

we did there.” Then he’d make a modification and see where something was appropriate. Wherever a precedent existed, we would test it ourselves. Sometimes nothing existed, or sometimes there was a little sketch or drawing that had never been worked out in all of its glory for every situation, like his grouping of switches.’

It could be objected that what Marshall Meyers remembers is a case of pure expediency; it just saves time and money to look up something that exists. The phrase ‘had developed his own vocabulary and his own details’ hints, however, that that is too simple an explanation. It would be tempting to conclude that details have more extended validity than general form but the conclusion would be faulty. As Meyers explained in the same interview:

‘The earlier Yale project started as a take-off of Kimbell, a one sided situation with this vault, light coming in from the side.’

There is a model of the March 1971 submission which shows the top floor as a series of vaults as if the Kimbell, then under construction, had been lifted up and placed on top of a three storey building. Cost cutting eventually led to the design which was built. It was the ‘error elimination’ stage as in so many other projects. There was a return to the  $P_1$  with an altered problem recognition.

Kahn had also said in an interview in 1972 that:

‘It is also true that in the work completed is the mass of qualities unexpressed in this work which waits for the opportunity to release. I would never feel bored to be given a commission similar to the one I just did – just executed? just satisfied? or maybe “just did” is better ...’  
(McLoughlin, 1991, p.312)

$P_1$  to  $P_2$  is not surprisingly an iterative process in the work of any architect.

Some architects have made statements which relate to both the initial problem recognition, the general approach to the project, as well as to the eventual forms which were adopted. Daniel Libeskind is one of these. His descriptions are extensive and confirm his belief that buildings need a story, a narrative that informs the design. His much discussed Jewish Museum is a case in point. Early on in a talk given at Hanover University on 5 December 1989, he said:

'I felt that the physical trace of Berlin was not the only trace, but rather that there was an invisible matrix or anamnesis of connections in relationship. I found this connection between figures of Germans and Jews; between the particular history of Berlin, and between

Below  
**Daniel Libeskind**, Jewish  
Museum, Berlin 1988–99;  
ground floor plan

