1972. Concerning measurement, he didn’t make any comment on natural clocks like the musical bar, or on mechanical clocks as a chronometer that is not designed to measure a light wave.


Regarding recent work, this, and the membrane nature, makes us claim against the non-spatiality of consciousness, together with asking for the conditions of coincidence as will become clear from the following (Colin Mcginn, “Bewusstsein und Raum. Der Ort von Bewußtsein” [Consciousness and space. The location of consciousness], in Hans Ulrich Baumgarten (Ed.), *Erkenntnistheorie*, Freiburg/München: Alber 1999, pp.171-193, esp.177.

As regards Leibniz, he named it *initia* and not *characteristics*, even if his *Initia rerum mathematicarum metaphysica* and his characteristics overlap (G.W.Leibniz, *la caractéristique géométrique*, texte établie, introduit et annoté par Javier Echeverría, Paris 1995, and GM VII, pp.17-29).
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