truthful, representation of the past. Perhaps this does not matter and is, in any case, a misguided effort. The past is not here to be mimicked but to be mined; it is there for our eye to see what may be relevant and to use it as a critical *starting* point of something new. An excessive interest in the correct and a desire to simply copy may make us miss what could in fact be relevant. An insistence on a verisimilitude which is not achievable and would always be spurious is certain to hinder imagination and invention. The renaissance may have been so innovative and so successful precisely because the evidence of the antique was so vague at its start.

We accept – not necessarily always consciously – that etchings, photographs, models, film or electronic simulations do not convey the whole reality of a building. Frank Gehry's Guggenheim has been illustrated in professional journals, Sunday colour supplements and shown on television, yet the pilgrimage to Bilbao continues unabated. It is as if we had to touch the building to experience it fully.

Walter Benjamin and others have discussed the pitfalls of re-presentation. Ivan Gaskell, for instance, in his book on a single picture by Vermeer, *Woman Standing at a Virginal* of 1672 describes how a mid-19th century etching of the painting makes the woman avert her eyes. This was to have it conform with contemporary convention which held that only courtesans gazed back (Gaskell, 2000, p.135). We become aware that there has been some interference, that this is not a simple and total correspondence between the original and the re-presentation. In architecture, as in verbal translations between languages, this is in any case an impossibility; if there were total correspondence, it would be a clone of the original building.

As often as not the problem is that the medium of re-presentation is unable to replicate or even mimic the characteristics of the original. This is particularly acute in the case of architecture. Buildings are as a rule experienced by a moving observer, even if that observer stops from time to time to give particular attention to some space or detail. This sequential viewing of images necessitates movement through space as crucial to the total experience. Even if there is no muscular movement, as say by an observer in a wheelchair, the need to travel through a building and to have to refocus the eye continually is a vital element of our perception. There is as yet no adequate reproduction of that kinaesthetic experience. It depends very considerably on being at full scale; computer 'fly-through' simulations or views within a three-dimensional model are sensed differently, as has already been suggested, not least because the eye is at a constant focus and does not have to