



**HAL**  
open science

# Principles of Latent Monumentality in Tange Kenzō's Concepts of Tradition and Creation. A Study of the Formation of Tange Kenzō's Discourse

Benoît Jacquet

► **To cite this version:**

Benoît Jacquet. Principles of Latent Monumentality in Tange Kenzō's Concepts of Tradition and Creation. A Study of the Formation of Tange Kenzō's Discourse. *Journal of architecture and planning -Nihon Kenchiku Gakkai keikaku kei ronbunshū*, 2006, 601, pp.211-216. halshs-02332858

**HAL Id: halshs-02332858**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02332858>**

Submitted on 28 Oct 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# PRINCIPLES OF LATENT MONUMENTALITY IN TANGE KENZO'S CONCEPTS OF TRADITION AND CREATION

Study of the formation of Tange Kenzō's architectural discourse

丹下健三の「伝統」と「創造」の概念に潜むモニュメンタリティの原理

—丹下健三の建築言説の形成に関する研究—

Benoît JACQUET\*

ブノア ジャケ

This study focuses on the principles of latent monumentality related to the concepts of tradition and creation in Tange's way of thinking, as they originally appear in the early writings that form the basis of his architectural discourse.

The first part introduces the problematic of the epoch and the relation between modernism and monumentality; it presents the methodology used to analyze Tange's discourse and the past studies to which the author referred. The second part explores the original conception of the philosophical concepts of tradition and creation in "Michelangelo *shō*" (1939). In this part, Tange's discourse is compared to the discourse of Le Corbusier and contemporary western philosophers – Martin Heidegger and Friedrich Nietzsche in particular – which had a strong influence on Tange's way of thinking. In the third part, the author interprets the architectural meaning of the concepts of tradition and creation in relation with Tange's discourse on Japanese monumentality, at the end of the fifties. It reveals that, after the analysis of Le Corbusier, the tradition of the Parthenon and its relation with western philosophy and aesthetics, Tange looked for a hint into tradition and creation at the origin of Japanese architecture.

**Keywords:** Tange Kenzō, Discourse, Monumentality, Le Corbusier, Tradition, Creation

丹下健三、言説、モニュメンタリティ、ル・コルビュジェ、伝統、創造

## 1. Introduction to a study on Monumentality

### 1.1 Problematical background

This paper is based on the postulate that Tange's principles of monumentality were in formation in his early architectural discourse. The author postulates that the concepts of tradition and creation, which first appeared in "Homage to Michelangelo. Introduction to a Study on Le Corbusier" (1939)<sup>1</sup>, were used to express Tange's intentions on monumentality. Monumentality has been a delicate issue for modern architects. In 1939, Tange was training at Maekawa Atelier where he was introduced to Le Corbusier's architecture and took part to the Memorial of the Fallen Soldier's competition<sup>2</sup>. Le Corbusier's architectural discourse on classic architecture was a fundamental influence on Tange's theoretical background.

At that epoch, Le Corbusier had entered in conflict with the *Académie des Beaux-Arts*, about the issue of monumentality, since the competition for the *Palais des Nations* in Geneva, in 1927<sup>3</sup>. Le Corbusier, who had to justify his architecture, started to develop a discourse about a new kind of monumentality, which can indifferently be revealed in the house or in the palace<sup>4</sup>.

Tange hardly discussed the notion of "monumentality". Uses of this term in his architectural discourse are very few and they correspond to the war situation and its need for monumental symbolism<sup>5</sup>. Rather than "Monumentality", which does not exactly have the same cultural and aesthetical values in Japan and in the West, Tange started with an interpretation of the concepts of tradition and creation, in "Michelangelo *shō*". Thereafter, some of the buildings he designed can be defined as monuments (in their function as much as in their symbolism). For instance, it is from the Hiroshima Peace Center, that Kawazoe Noboru launched the controversy on tradition (*dentō ronsō*). Even for the design of administrative buildings – which

can be seen as civic monuments – such as Kagawa Prefecture Hall, Tange referred to and applied the concepts of tradition and creation<sup>6</sup>.

At the beginning of the sixties, Tange's researches on the fundamentals of Japanese architecture, Katsura *rikyū*<sup>7</sup> and Ise *jingū*<sup>8</sup>, were echoed by some members of the modern movement, such as Walter Gropius and Siegfried Giedion. Giedion who had discussed about the "Need for Monumentality" during the war, was also pursuing a survey on the origin of architecture<sup>9</sup>.

For which reasons modern architects studied traditional architecture? In 1962, Giedion wrote that he wanted to understand "how the modern man has been formed" from the origin of creation<sup>10</sup>, and how he created a meaningful environment. In parallel to this fundamental question, Tange revealed that the study of Ise's form could help him to respond to the question:

"What are the symbols of the present?"<sup>11</sup> (Tange, 1965, p. 52)

### 1.2. Purpose of study

The purpose of this present study is to consider the formulation of the concepts of tradition and creation as an original process in the formation of monumentality. Although these terms have a wide meaning, the aim is to focus on their relation to Tange's intention to develop architecture that fits his epoch's need for monumentality. This tendency to monumentality is latent in his work and, for this reason, it is necessary to compare his discourse at two different moments of his career: at the beginning and twenty years later. This choice is also due to the apparition of the concepts of tradition and creation in Tange's writings.

The study of Tange's discourse in "Michelangelo *shō*" shows that Tange found in Le Corbusier's discourse a hint to deal with the issues of tradition and creation, which form the theoretical background for an interpretation of monumentality.

\* Graduate Student, Graduate School of Engineering, Kyoto Univ., M. Eng.

京都大学大学院工学研究科 大学院生・工修

The analysis of the same concepts in his essays on Japanese “monuments” aims to show the evolution and adaptation of his discourse for the creation of contemporary Japanese architecture.

### 1.3. Methodology

In order to interpret Tange’s discourse, the hermeneutical method consists in stressing the meaning of the concepts from which this architect structured his thought. Inside the architect’s discourse, some words create a conceptual environment; they are precepts, signs or concepts, which express his purpose. The analysis of the discourse aims to stress the intentions that are sometimes not directly and explicitly revealed by the architect, because they are part of his strategy.

In order to enter in the architect’s way of thinking, the analysis relies in priority to the references (quotation, reference to an author or concepts) that are present in his own writings. In the case of Tange’s text, there is a recurrence in the reference to contemporary philosophers, such as Martin Heidegger and Friedrich Nietzsche. Tange applies them as conceptual materials for the construction of his discourse. The analysis uses them only as the tools of a “bricoleur”<sup>12</sup>, to deconstruct and to discover the formation of the discourse.

The analysis of “Michelangelo *shō*” –, and the comparison with the writings that influenced Tange’s way of thinking at that epoch, focus on the concepts that form the basis of his discourse on monumentality. Finally, the analysis of the essays written in 1960 and 1962 shows continuity in the discourse and a sharper comprehension of the concepts of tradition and creation.

### 1.4. Referential studies – specificity of the present research

This study started from Fujimori Terunobu’s analysis of Tange’s early writings and “Michelangelo *shō*”, the influence of Le Corbusier’s tradition and Heidegger’s philosophy on Tange<sup>13</sup>. In order to understand “Michelangelo *shō*”, the author studied Tange’s philosophical references and Le Corbusier’s original writings and decided to relate them to the problem of monumentality<sup>14</sup>.

Sasaki Hiroshi remarked that Tange took Le Corbusier as a model of “creator”<sup>15</sup> and Naka Masami stated that “Michelangelo *shō*” manifested Tange’s intention to carry on “historical mission”<sup>16</sup>. These points are taken in consideration in the present analysis and linked to the formation of Tange’s discourse from philosophical and aesthetical speculations on the origin of architecture.

The essays of Isozaki Arata on Katsura, Ise, and the “Japanese-ness”, helped to understand Tange’s strategies towards the Modern Japanese Movement<sup>17</sup>, in a context recently explored by Yatsuka Hajime<sup>18</sup>. From those studies, one could figure out that the monumentality developed by Tange corresponds to Isozaki’s notion of “Architecture with a Capital A”, which supposes a comprehension of the political, intellectual, artistic and social contexts that symbolize the spirit of the epoch. This present paper does not dig in all of these aspects but it intend to present Tange’s dialogue between tradition and creation as an original source for the monumentalisation of Architecture.

About the relation between Monumentality and Modernism, the author is indebted to the notions of “hidden” and “latent” monumentalities, developed by Jean-Louis Cohen<sup>19</sup>. The author supposed that the point of view adopted by Cohen on western modern architecture fit Tange’s latent monumentality.

## 2. The formation of the concept of Monumentality through Tradition and Creation

### 2.1. The Tradition of Le Corbusier

In “Michelangelo *shō*” Tange demonstrated that he has been deeply influenced by Le Corbusier. His analysis of *Vers une architecture* and *Croisade*<sup>20</sup> reveal that he placed his architectural discourse in the stream of Le Corbusier’s tradition.

In the third edition of *Vers une architecture*, Le Corbusier introduced two paradoxical points of view on monumentality. First, in the foreword “Température”, about the competition for the monumental institutional building of the League of Nations Palace (1927), he criticized the Academism and the imitation of past monuments. Secondly, in different chapters of the book, he presented the Parthenon as “pure product of the spirit”, model of perfection, and machine made for emotions. While the *Académie des Beaux-Arts* was still teaching how to reproduce and imitate the aesthetical canons of Greek Antiquity<sup>21</sup>, Le Corbusier was studying the mathematical and sculptural qualities of the Parthenon, which create the “pathetic” emotion of this monument.

In *Croisade*, following the thought developed in *Vers une Architecture*, Le Corbusier called for a rediscovering of Antique Greek architecture, not in the academic meaning of *Beaux-Arts*, but from a philosophical and aesthetical point of view, in exploring the essence of architectural emotions. Le Corbusier referred again to the architecture of Athens’s Acropolis, in order to illustrate his architectural ideology, and wrote:

“On the Acropolis, in the silent bosom of its landscape that emerged from prehistory, a pathetic discourse is rising, almost a scream, a short clamor, whole, violent, compact, massive, accurate, sharp, decisive: the marble of temples is bearing the human voice.” (Le Corbusier, 1933)<sup>22</sup>

According to Le Corbusier, the monumentality of the Parthenon, standing on top of the Acropolis’s landscape, is expressing the “human voice” and people’s beliefs. The erection of monumental architecture is the fruit of a fight with nature, it was selected by the human gesture, in order to represent the energy and emotions of a whole people. According to Le Corbusier, each epoch creates its system of thinking and the aesthetical values that belong to it; therefore, modern architecture must create the monuments that bear the voice of the modern man.

Le Corbusier’s point of view on monumentality is different from the Academy but his concern on tradition is also different from the rationalist and functionalist focus of other modern architects. In the introduction of “Michelangelo *shō*”, Tange quoted the conclusion, “Certitude”, of Le Corbusier’s *Croisade*:

“The people of the North, the first engaged in the machinist adventure, had been caught by a devastative rage: a cleaning, we must clean! This was a religion, the one of the denial, the void, the clean, the absence”; “I say today (...) that from Athens to Alicante, modern architecture can and must confront to the clamor of the Acropolis.” (Le Corbusier, 1933; quoted in Tange, 1939, p. 36)<sup>23</sup>

In *Croisade*, Le Corbusier explained that a Northern European spirit – probably the one at the origin of the architecture of Walter Gropius and Bauhaus – inspired by the faith in industrial progress and the cult of the machine –, created the basis of modern architecture through an effort of abstraction, a “mental attitude”, “cleaning” architecture from its ornamentation and its stylistic references to the past. By this “devastative rage”, “the human creative force stood up and the works of contemporary architecture appeared”<sup>24</sup>. This process of abstraction was a first step in the creation of modern architecture, but the next step is to look back to tradition, listen to the “clamor of the Acropolis” and use the human creative

force to build the monuments of modernity with the materials and techniques of the modern epoch.

This aspect of Le Corbusier's way of thinking about architecture, which emphasizes the importance of the classical tradition as a reference for modern creation, is the one that Tange chose to study.

## 2.2. Origins of Creation in "Michelangelo *shō*".

In "Michelangelo *shō*", Tange demonstrated that he was aware of the latest philosophical thinking of his time, such as Heidegger's study on the essence of Hölderlin's poetry<sup>25</sup>. Following the hermeneutic method of Heidegger, Tange explored the origin of architectural creation by a philosophical interpretation of Le Corbusier's writings. Why did he choose Le Corbusier rather than another architect? Because, Le Corbusier created architecture from the essence of architectural creation itself. In this meaning, Le Corbusier is like Hölderlin, who: "poetizes the essence of poetry"<sup>26</sup>.

Tange interpreted Le Corbusier's origin of creation in the way Heidegger did about Hölderlin. As a result, the words used by Tange and the architectural works (which are all Antique monuments) to which he referred, are similar to those described by Le Corbusier in *Vers une architecture*. By comparing the writings of Le Corbusier and Tange it appears that the chapter "Michel-Ange" of *Vers une architecture* influenced the reference to Michelangelo:

*"The Coliseum has been watched by him [Michelangelo] and its glad measures understood; Caracala's Thermae and Constantine's Basilica have shown the limits that one should overcome by a high intention."* (Le Corbusier, 1923)<sup>27</sup>

*"The Coliseum revealed him [Michelangelo] Grandeur while Constantine's Basilica and Caracala's Public Baths showed him perfection. He felt compelled by his destiny to pursue an even nobler intent, that of enriching, transforming, completing and giving an even deeper meaning to this creation."* (Tange, 1939, p. 45)

Tange, who had never been to Europe at that time, relied on the words of Le Corbusier to follow European monumental tradition. In *Vers une architecture*, Le Corbusier imagined that Michelangelo learned from the city of Rome, and the monuments that form its environment. This tradition is seen as the creative milieu that Michelangelo had to appropriate to begin his creation. According to Le Corbusier and Tange, the intention of Michelangelo was to "overcome" and give a deeper "meaning" to this world of "creation". The tradition is the original substrate of the creation but the creator needs to find in itself the meaning of the spirit of the epoch.

As wrote by Le Corbusier: "the work of Michelangelo is a creation (...) which overcomes historical epochs"<sup>29</sup>. According to Tange, the role of Le Corbusier (1887-1965) in the 20<sup>th</sup> century is comparable to the one that Michelangelo (1475-1564) played in the Renaissance. His historical mission was to re-create from an original "creative will" and to give birth, under new forms, to a modern interpretation of tradition.

In 1937, in "Reflections on Culture", Tange, who was already discussing about the rehabilitation of tradition, wrote:

*"Rehabilitation is not the reinstatement of the past, but the revival of a kind of style [or genre] that formed according to a practical understanding of the epoch."* (Tange, 1937)<sup>30</sup>

## 2.3. Geometry as an expression of monumentality

How can the creative process originated in tradition be expressed in monumental architecture? The architectural response needs to be "practical" and to repudiate the imitation

of the past. One essential expression of architecture is communicated by geometry. For Le Corbusier, it is the use of perfect "measure", mathematical and geometrical processes (including the Golden Section) that fund architectural emotions. For Tange, the perfection of a monument such as the Parthenon is the result of the equilibrium between two aesthetical impulses, which are the result of the application of two different types of geometries. Tange referred to the origin of the creation of geometry as described by Paul Valéry<sup>31</sup> and explained that, before the construction of the Parthenon by the architect Phidias, there existed an "organic geometry", which was not ruled by classical geometry. The Parthenon would be the fruit of these two modalities of conception:

*"The bold and fortunate instant of balance between the two realms yielded the perfection of the Parthenon. It was born in the time of the rare conciliation between the organic richness of the original Greek geometry and the infallibility of the inorganic nature of geometry."* (Tange, 1939, p. 38)<sup>32</sup>

Tange's discourse on the geometry of the Parthenon shows a fundamental difference between the one of Le Corbusier. While Le Corbusier praised the rationality of Phidias's regulating tracings (*tracés régulateurs*), Tange introduced the notion of an "organic" geometry, as a necessary component of the whole composition, counter-balancing the mathematical value of the rational geometry.

The difference between Le Corbusier's and Tange's conception of monumentality comes from the fact that Le Corbusier is influenced by the modern discourse on industrialization – stating that the Parthenon is a "standard" corresponding to the techniques of its time – while Tange is rather concerned by the presence of aesthetical factors.

## 3. Interpretation on the meaning of Tradition and Creation in Japanese architecture

### 3.1. Dualism of Yayoi and Jōmon

Tange's conception of the dual structure of the Parthenon originated in the paradigm proposed by Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy*<sup>33</sup>, about the complementary opposition between the influences of Dionysus (God of desire) and Apollo (God of reasoning), which are at the source of classical Greek aesthetics. The balance between these two impulses was considered by Tange as the peak of Greek culture, and the two necessary inspirations of Tragedy, just as the two origins of Geometry that created the architecture of the Parthenon.

In "Michelangelo *shō*", Tange was only discussing about western monuments and philosophy, but in the texts he wrote at the end of the fifties – at the moment of the controversy on tradition (*dentō ronsō*) –, he used anew the same principles of a double origin of aesthetics for the analysis of the Japanese architecture of Katsura *rikyū* and Ise *jingū*. In *Katsura: Tradition and Creation in Japanese Architecture*, he put in relation the aesthetics of Jōmon and Yayoi civilizations with Nietzsche's concepts of Dionysus and Apollo:

*"In Yayoi forms, there is a conscious aesthetic which stands out in sharp contrast to the unconscious vitality of Jomon. The one is resigned and still; the other, rebellious and dynamic. The dichotomy is parallel in some ways to that between the Dionysiac and Apollonian elements on the life of ancient Greece."* (Tange, 1960, p. 213)

About Ise, Tange alludes to an aesthetic balance, considering that this architecture appeared at a moment of transition between the vitality of the Jōmon era and the aesthetic

of the Yayoi era. In Ise: *Prototype of Japanese Architecture*, Tange wrote:

*"I said of the Ise form and space that they combine elementary vigor and an aesthetic discipline transcending time, and a rare achieved balance of the vital and the aesthetic."*<sup>35</sup> (Tange, 1965, p. 51)

According to Tange's dualist way of thinking, Apollo and Yayoi are related to the visible representation of aesthetics while Dionysus and Jōmon are depending on a vital, human or animistic will. In the first category are the architects that use rational method and geometry, such as Phidias did for the Parthenon, Leonardo Da Vinci at the Renaissance, and the Bauhaus ("*People of the North*"). In the second category, the "artistic will" is relevant to organic geometry, such as in the work of Michelangelo, and Le Corbusier.

Tange related the dualist way of thinking expressed in "Michelangelo *shō*" to his lecture of Japanese architecture, but Ise revealed him new interpretation of tradition and creation.

### 3.2. Ise as symbolization of myths

As if Ise had given him the answer to his questioning on the monumentality of traditional architecture, Tange wrote:

*"At Ise it flashed through my mind that this shrine might itself be viewed as the symbolic form of the religious myths."*<sup>36</sup> (Tange, 1965, p. 16)

This revelation is a key to understand Tange's conception of monumentality as a "symbolization" of the myths that originate architecture. Ise's monumentality, symbol of the worship of nature and shintō's animism, and bearer of the myth of the creation of Japan, is a symbolic reference for Tange who is constantly re-creating architecture from zero, from an origin that would be a reference to create the present anew.

In 1939, Tange understood that he was the bearer of an "historical mission", and needed to create an architecture that would carry the symbols of a new world. At the other side of the world, Giedion was manifesting the necessity to create a new tradition<sup>37</sup>. According to him, Monumentality is carrying people's beliefs, "artistic will" (Riegl's *Kunstwollen*), historical and social intentions that symbolize the essence of architecture.

*"Monumentality springs from the eternal need of people to make symbols for their actions and destiny, for their religious and social convictions."* (Giedion, 1944)<sup>38</sup>

### 3.3. The Parthenon and Ise as models of monumentality

About Monumentality, Tange's models are the Parthenon and Ise, for their capacity to couple the aesthetic representation and the vital will of architecture. The Parthenon is a model that Tange appropriated from his interpretation of Le Corbusier's discourse, and then he took Ise as "*prototype of Japanese Architecture*". The comparison between those two monuments started with Bruno Taut and it has been taken as a proof that Japanese architecture was part of the "*world history*" (*sekaishi*)<sup>39</sup>. Since that time, the association between the Parthenon and Ise remained and Tange explained it through the balance of the dual origins of aesthetics.

There is no dualism in tradition and creation, because of their complementarities; they are not opposed but rather in what Heidegger's called a dialogue "*between*" gods and people. According to Tange, Michelangelo, and probably Le Corbusier too, is this ideal creator who, stands between past tradition and future creation.

*"He has the strength to bear the whole weight of history on his shoulders and (...) must have a deep understanding of the fundamental tendencies of world history."* (Tange, 1939, p. 46)<sup>40</sup>

*"As for the poet, he stands between those, the gods, and these, the people"*<sup>41</sup> (Heidegger, 1936)

The "historical mission" of Tange stands between tradition and creation; it means, between the architecture of the gods and the people, which is a symbolized by monumentality.

## 4. Conclusion

First, from the analysis of "Michelangelo *shō*", one can clearly see that Tange's main concern was Le Corbusier's discourse on the Parthenon and on the creative spirit of Michelangelo. They were architects that created a new architecture from their understanding of the origin of monumental architecture.

The principles of Tange's monumentality were born in the relation between the opposite but complementary impulses of tradition and creation. Tange did not give a definition of the concepts of tradition and creation. Instead of giving a definition that would be reductive, he evoked images and names (the Parthenon, Ise, Yayoi, etc.) that illustrate his conception of tradition and creation. This way of thinking, which is close to the "savage mind" (Lévy-Strauss, 1962), is producing signs and symbols that must be interpreted. For Tange, tradition and creation are not concepts but ways of creating; they are not methods to be applied, but processes that are used to develop a symbolical environment, which is the essence of monumentality.

Tange looked at the concepts of tradition and creation, with the intention to create a new monumentality and go further into Le Corbusier's discourse. Compared to Le Corbusier, Tange's discourse is rather carrying an aesthetical point of view. At first, this aesthetical ideal was funded on western philosophical sources, but it was then applied to Japanese values (*nihonteki na mono*) that corresponded to a revival of Japanese architecture. It could be said that this fitted his initial intention to integrate Japanese architecture inside the "*world history*": considering that, for instance, Ise bears universal qualities of monumentality that can also be a model for starting a new world class architecture. Ise's monumentality is a referential model for Tange just as the Parthenon was the model of Le Corbusier, but, in comparing them, Tange aimed to find an expression of universal value for the making of Japanese modern architecture.

By going to the origin of architecture, at the root of tradition and creation, Tange is following the steps of Le Corbusier and the Modern Movement, which ambition was not to reproduce the past tradition (like it was done by Academism) but to understand the modern man by returning at the source of art creation and find a significance for the culture of the present. Monumentality, as symbolical architecture, aims to be a memory of the present, but present's culture is always changing and the architect must imagine a creative interpretation of the tradition. The "*symbols of the present*", the contemporary monumentality, can only be rooted in a creative understanding of the tradition.

To resume, Tange's Monumentality was not manifested as discourse, but it was latent, hidden between the concepts of Tradition and Creation. Then, from his creative view on (Japanese) traditional architecture, Tange discovered an inspiration for (Japanese) Modern Monumentality.

## Notes and references:

<sup>1</sup> 丹下健三「MICHELANGELO頌—Le Corbusier論への序説」『現代建築』1939年12月号、36-47頁。Referred as "Michelangelo *shō*".

<sup>2</sup> Tange helped both Sakakura Junzō and Maekawa Kunio. 坂倉順三、

前川國男「志霊塔懸賞建築競技」『現代建築』1940年4月号。

<sup>3</sup> About the League of Nations events, see GIEDION Siegfried (1941). *Space, Time and Architecture. Towards a New Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 1974, pp. 696-697.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. LE CORBUSIER (1928). *Une maison - un palais. "À la recherche d'une unité architecturale"*. Paris: Editions Crès et Cie.

About this period, see Yatsuka Hajime's analysis in 八東はじめ『ル・コルビュジェ』岩波書店、1983年9月刊、85-123頁。

<sup>5</sup> For the competition for the Memorial of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (1942), Tange designed a monument based on a creative interpretation of Japanese tradition and Michelangelo's design. 丹下健三「大東亜記念栄造計画」『建築雑誌』1942年12月号。

<sup>6</sup> In *Shinkenchiku*, June 1956, Tange published pictures of Kagawa Prefecture Hall with an essay titled: "Creation of Contemporary Architecture and Tradition of Japanese Architecture". 丹下健三「現代建築の創造と日本建築の伝統」『新建築』1956年6月号。

<sup>7</sup> ワルター・グロピウス、丹下健三、石元泰博『桂・日本建築における伝統と創造』造形社、1960年刊。GROPIUS Walter, TANGE Kenzō, ISHIMOTO Yasuhiro (1960). *Katsura: Tradition and Creation in Japanese Architecture*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

<sup>8</sup> 川添登、丹下健三、渡辺義雄『伊勢・日本建築の原型』朝日新報社、1962年刊。KAWAZOE Noboru, TANGE Kenzō, WATANABE Yoshio (1965). *Ise: Prototype of Japanese Architecture*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

<sup>9</sup> GIEDION Siegfried (1956). *Architektur und Gemeinschaft*. Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag. GIEDION Siegfried (1962). *The Eternal Present: The Beginnings of Art*. New York: Pantheon Books.

<sup>10</sup> GIEDION (1962). P. xviii.

<sup>11</sup> 丹下健三「この伊勢のフォームは、<現代の象徴は何か>という、つねに新しい問いを私たちに投げかけているのである。』『伊勢』前出、62頁。

<sup>12</sup> LEVI-STRAUSS (1962). *La pensée sauvage*. Paris: Plon. Pp. 30-36.

<sup>13</sup> 藤森照信「ル・コルビュジェと丹下健三」高階秀爾、鈴木博之、三宅理一、太田泰人『ル・コルビュジェと日本』鹿島出版会、1999年刊。丹下健三、藤森照信『丹下健三』新建築社、2002年10月刊。

<sup>14</sup> The author interviewed Prof. Fujimori on this theme (26.11.2004).

<sup>15</sup> 佐々木宏「丹下健三」『巨匠への憧憬：ル・コルビュジェに魅せられた日本の建築家たち』相模書房、2000年11月刊、頁 373-383。

<sup>16</sup> NAKA Masami (1970). Op.cit.

<sup>17</sup> 石元泰博、磯崎新、佐藤理、熊倉功夫『桂離宮：空間と形』岩波書店、1983年11月刊。石元泰博、磯崎新、稲垣栄三『伊勢神宮』岩波書店、1995年2月刊。

<sup>18</sup> 八東はじめ『思想としての日本近代建築』岩波書店、2005年6月刊。

<sup>19</sup> COHEN Jean-Louis (1998). "Das Monumentale: latent oder offenkundig". In SCHNEIDER Romana, WANG Wilfried (eds.) *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 2000, Macht und Monument*. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje. Pp. 71-87.

<sup>20</sup> LE CORBUSIER (1923). *Vers une architecture*. Paris: Editions Crès et Cie. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 1928. First Japanese edition: ル・コルビュジェ「建築芸術へ」宮崎謙三 訳、構成社書房、1929年刊。LE CORBUSIER (1933). *Croisade ou Le crépuscule des académies*. Paris: Editions Crès et cie. Tange used a translation of Ikuta Tsutomu.

<sup>21</sup> According to Riegl, until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was considered that the creations of Antiquity were representing an objective and absolute artistic ideal. Cf. RIEGL Alois (1903). *Der moderne Denkmalkultus. Sein Wesen und seine Entstehung*. Wien-Leipzig: W. Braümüller.

<sup>22</sup> Translated by the author. "Sur l'Acropole, dans le giron silencieux de ce paysage surgi de la préhistoire, s'élève un discours pathétique, presque un cri, une clameur courte, entière, violente, compacte, massive, aiguë, tranchante, décisive: le marbre des temples porte la voix humaine." Cf. LE CORBUSIER (1933). *Croisade ou Le crépuscule des académies*. Paris: Editions Crès and Cie. P. 75.

<sup>23</sup> Trans. by the author. "Les gens du Nord, les premiers engagés dans l'aventure machiniste, avaient été saisis d'une rage dévastatrice: un

*nettoyage, Il faut nettoyer! Ce fut presque une religion, celle de la négation, celle du vide, celle du propre, celle de l'absence*."; "Je dis aujourd'hui, (...) que d'Athènes à Alicante, l'architecture moderne peut et doit affronter la clameur de l'Acropole". Ibid. P. 77.

<sup>24</sup> LE CORBUSIER (1933). Ibid. P. 77.

<sup>25</sup> See HEIDEGGER Martin (1936). "Hölderlin und das Wesen der Dichtung". *Erläuterungen zu Hölderlins Dichtung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1951, pp. 31-45. Tange could have access to the Japanese edition published in March 1938: ハイデッガー『ヘルダーリンと詩の本質』斉藤信治訳、理想社、1938年3月刊。

<sup>26</sup> Trans. by the author. "Hölderlin dichtet das Wesen der Dichtung". Ibidem, p. 44.

<sup>27</sup> Trans. by the author. "Le Colisée a été vu par lui [Michel-Ange] et ses heureuses mesures retenues; les Thermes de Caracalla et la Basilique de Constantin ont montré les limites qu'il convenait de dépasser par une intention élevée." Cf. LE CORBUSIER (1923). "Michel-Ange" in "Architecture, la leçon de Rome". *Vers une architecture*. Op. cit., pp. 134-138.

<sup>28</sup> Trans. by the author. 丹下健三「コロシムは彼の眸の前に始めて壮大であった、コンスタンチンのバジリカと、カラカラの浴場は彼にその極致を示した。彼こそ造型の意志の家門であり、彼の使命はなお一層崇高な意図によって、これを強大にし、高め、深化し転身しつつ、新たなより高い創造に到ることであった。」前出。

<sup>29</sup> Trans. by the author. "L'œuvre de Michel-Ange est une création, (...), une création qui domine les époques classées." Op.cit., p. 134.

<sup>30</sup> Trans. by the author. 丹下健三「復興は単に過去様式が復興するのではなく、時代の実践的理想に依つて変形された様式、即ち類型としての様式が復興する。」「文化を思ふ」『建築』東京帝國大學、『丹下健三』前出、38頁。

<sup>31</sup> See Paul VALERY (1924). "La crise de l'esprit" in *Variété I*. Paris: Gallimard.

<sup>32</sup> Trans. by the author. 丹下健三「この譲渡の二つのものの、果敢ない均衡の刹那に、パルテノンのは僥倖なる完成を遂げた。それはギリシアの根源の幾何学の有機の豊饒と芳香と、まさに頽廃せんとする幾何学の無機の鋭気の、稀有の饗宴の刹那に生れた。」前出。

<sup>33</sup> NIETZSCHE Friedrich (1909). *Die Geburt der Tragödie*. Leipzig: C.G. Naumann.

<sup>34</sup> 丹下健三「弥生的なものには、縄文のものである、動的な、生成的な性格にたいして、静的な形式性がみとめられるであろう。ヴァイタルなものに対して、エッセティックなものともいいうるであろう。あるいはディオニユソスのものにたいするアポロ的なものと規定することも、あるいはできるかもしれない。」『桂』前出、25頁。

<sup>35</sup> 丹下健三「私はさきに、伊勢の形態と空間形象について、原始的な迫力をもつとともに、時間を越えた美的秩序をそなえている、生命的なものとの美的なものとの稀有な均衡、と語った。』『伊勢』前出、63頁。

<sup>36</sup> 丹下健三「ふと私には、伊勢で、この神域そのものが神話の形象化とも思われた。』『伊勢』前出、3頁。

<sup>37</sup> There was no relation between Giedion and Tange at that time. They probably met for the first time at CIAM VIII (1951).

<sup>38</sup> GIEDION Siegfried (1944). "The Need for a New Monumentality" In OCKMAN Joan (1993). *Architecture Culture 1943-1968. A Documentary Anthology*. New York: Rizzoli-Columbia University.

<sup>39</sup> The concept of "world history" (*sekaishi*, 世界史) was discussed by Nishida Kitarō and Kōyama Iwao of the Kyōto School of philosophy.

<sup>40</sup> Trans. by the author. 丹下健三「彼は一切の歴史の負荷を背負いつつ、(略)世界史の深く傾向的なもの(略)を身に受けねばならない。」前出。

<sup>41</sup> Trans. by the author. "Der Dichter selbst steht zwischen jenen - den Göttern, und diesem - dem Volk." Op.cit., p. 43.

## 和文要約

### 研究目的と方法

本研究は、丹下健三の建築言説を対象とし、「伝統」と「創造」という、よく知られた彼の概念の根底に「モニュメンタリティ」の原理が潜んでいることを明らかにするものである。「伝統」と「創造」という概念について、丹下は「Michelangelo頌-Le Corbusier論への序説」(1939)の論文で初めて論じている。そして約二十年後、『桂・日本建築における伝統と創造』(1960)及び『伊勢・日本建築の原型』(1962)において、再び論じている。本研究ではこれらを主要な対象とする。

丹下の建築言説には、ル・コルビュジェをはじめ彼が影響を受けた近代西洋哲学者(ニーチェ、ハイデッガー、ヴァレリー)が引用されている。そこで本研究では、それらの原典と丹下の解釈との比較分析を通して、丹下の建築言説を解釈する方法をとる。

### 研究内容

「Michelangelo頌」と約20年後の2冊の著作(『桂』と『伊勢』)を比較し、丹下が用いる「伝統」と「創造」の概念の根底に「モニュメンタリティ」に対する丹下の関心があることを示す。近代建築とモニュメンタリティの関係については、ル・コルビュジェ等の近代建築家やギーディオンも関心を示しており、それらの影響と丹下の独自性を以下のように明らかにした。

現代建築家としてのル・コルビュジェの獨創性は、過去を見習うボザールのアカデミーとも、伝統を無視する他のモダニズム派(バウハウス)とも異なる方法で、パルテノンのモニュメンタリティを参照したことにある。ル・コルビュジェによると、パルテノンは幾何学の秩序と数学の応用の完璧なモデルとされ、その時代の意志を象徴する建物と解されるが、丹下によるとパルテノンのモニュメンタリティは二つの幾何学の様式の完璧なバランスであり、それらは有機的かつ経験的、無機的かつ合理的と解釈されている。

この解釈の二重性はヴァレリーによっても説明され、ニーチェが定義したアポロとディオニュソスの概念が元になっている。丹下は日本建築における「伝統」と「創造」の起源を分析するために、この考え方を応用したと考える。なぜなら、伊勢神宮もまた二つの伝統美によって説明されるモデルとし、一つは縄文的なるもの、もう一つは弥生的なるものとしているからである。更にこの考察はsymbol化されたものというモニュメンタリティの原理を丹下に対して新たにもたらした。

### 結論

丹下はミケランジェロとパルテノンに関するル・コルビュジェの言説を分析し、西洋建築の起源であるパルテノン同様、この分析を日本建築の起源である伊勢神宮に適用したことを示した。また、パルテノンと伊勢神宮はともにモニュメンタリティを表現しており、それらが建築を生み出す神話の象徴として、丹下のモニュメンタリティを理解する上で重要な要素であると考えられる。

丹下は「伝統」と「創造」に明確な定義を与えず、プリコラージュ(レヴィ・ストロース、1962)のように、象徴的なイメージと名前を参照しながら、それらに意味を与えていると考えられる。

直接に言及されることはないが丹下の真意は建築の起源を理解し、現代におけるモニュメンタリティをデザインすることにある。現代建築家として、常に「伝統」と「創造」の起源に戻り、ゼロから現代のモニュメンタリティを再解釈することが、丹下健三の「伝統」と「創造」の概念に潜むモニュメンタリティの原理と考えることができる。

(2005年6月6日原稿受理、2005年12月8日採用決定)