freedom to treat the envelope of buildings independent of their functional aspects, and a taste for a certain amount of disorder (by comparison with the strict order imposed by Modernist design principles). Stirling's work of the mid-1970s is considered postmodern in spirit by many observers. Regardless of whether or not he saw himself as a postmodern architect, he evidently felt that he was doing something new and different (also as compared to his own former work) that would not be understood unless he employed the appropriate measures to explain it to the public.

When reconstructing the memory of his design pursuit pertaining to the German museums, it was important to Stirling that the design story should be told, which returns us to the design narrative and its expression as presented and analyzed in this discourse. Stirling did not invent new representational means, nor did he feel the need to use ex-architectural media, as we may arguably call some of the notations employed by other postmodern architects a little later on.[10] Stirling's choice of representational substance was straightforward and utilized the material his office routinely worked with, including the tiny doodles and the abstract up and down axonometric views. The novelty rested in the decision to give priority to concept over factual description, to process over product, and to use for this end all available resources, including the public display of preliminary "raw" material that is normally made for internal consumption only. A generation later the architectural community worldwide conceives of Stirling's German museums in terms of both the built Staatsgalerie in Stuttgart and the publications of the 1970s. One has an image of the designs that is strongly impacted by the memory that Stirling had reconstructed for us, which would have had a presence and been influential even if the Staatsgalerie had never been built at all. It seems safe to assume that, had Stirling lived to witness the long-lived success of his representational choices, he would have been pleased, of course, but our guess is that he would have already been searching for ways to reconstruct a new genre of architectural memory.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. We use the name Stirling to refer to the architectural office of James Stirling and Michael Wilford, who was an equal partner in the firm, as well as other associates in the office.
2. "Stirling in Germany, the architects' report", *The Architectural Review*, CLX(957): 289–296, November 1976.
3. James Stirling and Partner, *Landesgalerie* Nordrhein-Westfalen in Düsseldorf, James Stirling and Partner with Werner Kreis, Robert Livesey, Russ Bevington, Ueli Schaad; the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne, *Lotus International* 15: 58–67 and 68–79 respectively, 1977.
4. *Architectural Design* 47, (9–10), 1977: xx–61.

5. We did not find the diagrams in publications of the 1980s. Tzonis and Lefaivre (1992) published schematic drawings for the State Gallery project in Stuttgart and called them "conceptual diagrams" (ibid., p. 126). In Wilford, Muirhead and Maxwell (1994) the drawings are called "schematic down and up views" (ibid., pp. 58, 62).
6. At present Stirling's remaining sketches are being collected and archived. This endeavour is still in progress (Wilford 2000).
7. Various sequences of sketches and abstract diagrams for the German projects were published in the 1970s and 1980s by *Architectural Design (AD)*, *Lotus*, *Architecture and Urbanism (A+U)*, and *The Architectural Review*. It is important to point out that it was not accidental that these particular magazines were the ones to herald a new approach to representation of architectural images. According to Nesbitt (1996), the magazines *AD*, *Lotus* (founded in 1963), and *A+U* (established in 1971) had some of the same architects on their editorial boards, were among the independent magazines and academic journals that shared a "response to the professional crisis in modern architecture" (ibid., p. 23), and promoted new cultural sensibilities.
8. In Schinkel's building, however, the circular space had a roof over it.
9. Our thinking in this respect is not unlike that of Frédéric Pousin (1995), who addresses the appearance of new forms of architectural representation. In his view, new representational practices come into being when a need arises to rewrite history. Accordingly, architectural representation is not only prescriptive but also descriptive, and in this capacity it is used to express architectural thought both as a medium of conceptualization and the expression of doctrinarian thought. Pousin exemplifies his arguments through an analysis of Leroy's 18th-century work on the ruins of Greek temples.
10. We refer to notations used by Libeskind, Hadid, Tschumi and others.

References

Anderson, S 1984. Architectural design as a system of research programmes. Design Studies 5(3):146–150.

Arnell P and T Bickford, eds. 1984. James Stirling: Buildings and projects. New York: Rizzoli.

Arnheim, R 1969. Visual thinking. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Attneave, F 1971. Multistability in perception. Scientific American 225:62–71.

Baker, J 1992a. James Stirling and the promenade architecturale. The Architectural Review 191:72–75.

Baker, J 1992b. Stuttgart promenade. The Architectural Review 191:76–78.

Bois, Y-A 1981. Metamorphosis of axonometry. Daidalos no.15:41–58.

Chambers, D and D Reisberg 1992. What an image depicts depends on what an image means. Cognitive Psychology 24:145–174.

Colquhoun, A 1984. Democratic monument. The Architectural Review 176(1054):19–22.

Curtis, WJR 1984. Virtuosity around a void. The Architectural Review 176(1054):41–44.

Evans, R 1997. The developed surface: An enquiry into the brief life of an eighteenth-century drawing technique. In Translation from drawing to building and other essays edited by R Evans. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp 195–232.

Fish, J and S Scrivener 1990. Amplifying the mind's eye: Sketching and visual cognition. Leonardo 23:117–126.

Gardner, H 1980. Artful scribbles. New York: Basic Books.

Girouard, M 1998. Big Jim: The life and work of James Stirling. London: Pimlico.

Goldschmidt, G 1991. The dialectics of sketching, Creativity Research Journal 4(2):123–143.

—— 1992. Serial sketching: Visual problem solving in designing. Cybernetics and Systems (23):191–219.

Goodnow, J 1977. Children drawing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gössel, P and G Leuthäuser 1991. 20th century architecture. Köln: Taschen.

Herbert, DM 1988. Study drawings in architectural design: Their properties as a graphic medium. Journal of Architectural Education 41(2):26–38.

Jacobus, J 1975. Introduction to James Stirling: Buildings & projects 1950–1974 by James Stirling. London: Thames and Hudson.

Jencks, C 1982. Current architecture. London: Academy Editions.

Jones, E 1992. "Edward Jones" in Jim and I. The Architectural Review 191(1150):68–69.

Klevitsky, E 1997. Three dimensional composition in architectural education in the 20's: The Bauhaus and Vkhutemas schools. MSc thesis. Haifa: Technion – Israel Institute of Technology.