**A rethinking of the sound phenomenon:** If we are to relate the domains of architecture and music, a good starting point might be their commonalities: starting from the most general claim of all, they are both essentially the product of human interaction with the sensible world, through the systematic repetition of acts that influence matter directly as their object. In music, this act is the creation of a vibrating body, the instrument, that produces a movement of air molecules and thus the propagation of a sound wave, while in architecture this act is the repurposing of existing matter. These acts themselves constitute a performance, their outcomes an artifact. Here we encounter a limit of terminological nature: while the object of artistic acts is, in all cases, matter, the phenomenon of “sound” is understood to be, in conventional circumstances, completely immaterial. That is because, given the leading ideal of Music the west looks towards, artistic value is placed solely in the formal and systematic aspect of music-making, and far less on the embodied component of music. The focus, in other words, is focused solely on the study and systematization of vibrational events, and not at all on the physical causal chain that leads to the production of such a vibration. Throughout musical education, the very crucial aspect of the relationship between one’s physicality and the vibration (and, therefore, sound) that they produce through their instrument is not wholly absent, but because the only available means for its accurate description rely on the explanation of the very complex series of mechanical and kinetic changes that leads to sound production (of which acoustics is only a miniscule part), its grasping is difficult, and often inconsequential to the practical act of music making, which cannot knowingly be informed by this type of mathematical knowledge. The way in which it is introduced into education, then, is seen as something completely separate from the afore mentioned body of knowledge, to some extent a sympathetic approach to sound production, in the sense that it infers the cause of a certain sound from one’s personal experience of embodiment. What I mean to say by this is that by looking inwardly at the way we understand our body to function, and looking outwardly at the way we understand our instrument to function (though instrument and body are, in some cases, identical), we are able to infer, more or less accurately, what kind of action produced a certain sound.

This incredible faculty which we possess, probably solidified through the observation of the link between certain actions and certain sounds in early humans, makes it possible for all sound phenomena to be understood by us as the product of a certain physical cause, which is then inferred through empirical knowledge and, in the case of musical events, through self-reflection on the possibilities of one’s own body in relationship to a specific instrument. Phonic events are treated by humans as signifiers, whose content is the embodied act from which they originate. Although this does not mean that phonic events contain in them their physical cause, their perception creates in us the idea of such a cause, and a greater extent of experience of phonic events, or a deeper understanding of the relationship between one’s body and their instrument, grants the spectator a better and more detailed understanding. This is particularly evident in the practical approach to timbre and grace-notes applied in the teaching of an instrument.

In recognizing the very particular process involved in human perception of sound, we are able to relate it, once again, to matter, as its *grain*, as Roland Barthes would call it, is **ever** present and perceivable. This solves a very practical problem, namely that we readily accept the fact that architecture is able to act on all of our senses at once (as long as one is excited at the idea of licking a Greek Temple), but claiming the same for music is somewhat contemptuous. Through this definition of sound, we are able to give back to it its spatial quality, which makes it infinitely easier to reason on analogies between the two Muses.

**Rhythm, *via positiva* and *via negativa*:** I was really struck by your idea of rhythm in architecture, and I guess the following paragraph will try and kind of explain what immediately clicked with me. The Greek “*rhythmos*” speaks above all of organization (its most basic form being repetition), something relevant to music and architecture alike. Since a musical act is nothing but a series of embodied actions that, through the use of an instrument as a vibrating string (or set of vibrating strings), produce a sound wave, and a musical performance is nothing but a series of musical acts, then it can be said that music deals in the production and perception of sound waves. The production of these sound waves, when organized through time, constitutes a rhythm. When it comes to its strictly visual component, architecture too can be said to deal in waves, in the sense that the matter repurposed through the creative act is perceived by our sensory organs in virtue of its reflection of light (**light is not just a wave though… how does that factor in? I don’t know!**). In making music one creates sound waves, and their timely organized production constitutes rhythm. In the creative act of architecture, namely the repurposing of existing matter and its accumulation or removal (**I know it’s a very brutal way to put it, doesn’t really do architecture justice**), one creates an obstacle for light to be reflected from, and in repeating these creative acts in an organized way, rhythm is likewise created.

**Space and time in music and architecture:** Our experience of both music and architecture, long as we abide with the way they have been deformed above, are then inextricably related to both spatial and temporal realities. Most obviously, in the case of music, because sound waves are understood through two most basic parameters: their amplitude (the amount of air they move, and subsequently, their spatial dimension) and their frequency (the amount of oscillations in a given interval of time), and are themselves extended objects propagating over time. The musical phenomenon, then, is understood to be the unfolding of (spatial) phonic events through the time of the composition’s execution. The object of architecture, then, is extended matter, meaning objects that occupy a specific place as well as a specific time. This matter is then organized, and the result is a certain portion of space being allocated, for a certain amount of time, to it. The architectural phenomenon, then, is understood to be a certain portion of space being allocated to a certain block of matter, inhabiting both time and space, the experience of which presupposes the movement over time of the spectator.

**Bodies and Bodily Functions to which followed Function as Shape as Dance**

No music would be, were there not a body. Any body is equivalent to an instrument. A shape, a hollow shape, a vibrating, hollow shape. Made to swing when in agitated, irritated, alived. Whether it is a person singing, a guitar, a violin or a flute, there is a body. The body itself is inhabited by rhythm. Visually; Visually it is inhabited by rhythm. No; by harmony.

We deduct. Harmony is something acoustic, it is inherently natural and inherently mathematical. Through the epiphany of this sound being mathematical, it reaches shape, not yet body, shape. This shape is found in naturally grown subjects, such as plants, beehives, animal’s bodies. It is as if the worldly music has sieved into its creatures and all that is alive is engaging in a dance. We falsely call it proportion, but it is harmony. From this we deduct harmonic proportions. Instruments, the smallest form of architecture, most clearly showcase these harmonic proportions. Tact and melody a musical proportion – harmony – are recognizable before the first tone comes out of this instrument.

I will let other people think this thought through until the end: instruments are architecture and perhaps all architecture is an instrument. Every instrument appears different depending on what kind of dance it is supposed to produce. Every instrument is perfect, yet incomplete as with one instrument alone one cannot produce any sound.

As a final note on this subject: Even though the instrument itself is inherently harmonic, it still takes knowledge to produce a harmonic dance with it.

**Beware the architectonics**

As they are nothing else than a recipe. Not a result, a way only, to look at something. A guide which helps one solve one riddle, not all. Beware also: architectonics are not architecture.

One of many architectonics is the mathematical solution of harmonics. The mathematical solution of harmonics is not yet a sound.