

# Landscaping Ecosystems or the Taste for a Nature in Ruins

**Smaranda Todoran**

Assistant Professor, PhD, Faculty of Architecture, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
arh.smaranda.todoran@gmail.com

**Keywords:** attachment; garden; pleasure; care; order; sense of time

## Introduction

As the ecological discourse is blooming in all areas of human culture, architecture finds itself at a crossroads. It needs to clarify, on the one hand, to what extent it may be responsive to ethical ideologies that translate into technical problems regarding low energy consumption, smart use of resources, low impact on the environment, and, on the other hand, to what extent it can be transformative and assume these matters in its own “autonomous” project. In the introduction to a collection of essays entitled *The Return of Nature. Sustaining Architecture in the Face of Sustainability*, the editors, Preston Scott Cohen and Erika Naginski, point towards the influence contemporary discourses on nature bear upon the architectural form. The dissolution and corrosion of form found in the paradigm adopted for the continuous plan of the unbuilt project for the Jussieu Library by OMA, would then be nothing else but the replication of a ruination process and the display of interest in how architecture (and culture) eventually dissolves at the hands of nature.<sup>1</sup> This example, as well as others referred to in the book (ranging from projects by Diller & Scofidio to Steven Holl) have to do with a new kind of return of nature, different from the natural inspiration translated into harmonic perfection (the Renaissance) or its reasoned imitation (Laugier’s Enlightenment).<sup>2</sup> Not only limited to the organization of the plan, the natural model is interesting for architects when dealing with the question of materiality and the aesthetics of the volume, as is the case of Jean Nouvel’s employment of vegetation in the layered façades of projects like the Museum of the Quai Branly or even earlier for the Cartier Foundation, as a material that transgresses contextualist and historicist architectural discourses.<sup>3</sup> Such translations might have a grounding in the new circumstances of the relationship between built form and natural environment that already since the 1970s were inviting authors like John Simonds towards a reflection on how we should reconsider and use the immense corpus of abandoned industrial sites as places of tension between culture and nature.<sup>4</sup> The interest in the vegetation of the wastelands as such is the first playground not for society in general or for architects, but rather for landscape artists and designers. As authors Desbussche, Lescarré and Lespart point out, while for the general rural and urban population the wasteland is first looked at with disappointment and worry – a feeling of failure of the economic system –, and for biologists it is as an occasion to study nature scientifically,<sup>5</sup> for landscape designers it represents the possible opening towards a renewed understanding

1 Preston Scott Cohen and Erika Naginski (eds.), *The Return of Nature. Sustaining Architecture in the Face of Sustainability* (New York, London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2014), 3.

2 Ibid.

3 Smaranda Todoran, “The Use of Vegetation as Expression of a Happy Memory in Jean Nouvel’s Recent Projects,” in *Urban Ecology, Water Quality and Climate Change*, ed. Arup K. Sarma (Cham: Springer, 2018), 29–38.

4 John Ormsbee Simonds, *Earthscape* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978).

5 M. Desbussche, J. Escarré and J. Lepart, “La friche, un champ de recherche fertile pour les biologistes,” *Pour la science* 188 (juin 1983): 12–13.



Fig. 1 No Title, photograph by Dan Coroian-Vlad, from the series entitled *Broken Flowers*

of the garden and of the landscape.<sup>6</sup> The way garden designers, following the modernist age of green space, look at in-situ vegetation might then be enlightening for the lessons drawn by architects in the production of architectural space and its theoretical implications. This premise is strengthened by a point of view reiterated throughout the history of the relationship between garden (park) and architecture: whether in Laugier's celebrated words, that present the park as a model for the town or the plan of a building,<sup>7</sup> or in Tschumi's more recent affirmation that gardens were always meant to anticipate architecture.<sup>8</sup> In this context, the paper tries to examine how the theoretical interest in wastelands and in-situ vegetation, often surrounding ruined architecture, may be translated into architectural discourse, and what are its consequences, beyond formal or visual aspects, on a larger, more transformative role of architecture in society.

6 Gilles Clément, "La friche apprivoisée," *Urbanisme* 209 (septembre 1985), 94.

7 Marc-Antoine Laugier (ed.), *Essai sur l'architecture. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, & augmentée ; avec un dictionnaire des termes, et des planches qui en facilitent l'explication. Par le P. Laugier, de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 1755.

8 Bernard Tschumi, "The Pleasure of Architecture," in *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965-1995*, ed. Kate Nesbitt (New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 539.





Fig. 2 No Title, photograph by Dan Coroian-Vlad, from the series entitled *Broken Flowers*

The paper tries to look at the ways the preference for ecosystem-inspired gardens in today's approach to garden design is relevant for architecture. Putting aside formal or spatial perspectives, the paper concentrates more on other aspects that may appear insightful. The question of emotion and pleasure brings forward the thin balance between order and disorder and discovers a way to link this balance to the question of temporality. In its turn, investigating matters of temporality reveals more understandings of the question of how architecture may create attachment, how pleasure and care relate and from what perspective these causal relationships can be interpreted. In a larger context, the question arises whether architecture is transformed by society, reflects transformations in society or informs a deeper understanding of its contemporary condition.

### Investigation

In order to see how the interest for in-situ plant species (manifest in today's landscape design) might influence architecture, the paper proposes to look at a set of texts accompanied by references to projects, whose authors are mainly architects or landscape designers, but also framed by philosophical points of view. Forming couples of texts with the same problematic,

they propose a change of angle that can bring nuances to the architectural discourse. The themes proposed for discussion are (1) the relationship between pleasure and order, following texts by Bernard Tschumi and Gilles Clément (that invoke both Ruskin and Michel Foucault), (2) the need for a different understanding of time, following texts by Jean Nouvel and Piet Oudolf, and (3) the continuity of the favor for ruins linked to the idea of the garden throughout Modernism, around the work of Karl Foerster and Karl Burle Marx. The intertwining of these themes is then explored in the findings of the paper, while possible conclusions are discussed, some in the form of reflections, others in the form of questions. What is at stake in the present investigation is the analysis of factual conditions of the present state of architecture, in an effort to stay alert to its implications within and outside the discipline itself.

### Pleasure and Order

In a 1970s essay, Bernard Tschumi discusses the continuous banning of pleasure from the field of architecture as an unresolved problem of the discipline.<sup>9</sup> It comes as the consequence of long-lasting debates on the opposition between order and disorder, ornament and purity of form, rationality, and sensuality – oppositions that have their origin, as Tschumi puts it, in the mythical figures of Apollo – the ethical and spiritual – and Dionysus – the erotic and sensual.<sup>10</sup> Their inheritance for architecture is the opposition between two sides of the discipline – one that is planned, organized, and conceptualized, the other that is unplanned, empirical, open to the experience of space.<sup>11</sup> A fascination for pleasure in architecture was sparked however during the Enlightenment, within the works of Capability Brown, William Kent, Jean Jacques Lequeu, Abbé Laugier or Giovanni Battista Piranesi. Their work is often linked to the garden as a form of resisting the late eighteenth-century obsession for order.<sup>12</sup> What creates pleasure in the garden of the eighteenth century is the combination between order and disorder, rationality, and sensuality<sup>13</sup> – as is the case with Kents's Stowe Gardens or Piranesi's drawn ruins. From the theoretical point of view, Ruskin's look at pleasure in terms of "delight" adds a nuanced dimension to the question of pleasure, as a necessary mission of architecture. In *Modern Painters*,<sup>14</sup> he defines the picturesque and the sublime as aesthetical categories where the irregular variety of compositions and the rugged texture of ruins are combined. Unruined Greek architecture is beautiful, nature is sublime, but ruins covered by vegetation are both<sup>15</sup> – and that represents the origin of pleasure. Even if his point of view is highly linked to matters of form and aesthetic categories, other texts, explored later in the paper, show how the combination ruin-vegetation is for Ruskin an opportunity to consider other missions of architecture related to the perception of time, the concept of memory and a deeper understanding of care. What also emerges by both Tschumi and Ruskin is how pleasure arises in architecture at a point where usefulness, another Vitruvian condition of the discipline, is obliterated: it is the lack of use that sparks the possibility of pleasure.<sup>16</sup>

In Tschumi's essay, the chronology of pleasure in architecture goes as far as the ruined villa Savoye in the sixties – an example of how sensuality had overcome even the most rational of buildings. The mutation from the conscious design of eighteenth-century gardens (where both

9 Ibid., 532.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid., 534.

12 Ibid., 535.

13 Ibid.

14 George P. Landau, *The Aesthetic and Critical Theories of John Ruskin* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961), 230–241.

15 Ibid, 239.

16 Tschumi, *The Pleasure of Architecture*, 535.

ruins and landscape were fabricated), to the process from which Savoye emerges, is not unlike the permutations Gilles Clément operates in both his projects and theoretical works, shedding light on the pleasure-order relationship in contemporary design. Clément's Henri Matisse Park in Lille creates ruins in a calm landscape of green meadows and bushes (ruins serve as the destabilizing element amidst an orderly vegetation), while The Garden of Interstitial Wildness at the ruined submarine base of Saint Nazaire makes use of labels as a means of balancing the rapport between disorder and order, sensual desertion, and scientific precision.

This careful balance between order and disorder, although not explicitly associated with the idea of pleasure, continues the tradition in which vegetation and ruins are a successful mix, and gardens are again the central figure. In *Le Jardin en Mouvement*, Clément says that "without any doubt, the history of the garden is particularly marked by the idea of order. It is in the garden – and only in the garden – that nature can be read in a particular order."<sup>17</sup> But what is the essence of this order? Especially when there are voices that affirm, looking at Clément's design, that it is the expression of disorder: "an ecologist's dreamworld of random pioneer growth on abandoned industrial sites,"<sup>18</sup> "no grass cleansing, no straight alley, an expansion, an accumulation, that adjusts and deregulates on its own."<sup>19</sup> The idea of order as apparent disorder can be understood in Clément's writings in relationship to the philosophy of Michel Foucault. It is remarkable that two of the landscape architect texts close on approximately the same phrase: the "friche" (wasteland) stands for an aesthetic incoherence that seems like a spark, a fugitive encounter with a bit of time.<sup>20</sup> This resonates with Foucault's affirmation in *Les Mots et les Choses*, that there is a worse disorder than that of things that do not go together; it is the disorder that sparks the fragments of many possible orders in all dimensions, without rule or Heteroclite geometry.<sup>21</sup> The possible linkage between the philosopher's and the landscape architect's understandings of order and disorder is developed by Danielle Degenais in her thesis<sup>22</sup> and may be seen as a *mise en actualité* of Tschumi's interrogation on pleasure. In contemporary landscape design, what is proposed through natural ecosystems is a disorder that comprises multiple possibilities of order, linked to the question of time. The question of time can be explored in relation to the theme of the paper when looking at other two authors, Jean Nouvel and Piet Oudolf.

### Time, Pleasure, and Care

In an interview at the occasion of the exhibition dedicated to his work at the Pompidou Center in 2001, the architect Jean Nouvel speaks about the necessity to integrate vegetation in architecture, to imbue it with a new dimension of time, one that is not traditionally associated to the built world: the ephemeral. It is important from the start to note how this interest in vegetation is less linked to matters of form or aesthetics, but rather to an avoidance of the image, as stated in a dialogue with Jean Baudrillard. Baudrillard declares that he is disappointed by image today, as it is too saturated, devoid of the possibility to create emotion.<sup>23</sup> Not unlike pleasure as discussed by Tschumi, vegetation is about fugacity, sensitivity, vibrance and emotions – and the use of vegetation in architecture alone makes possible to seize the confrontation between the ephemeral and the perennial.<sup>24</sup> Even more, the abandonment of

17 Gilles Clément, *Le Jardin en Mouvement* (Paris: Pandora, 1991), 15.

18 John Dixon Hunt, *The Picturesque Garden in Europe* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002), 210.

19 Anne Cauquelin, *Petit traité du jardin ordinaire* (Payot & Rivages, 2003), 145.

20 Clément, *La friche* apprivoisée, 91-95.

21 Michel Foucault, *Les Mots et les Choses* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), 9.

22 Danielle Degenais, *Écologie, structuralisme et art des jardins dans le discours du paysagiste français Gilles Clément (1943-)* (PhD diss., Université de Montréal, 2007).

23 Jean Baudrillard and Jean Nouvel, *Obiecte singulare*, trans. Ciprian Mihali (Bucharest: Paideea, 2004), 23.

24 Jean Nouvel. "Du Vegetal," in *Ateliers Jean Nouvel*. [Online] (April 15th 2011), <http://www.jeannouvel.com>, accessed April 15th 2021.

permanence and the admittance of the ephemeral condition and of the possibility to disappear is what allows degrees of familiarity, pleasure and emotion,<sup>25</sup> as Nouvel states in the same dialogue with the French philosopher. Again, this emotion can be corroborated with the lack of use – and Baudrillard develops this idea in his seminal work *The System of Objects*, when referring both to the old object and to the natural one – as they appear in the post-modern interior.<sup>26</sup> But this very emotion brings in again the matter of duration. For when a building becomes an object of desire, its admirers want it to last. A paradox is apparent here in terms of temporality, for while it is the fragility of the ephemeral that triggers pleasure, this fragility is also the trigger for a wish to make this pleasure last. A building will stand for so long as it will be loved,<sup>27</sup> Nouvel further says in the dialogue with Baudrillard, an idea to which the philosopher is reluctant because, in his opinion, anything can be loved. The sense of loving implied here in order to make the loved object last can be understood as a form of taking care of – as a prolongation of taking care for.<sup>28</sup> Nature in the garden is exactly that: nature cared of as long as it is cared for. But how does this change when nature is left wild? How does the fragility of the ephemeral that generates emotion become compatible with caring for and the possibility to entertain this care in time?

As to how wild vegetation makes this play of temporalities possible, it is interesting to look for a complementary point of view by Piet Oudolf's approach to planting design. His intervention on the High Line in New York is the perfect example of how an ecosystem that appeared on its own amidst the ruined rails can be the root and inspiration for garden design. Although the artist's interest in wild species has a lot to do with ecology, the question of time perception appears as an important theme when wild plants and settings are preferred to the formal ones. For the designer, signing off a wild garden project is, unlike that of a formal garden or of a built site, an act of letting go, of inviting a process to continue on its own, expecting nature to fulfill the work through its own specific processes.<sup>29</sup> This is emotional in its spontaneity and element of surprise, as opposed to the emphasis on control that anything that is finished presupposes (from formal gardens to architecture).<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, emotion comes from the wild garden, no longer the traditional place of controlling nature. The task of taking care of – that the term "maintenance" used by Oudolf implies – is delegated to nature itself. Translating the relationship ephemeral – love – wish to make last, can this mean an ultimate form of unselfish love, an acceptance of the lack of control, a lack of implication that is also a sign of detachment? And if this enters realms of possibility that go more into psychology, what are the implications in architecture? A lack of maintenance, does not translate the dissolution of boundaries between one order and another order into architecture, and does it not represent shifts in society apparent since postmodernity? The boundaries between chaos and order are effaced in a need for both possessiveness and detachment, trust and fear, pleasure and love.

### The Lingering Mood for Ruins

Marc Augé said in his *Time in Ruins*, that contemporary societies cannot produce ruins, not necessarily because they cannot be interesting aesthetically, but because we do not have time to produce them.<sup>31</sup> Corroborating his fears with Nouvel's and Oudolf's texts, vegetation than appears as a means of measuring time differently, of making time, of somehow delegating

25 Baudrillard, Nouvel, *Obiecte singulare*, 7.

26 Jean Baudrillard, *Le Système des objets : la consommation des signes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1968), 80.

27 Ibid., 52.

28 Edward Casey, *Getting back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993), 152.

29 Piet Oudolf and Noel Kingsbury, *Planting: A New Perspective* (Portland, OG: Timber Press, 2013), 12.

30 Ibid.

31 Marc Augé, *Le Temps en Ruines* (Paris: Galilée, 2003), 137.

control to the natural world. It is nature alone that can wildly manage its disappearance, it is only its disappearance that can be tolerated emotionally, as it is capable of regeneration on its own. Removing the human control from this process becomes the safest way to satisfy the need for both the fragile ephemeral and for the possibility of duration. Again, order and disorder are at play, not only in space, but also in time.

As a corollary to the above, a look at the relationship between natural ecosystems and gardens in modernism may be further illuminating. While modernism introduces the idea of green space as a form of annihilating the garden,<sup>32</sup> gardens as forms of approaching nature resist between the wars in at least two forms. The example of two landscape artists and architects can be relevant here. When looking at Karl Burle Marx's garden design, what is obvious from the beginning is the level of control imposed on vegetation. Like the paint in his paintings, plants are manipulated into a controlled form that requires extended care and the need for maintenance. Like paintings, gardens are resistant to change, aim at long-term duration and rely upon order alone as a condition of their existence. Even when it is the ecosystem of the jungle that is introduced in the garden, this is done obliterating the order of nature: the ecosystem is broken into pieces of controlled design, inspired by modern paintings.<sup>33</sup> This approach to the garden is a natural prolongation of modernist architecture: reason (and order as its design principle) governs beauty – and the garden is no exception. An understanding of time is also implied here, in junction with the idea of caring for. Such an orderly garden can exist and has been created only as far as there is a trust that it can be maintained by an assumed discipline (also a matter of internal order of the mind) for an indefinite amount of time. The consciousness of a finite time is obliterated here. It is not to say that time is not understood in its development, but what the orderly garden relies upon as a condition of its existence is the possibility that it may last and not the possibility that it may disappear.

But the manifestations and points of view towards the garden during the 1920s and 1930s do show, however, the possibility of various approaches to garden design and a resistance of the garden as a place where order and disorder coexist. It is the case of landscape artist Karl Foerster. Foerster, who successfully bred approximately 370 crosses, of which many were perennials and grasses, was highly sensitive to seasonal variations,<sup>34</sup> promoted low maintenance design and got inspired by wild ecosystems found in Europe, especially the most fragile. An inspiration for many contemporary artists, Foerster was perceived during the two world wars as an idealist and an anachronistic designer. His influence is probably due to his success with the general public (his books on gardening were carried by soldiers in the war) and to his view of nature as a realm of hope that shows a lingering mood for ruins, a need for the metaphysical, present even in the most reason-governed of times. It is ironic how he was perceived as a romantic figure at his time. Today, as opposed to Burle Marx, we might see his understanding of the fragility of the garden as a deeper understanding of the reality of the pre-war and mid-century era. Loss, danger, disappearance, change – all need to be integrated in our perception of beauty and of pleasure. Indeed, it is striking to see beyond the apparent optimism of Foerster's position its deep connection and understanding of time and of its burdens.

### Proposed Findings

The comparison of different points of view of architects and landscape designers has brought up two complementary findings. On the one hand, pleasure in architecture can be achieved by mixing order and disorder, represented by plants and ruins together; ecosystem-based design

32 Jean Pierre Le Dantec, *Le sauvage et le régulier (art des jardins et paysagisme en France au XXème siècle)* (Paris : Le Moniteur, 2002), 280.

33 Jacques Leenhardt, "From Modernity to Ecology," in *Roberto Burle Marx: The Modernity of Landscape*, ed. Lauro Cavalcanti (Barcelona: Actar Publishing, 2011), 59-60.

34 James van Sweden, *Gardening with Nature* (Random House Gardening series, 1997).



makes that possible by underlining a multitude of orders that emerge within an apparent disorder. On the other hand, these ephemeral sparks are possible within the uncontrolled natural world, where time and its outcome are themselves part of a *natural* process, and that has become the new order of the garden: the garden as an ecosystem.

The return of nature under the form of ecosystems in the garden may appear as a paradox. It turns against the very idea of a garden as a place of manifest care of nature, a place where it is well maintained, better known, and organized. It also turns against the idea of wild nature and the idea of natural order because it is not the order of biology that is on display here, but the fragility of biological presence. The idea of pleasure and the idea of care are confronted through the idea of maintenance. Caring for is no longer about looking after, but rather about the capacity to let go. What does this say about the way our society relates to ideas of attachment, of involvement, of the psychology of love? In architecture, is this relevant in the way the mood for ruins becomes today not only a manifest aesthetic taste, but also the manifestation of a need to break away from our understanding of architecture, defined by a long-lasting relationship, towards a need for constant renewal, new excitement, more linked to pleasure and more linked to the acceptance of an imminent disappearance.

The question of time brought up in the equation is also essential. After modernity, with its trust for a linear time, a time that constructs the path towards good and progress by means of rationality, architecture may indeed be accepted more as an ephemeral act. The statement of Jean Nouvel, in the dialogue with Baudrillard, that buildings should last for so long as they are cared for, resonates with Ruskin's two-hundred-year-old statement, that buildings are to be cared for without altering their soul, until they reach a stage beyond repair.<sup>35</sup> While for Ruskin it was a matter of morality in the Christian sense, an understanding of love in an Augustinian sense was also implicit. Do not get attached to something earthly, something that is threatened by disappearance: "love, but be careful what you love." Hannah Arendt, in her thesis on Augustine, associates the ideas of love, possessiveness and time:

"So long as we desire temporal things, we are constantly under this threat, and our fear of losing always corresponds to our desire to have. Temporal goods originate and perish independently of man, who is tied to them by his desire. Constantly bound by craving and fear of a future full of uncertainties, we strip each present moment of its calm, its intrinsic import, which we are unable to enjoy. And so, the future destroys the present [...] Who will hold [the heart], and fix it so that it may stand still for a little while and catch for a moment the splendor of eternity which stands still forever, and compare this with temporal moments that never stand still, and see that it is incomparable... but that all this while in the eternal, nothing passes but the whole is present."<sup>36</sup>

These notes on love can be translated into architecture as a need to see it beyond the temptation of a lasting object of desire. What appears to be a condition for the possibility of pleasure is that it needs to be linked to the present. The present may suffer continuous reiterations, but it is always under the sign of an imminent disappearance.

A brief look at examples of modernist landscape designers shows how the need for an interplay between order and disorder resists the dominant characteristic of an age. As was the case with the Enlightenment, the belief in rationality brings forward its limitations and puts on display (in perhaps more extreme ways) the need for balance, the need for accepting – even when the future is most trusted – the schizophrenia implied by this trust. The danger of disappearance lingers even in the most confident relationships (it is intrinsic to its sanity as well as to its beauty) and architecture, although more familiar with some ambition to last than other areas of human culture, is no exception.

35 John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (London: The Electric Book Company Ltd, 2001), 253-254.

36 Hannah Arendt, *Love and Saint Augustine* (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1996), 145.



## Conclusion

What can be called a nature in ruins, untended to and wild, can be read as a continuation but also a shift from the adventures of the eighteenth century in the art of gardening. Whereas the Enlightenment tried to find a way to evade too much reason and complement it with emotions, today what is at stake is also a need to slow down time and fragment it: sparks of natural order within a continuous disorder.

The relationship between time and pleasure, between care and maintenance that operates in gardening with ecosystems – often around ruined architecture – is relevant for the way architectural theory positions itself towards the discipline today. It is not only a question of form and aesthetic choice that is at stake here. It is also the need to integrate into architecture new conditions of understanding the world and a state of mind specific to post-modernity. Time and love, order and disorder integrate fear of loss at a profound level. The idea of the unmaintained garden is different both from the idea of a garden and from that of maintenance and presupposes a new paradigm about architecture's relationship today with the ideas of duration, pleasure and care. This paradigm operates an inversion that is yet to be investigated: nature in ruins, nature wild might compensate in fact our society's incapacity to produce ruins, as Marc Augé feared? Is it a way of breaking with order or a return to a more primal order, that of nature itself, that we can no longer ignore? How does this reflect not only upon our ecological concerns but also upon the field of architecture? Is there a psychological level implied here, in the way our society, at the end of modernity, has become more individualistic and has learned a way to manage its relationships by detachment, above all – fearing any form of attachment that can impose something to the other? Are we stoic? Are we afraid? Are we at the epitome of rationality in managing emotions? The paper stands as an invitation to further explore these questions, considering the close relationship between architecture and the ongoing history of the garden.

To look at the matter of ecosystem landscaping and the pleasures of natural ruins may thus represent for architecture a way to be relevant in society, as the authors of *The Return of Nature* put it, in a position of reflecting the general conditions of contemporary times. The transformative role of architecture as to these matters represents an opportunity for reflection through an ongoing process. What is at stake here is the condition of an art that traditionally relied upon an understanding of time that meant duration, on a condition of existence that presupposed maintenance as a form of care. Now, it seems, it is these very conditions that become loose. The extent to which the fact that this happens on architectural grounds may be relevant for society in general is a matter of reflection and an opportunity to take architecture outside the boundaries of the discipline.

## REFERENCE LIST:

- Arendt, Hannah. *Love and Saint Augustine*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1996.
- Augé, Marc. *Le Temps en Ruines*. Paris: Galilée, 2003.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Le Système des objets : la consommation des signes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1968.
- Baudrillard, Jean and Jean Nouvel. *Obiecte singulare*. Translated by Ciprian Mihaili. Bucharest: Paideea, 2004.
- Casey, Edward. *Getting back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Cauquelin, Anne. *Petit traité du jardin ordinaire*. Payot & Rivages, 2003.
- Clément, Gilles. "La friche apprivoisée." *Urbanisme* 209 (septembre 1985): 91-95.
- Clément, Gilles. *Le Jardin en Mouvement*. Paris: Pandora, 1991.
- Dagenais, Danielle. "Écologie, structuralisme et art des jardins dans le discours du paysagiste français Gilles Clément (1943-)." PhD diss., Université de Montréal, 2007.
- Desbussche, M., J. Escarré and J. Lepart. "La friche, un champ de recherche fertile pour les biologistes." *Pour la science* 188 (juin 1983): 12-13.
- Dixon Hunt, John. *The Picturesque Garden in Europe*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. *Les Mots et les Choses*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

- Landaw, George P. *The Aesthetic and Critical Theories of John Ruskin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Laugier, Marc-Antoine, ed. *Essai sur l'architecture. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, & augmentée ; avec un dictionnaire des termes, et des planches qui en facilitent l'explication. Par le P. Laugier, de la Compagnie de Jésus*. 1755.
- Le Dantec, Jean Pierre. *Le sauvage et le régulier (art des jardins et paysagisme en France au XXème siècle)*. Paris: Le Moniteur, 2002.
- Leenhardt, Jacques. "From Modernity to Ecology." In *Roberto Burle Marx: The Modernity of Landscape*, edited by Lauro Cavalcanti. Barcelona: Actar Publishing, 2011.
- Nouvel, Jean. "Du Vegetal." In *Ateliers Jean Nouvel*. Accessed April 15th 2021. <http://www.jeannouvel.com>.
- Ormsbee Simonds, John. *Earthscape*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Oudolf, Piet, and Noel Kingsbury. *Planting: A New Perspective*. Portland, OG: Timber Press, 2013.
- Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London: The Electric Book Company Ltd, 2001.
- Scott Cohen, Preston, and Erika Naginski, eds. *The Return of Nature. Sustaining Architecture in the Face of Sustainability*. New York, London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2014.
- Todoran, Smaranda. "The Use of Vegetation as Expression of a Happy Memory in Jean Nouvel's Recent Projects." In *Urban Ecology, Water Quality and Climate Change*, edited by Arup K. Sarma, 29-38. Cham: Springer, 2018.
- Tschumi, Bernard. "The Pleasure of Architecture." In *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965-1995*, edited by Kate Nesbitt. New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.
- van Sweden, James. *Gardening with Nature*. Random House Gardening series, 1997.

#### ILLUSTRATION CREDITS:

- © Dan Coroian-Vlad, *Broken Flowers series*, <https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.1782982488630&-type=3> accessed on December 13th, 2023.