



Medievalism and Le Corbusier

Author(s): Wayne R. Dynes

Source: *Gesta*, Vol. 45, No. 2, 50th Anniversary of the International Center of Medieval Art (2006), pp. 89-94

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#) on behalf of the [International Center of Medieval Art](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25067133>

Accessed: 06/10/2013 15:00

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press and International Center of Medieval Art are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Gesta*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Medievalism and Le Corbusier

WAYNE R. DYNES

Hunter College, City University of New York, emeritus

Abstract

The architect Le Corbusier drew inspiration from several aspects of medieval architecture, including Gothic, Romanesque, and vernacular trends. These elements were particularly important in the first phase of his career when he was known by his birth name of Jeanneret. The emergence of his mature Le Corbusier persona at the beginning of the 1920s muted overt medieval influences, yet the effects never altogether disappeared. Despite his familial Protestantism—and later atheism—the collective spirit and universality he perceived in medieval Catholicism continued to attract the Swiss-French architect. In his later years this affinity informed two major masterpieces, the chapel of Notre-Dame-du-Haut at Ronchamp and the monastery of La Tourette near Lyon.

At first blush the idea of the union of Le Corbusier and medievalism seems unlikely. What possibly connects a radical proponent of modernism with an era secularists deride as the Dark Ages? This first impression of absolute polarity is incorrect; instead, a closer examination of the origins of modern architecture shows that the connection was very real.

It is generally accepted that the nineteenth-century Gothic revival helped foster the rise of modern architecture.¹ This is particularly true of a variant vigorously championed by the French theorist and architect Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814–1879). In his copious writings Viollet-le-Duc emphasized the preeminence of structure in major Gothic buildings. He regarded these enterprises as a cutting-edge response to the technological challenges of the time. In an analogous fashion, Viollet-le-Duc suggested modern architects must confront the latest technological advances of their day, exploiting them to the full. More generally, the Gothic revival disrupted the aesthetic dictatorship of the classical-Renaissance tradition, represented by such hallowed names as Vitruvius, Palladio, and Vignola. Goths and modernists agreed that tradition had reached a kind of terminal ossification in the teaching of the *Ecole des Beaux-Arts*. Indeed, the term *Beaux-Arts* did service for this entire approach, which, it seemed, had reached a dead end.

To be sure, the role of medievalism—that is, a devotion to the values and ethos, the arts and practices of the Middle Ages—in the emergence of modern architecture was not limited to the Gothic. Romanesque and to a lesser degree Early Christian architecture influenced one of America's greatest architects, Henry Hobson Richardson, who utilized

their stylistic elements to striking effect in buildings in Boston, Pittsburgh, and elsewhere. There was also significant Romanesque-revival architecture in Europe, especially in Germany.²

The architect known as Le Corbusier was self-educated, and at the outset of his professional development was known by his birth name Charles-Edouard Jeanneret. Handicapped by his lack of higher education, Jeanneret did not always properly understand the historical sequence of the Romanesque and Gothic epochs, yet through assiduous private study and careful observation he developed a deep understanding of their aesthetic and structural principles. As his preference for the horizontal grew, his early attraction to Gothic architecture waned, and toward the end of his life Romanesque traditions played a major role.

In addition to Romanesque and Gothic, the vernacular trend also played a role. Worldwide in scope, vernacular architecture is to a large extent an anonymous, seemingly timeless tradition.³ In Europe, it grew out of the practice of humble masons and carpenters of the Middle Ages. Vernacular style figured prominently in the late nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts movement, which may be characterized as the triumph and exaltation of this hitherto humble trend. William Morris, its most influential champion, was the heir of the English medievalists Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin and John Ruskin.

Jeanneret underwent an exceptionally long period of professional maturation, encompassing the years 1887–1920. However, in his mature years, Le Corbusier demonstrated an ambivalent attitude toward this foundational phase and sought to delete his earlier efforts from his canon, excluding them from his otherwise copious *Oeuvres complètes*, the approved presentation of what purports to be the totality of his work. At the same time, he privately preserved his earlier sketchbooks, drawings, and written texts. This evidence today is undergoing heightened scrutiny, revealing many contrasts between Jeanneret and Le Corbusier. In crucial ways, the work represents opposing sensibilities. One might say that the self-realization of Le Corbusier required the suppression—even the slaying—of Jeanneret.

It is the thesis of this essay that medievalism—at first passive and *retardataire*, then more dynamic and up-to-date—was a major component of the architect's work as Jeanneret. Discarding that identity meant relinquishing the medievalism that held him captive. In basic outline, then, the narrative of this

essay will discuss medieval engagement during the architect's formative years as Jeanneret, followed by a rejection of this element in the mature, major phase of Le Corbusier's career.⁴ Yet the distinction is not so neat as this formula would suggest, for the mature work betrays significant after-echoes which can be detected even in the late burst of creativity manifested in the Ronchamp chapel and the monastery of La Tourette. In psychoanalytic terms this resurgence might be described as the "return of the repressed."

Jeanneret was brought up in a moderate congregation of Reform Christianity that owed its origins to John Calvin, implicitly acknowledging the supersession of the Middle Ages. Unlike Roman Catholicism, Reform congregations emphasize the centrality of careful reading of the Bible, a practice that may have been consequential for the architect. For example, the motif "eyes that do not see" in Le Corbusier's *Towards a New Architecture* may reflect the words "they have eyes to see but do not see" (Ezekiel 12:2).

In any event, the future architect's background would seem to invite little sympathy with the medieval era. Yet a family legend has it that Jeanneret's forebears stemmed from the medieval Albigensian sect, centered in southwestern France. The Albigensians suffered intense persecution at the hands of the Catholic majority. This family legend casts a curious light on Le Corbusier's religious buildings since all the significant structures were created for the Roman Catholic church. The two most important, La Tourette monastery and Ronchamp chapel of Notre-Dame-du-Haut, may be called Romanesque-like and Gothic-like respectively. To be sure, they are not imitations of the revival mode, but reflect a thorough assimilation and rethinking—so much so that many are unaware of the medieval influences that inform their extraordinary formal language.

Jeanneret's first mentor was Charles L'Epplattenier, the energetic director of the Ecole d'Art at La Chaux-de-Fonds, the home town of the future architect. This school had an orientation toward the English Arts and Crafts movement. Largely through the vigorous example of William Morris, the Arts and Crafts movement had a strong medieval component, seen, for example, in rambling plans, pointed arches, and decorative schemes involving flat images—all features found in Morris's Red House of 1881. To be sure, the more general orientation of Arts and Crafts architecture was toward the vernacular tradition. Yet even as this tradition developed anonymously over the centuries, it may be argued that its *fons et origo* lay in the Middle Ages. The lasting influence of L'Epplattenier is shown by Jeanneret's many letters to him. As Linda Kastan suggested in my 2004 Hunter College seminar on Le Corbusier, he may even have chosen his pseudonym in part in homage to his master, as both surnames begin with the French definite article "le."

The authors most read when Jeanneret was at the Ecole d'Art were Owen Jones, compiler of a vast compendium on design throughout the world; Eugène Grasset, the French deco-

orative artist; and John Ruskin. Today Ruskin is perhaps best known for his advocacy of the Gothic Revival, especially the Italian version of the style. However, Ruskin recommended careful study of nature, regarding it as a norm. It did not hurt that the Alps were among the English writer's favorite sites for this study. Ruskin saw both nature and the Gothic as exemplars of truth. For Jeanneret an additional affinity with Ruskin was that he had been brought up in a Protestant dissenting sect that provided few keys to understanding medieval art, pervaded as it is with apocrypha (not included in Protestant Bibles), saints, and the ideals of the monastic orders. By overcoming these limitations, the English writer demonstrated that one could retain Protestant convictions while still admiring the art of medieval Catholicism.

During his lifetime Ruskin forbade translation of his works. Indeed, their eloquent English style is part of the effect, which can be almost hypnotic. After his death in 1900, though, a kind of Ruskin renaissance was unleashed on the European continent through a flurry of translations. Jeanneret, naturally, read Ruskin in French.

In the summer of 1906, Jeanneret designed his first house, the Villa Jeanneret in La Chaux-de-Fonds, helped by another, more experienced architect. With its overhanging gable and sgraffito designs on the facade, the villa belongs to a genre sometimes called *Heimatkunst*—a vernacular style with its roots in central Switzerland and the German-speaking Alpine region. The house was not completed until 3 August 1907.

Jeanneret had still not undertaken what many architects regarded as a kind of "aesthetic honeymoon"—the formative trip to Italy. Equipped with a must-see list supplied by his teacher L'Epplattenier, the young Swiss began this trip on 3 September 1907. Partly for reasons of financial stringency, his itinerary was confined to northern Italy. Thus he missed the major monuments of ancient and Baroque art and architecture, which are for the most part located further south on the peninsula. Yet even in northern Italy he tended to skip the major monuments of incipient Renaissance art: Masaccio, Ghiberti, and Brunelleschi held little interest for him. Instead, guided by John Ruskin, he focused on the preceding period, the Trecento, the medieval climax.⁵

In Florence his guide was Ruskin's *Mornings in Florence*, first published in 1875, though he used a French translation of 1906. The grim, curmudgeonly tone that sometimes mars the Englishman's exhortations is notably absent from this little gem. There are five mornings devoted to seeing—quite selectively—three churches only. Like Ruskin, Jeanneret had accustomed himself to "papist" elements in medieval art, such as the prominence of the saints, the guiding role of the monastic orders, and medieval legend in general. The power of the art reconciled both Protestant men to these things.

Sometimes in his vade mecum Ruskin disarmingly admits that he has forgotten something, or failed to do some research that was needed. At the end he allows the visitor to go to lunch—and then go shopping. Jeanneret credited Ruskin with

teaching him how to see. His guide recommended starting at dawn, as some things can only be properly viewed in the best light. Light, differently inflected after a visit to the Parthenon, was to be for Jeanneret a major element in his architectural aesthetic.

So attentively did Jeanneret study *Mornings in Florence* that he even followed up on a kind of throw-away recommendation: Ruskin allowed that if a change were needed, then to visit the abbey at Val d'Enza (Galluzzo).⁶ For the young Swiss architect, this visit was to rank as one of his two most significant life-changing experiences. The other, as we shall see, was a visit to the Parthenon in Athens. Never one to accept the iconoclastic view of some modernists that earlier art had no value, his consciousness was forever anchored by two poles: Val d'Enza and Athens.

Of course Jeanneret admired monuments in other towns in Italy besides Florence. In the sixth-century church of San Vitale in Ravenna he paid attention to the interior, but only to render the gorgeous surfaces of the mosaics and marble incrustations in his drawings. The light and color of Venice enchanted him, while he seems to have viewed its buildings through the lens of Ruskin's major work, *The Stones of Venice*. Throughout, he produced copious renderings in pencil and watercolor, supplementing these records with photographs and postcards. The selectivity of his interest is remarkable. As noted, the Trecento was his favorite era. In looking at Trecento buildings, such as Or San Michele and the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence, he was mainly interested in decorative details of the surface. His graphic renderings suggest a series of exquisite tapestries. Conversely, he showed scarcely any interest in structure and technical problems. His vision at this time was essentially one of surface. He reduced the building itself to a mere core encased in a filigree of polychrome decoration.

A little later he reinforced this concern with surfaces through his acquaintance with the ideas of Gottfried Semper, the architect and theorist, whose imposingly ornate Kunsthistorisches Museum he saw in Vienna. Semper's key idea of cladding stemmed mainly from Renaissance sources, but the underlying aesthetic was much the same as the one Jeanneret absorbed through Ruskin. Overcoming this fixation with surface and replacing it with a plastic emphasis—conceiving buildings as three-dimensional entities governed by their inner structure—was to be one of the chief ways in which Le Corbusier eventually supplanted his younger self, Charles-Edouard Jeanneret.

The earliest years of Jeanneret's formation displayed a contradictory mixture of timidity and grandiosity. Given his provincial origins and uncertain career path, the timidity seemed almost inevitable. The grandiosity was fed by his reading, which proffered charismatic figures such as Zoroaster, Jesus, and Nietzsche as role models.⁷

In March 1908, Jeanneret went to Paris, where he remained for a year and a half. This was of course a period of

intense development in avant-garde painting, one of his chief interests. Painting was nonetheless overshadowed by a truly formative experience: his service as a part-time assistant to the architect Auguste Perret (1874–1954).⁸ Perret, whose firm included his brothers Gustave and Claude, specialized in reinforced concrete. In contrast to Jeanneret's obsession with surface of the previous years, Perret denounced ornament as a distraction from the real work of architecture, which lay in the interior structure. As Le Corbusier later recalled Perret remarking: "One must build with perfection; decoration generally hides a want of perfection."⁹ Throughout his life, the Swiss architect was to regard Perret as his most important master in architecture.¹⁰

Apart from the merits of his on-the-job training, this was a lonely time for Jeanneret. During his leisure time he threw himself into study. At Perret's urging, he used his first paycheck to purchase Viollet-le-Duc's massive *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française* in ten volumes (1854–1868). Viollet-le-Duc, who had much experience in both restoration and building, offered diagrams and detailed descriptions of medieval buildings, which he admired not so much for their religious value as for their witness of the imperatives of technology in their own day.

Jeanneret did not concern himself solely with theory, but sought to apply it to one of the most imposing Gothic monuments. As he recalled almost fifteen years later: "I was very keen on construction. I spent whole afternoons in Notre-Dame, equipped with an enormous set of keys from the Ministry of Fine Arts. I got to know the tiniest recesses of the cathedral, right to the tips of the towers, pinnacles, and flying buttresses. For me it was the Gothic epic poem."¹¹ Moreover, he attended lectures on Gothic architecture by Lucien Magne at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, supplementing these with private study of Romanesque architecture in the library. His sketchbook from the period shows attentive study of the way in which successive solutions to structural problems fostered the forward movement of the style. It is possible, though not proven, that as a painter he was attracted to the contemporary depictions of medieval buildings by the painters Henri Matisse and Robert Delaunay. In any event, Jeanneret's first Parisian period in 1908 represented the high-water mark of his medieval involvement. During this time he overcame his preoccupation with the surfaces of buildings (originally directed toward Italian Gothic structures), through close study of French Romanesque and Gothic work.

The years immediately following were marked not so much by formal study of medieval architecture as by the allied realm of vernacular building and folk art. He obtained a copy of the French version of Camillo Sitte's work on city planning, with its additional material emphasizing picturesque street compositions supplied by the translator, Camille Martin. This resulted in his first treatise on city planning, which remained unpublished through the architect's life.¹² The notebooks that survive from Jeanneret's German trip show a strong

interest in picturesque, often medieval, elements of towns. These interests were dampened but not eliminated by his work in 1910 with Peter Behrens in Berlin. Behrens preferred a spare, modern approach, one inflected by the German classicism of Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781–1841).

Many of these vernacular preoccupations surface in Jeanneret's trip through the Balkans from 7 May to 27 September 1911.¹³ During the early part of the trip, he dutifully followed advice given by one of his mentors, the Swiss writer William Ritter (1867–1955), to look at vernacular and folk art. His companion on the trip was August Klipstein (1885–1951), who was at that time studying for a doctorate. Klipstein had attended lectures by Wilhelm Worringer, and likely would have conveyed his teacher's ideas of medieval art as dominated by abstraction. Before the trip Jeanneret indicated a strong interest in seeing Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, but perhaps because his interest was so strong he was disappointed by the actual encounter. Instead, he fell under the spell of Ottoman mosques, caravansaries, and wooden houses. In Greece his visit to Mount Athos renewed the interest in medieval monasteries that had so strongly gripped him at Val d'Ema (Galluzzo) in 1907.

What Jeanneret was not prepared for, it seems, was the Athenian Parthenon, which bowled him over. Not only did this experience finally remove any lingering doubts about his commitment to architecture as a profession, it provided him with a new template, one that featured horizontal emphasis and a kind of sculptural concept of buildings as masses shaped by light.

Yet the medieval imprint was not altogether effaced. One way to consider the Jeanneret years is to recognize two high points (eureka moments, as it were). The first was his 1907 visit to the monastery of Val d'Ema (Galluzzo), which he perceived as the reconciliation of the individual and the collective. The second was his visit to the Parthenon in 1911, which finally ended his hesitation about the future course of his career: Jeanneret would become an architect. After he reinvented himself as Le Corbusier a decade later, this Hellenic theme continued to resonate: witness the illustrations in his book *Vers une architecture* (1923). Yet the Val d'Ema experience was not forgotten. Arguably it resurfaced in his ideas for the huge apartment houses known as *unités d'habitation*. These megastructures, of which six were actually built, embodied a twentieth-century version of the reconciliation of the individual and the collective, a prospect he had first begun to understand at Val d'Ema.

During the years 1920–1925, Le Corbusier and his collaborator Amédée Ozenfant brought out 28 issues of their review, *L'Esprit Nouveau*. It was at this time that the architect's invented (though ostensibly familial) identity, signaled by the portentous adoption of the name Le Corbusier, definitively supplanted his former identity as Jeanneret. Similarly, the copiously illustrated magazine was devoted entirely to the machine age, with no concessions to the past. In that respect it showed an affinity with Italian futurism, with its programmatic opposition to past traditions (*anti-passé*).

Yet as Le Corbusier began to turn his most significant articles from *L'Esprit Nouveau* into books a different story emerged. The past could be used, but selectively. In *Vers une architecture*, Greek temples assume an important place. He compares the Parthenon to a modern automobile: the two reflect the same underlying principles. In making this comparison Le Corbusier implicitly criticized the notion of Marinetti, the theorist of futurism, that a speeding automobile had definitively superseded the Nike of Samothrace as an icon of beauty. The system of drums found in Greek temples anticipates modern standardization of parts. In the book, a lone citation from the Middle Ages, a photograph of Notre-Dame of Paris, serves to illustrate Le Corbusier's system of proportion. The medieval era was fading in his perception, but as we shall see, the era did not disappear completely.

The magazine *L'Esprit Nouveau* was international, but not impartial. By implication it was linked to the French foreign policy that sought to forge alliances to contain Germany. During the 1920s, Le Corbusier accommodated the anti-German trend in France. The tall, vertical towers of Gothic cathedrals were considered quintessentially Germanic, despite the correct determination in the mid-nineteenth century that Gothic architecture was French in origin. Mediterranean clarity, it seems, demanded horizontals. Le Corbusier now decried the "primordial plastic poverty" of Notre-Dame of Paris, a building he had once adored.¹⁴

By the mid-1920s, the *Esprit Nouveau* period was over. Enough theory for theory's sake: the thing was to build. With the new emphasis on production, medievalism survived in unexpected ways. The commission to build the Cité de Refuge, the Salvation Army facility in Paris (1929–1930), inevitably evoked the formative experience at the monastery of Val d'Ema in 1907. There in the Tuscan hills was a model for collective, supervised living, which nonetheless respected the individual. In the view of William Curtis, the Cité de Refuge is a kind of translation of a medieval castle, complete with bastions, gate house, moat, and drawbridge.¹⁵

In 1934, Le Corbusier traveled to Italy to give a lecture. On this trip he saw in a new light some of the monuments that had engaged his interest on his youthful study trips. From the train he made a sketch of the cathedral group at Pisa, with its famous leaning tower. He was struck by the affinity between the solution of the problem of coordinating several major structures found in that medieval complex and his own efforts in the controversial League of Nations project (1927) and the Centrosoyuz complex in Moscow (1928–1935). The latter enterprise, a major undertaking, suggests a curious but real affinity between Soviet collectivism and that of the Middle Ages.

Somewhat unexpectedly, Le Corbusier's 1935 visit to the United States elicited a reexamination of the achievement of medieval cathedrals. He was aware of the conventional comparison of New York skyscrapers with medieval cathedrals—the Woolworth Building was dubbed "the Cathedral of Com-

merce,” for example. The title of his memoir of this visit—*Quand les cathédrales étaient blanches*—reflected this comparison. Yet Le Corbusier seeks to give it a new inflection. In thinking of the medieval cathedrals that survive in Europe we must cast aside the crumbling, grimy piles in our midst and return mentally to when they were new. “When the cathedrals were white, Europe had organized the crafts under the imperative impulse of a quite new, marvelous and exceedingly daring technique, the use of which led to unexpected systems of forms—in fact to forms whose spirit disdained the legacy of a thousand years of tradition.”¹⁶ With these words Le Corbusier reverts to the ideas of Viollet-le-Duc, who viewed medieval cathedrals not so much as spiritual statements as reflections of organization and technique. As we might say today, they were “cutting-edge” achievements responding to the latest challenges of technology.

Have we achieved something comparable today? Not yet, according to Le Corbusier. The skyscrapers may be a step in the right direction, but they are not our cathedrals, for those are yet to come.

The outbreak of World War II on 3 September 1939 was followed by nine months of relative calm, the so-called phony war. On 5 September, Le Corbusier and his wife Yvonne went to stay in Vézelay in Burgundy. The central focus of the town is a major Romanesque abbey, La Madeleine, which had been restored by Viollet-le-Duc. Doubtless, this stay did much to refresh Le Corbusier’s awareness of the Romanesque, which dated back to his first Parisian stay thirty years before.

In Western Europe the period immediately following World War II showed a powerful surge of reconstruction, marked by an austerity imposed by harsh economic conditions. For its part, the Catholic church, an important player in the reconstruction process, showed itself open to modernity in the arts.

Arguably Le Corbusier’s greatest single achievement, the hilltop chapel of Notre-Dame-du-Haut at Ronchamp, blends several religious traditions seamlessly. The relationship with the landscape reaches back to the Neolithic shrines of Western Europe. Evidently, Le Corbusier attributed a solar emphasis to this source. The site marks the emplacement of a venerable image of the Virgin Mary, providing the official justification of the structure. While there are no specific references to

Gothic art, the structure’s use of colored glass and its almost pneumatic élan reflect a general understanding of that period. There are important echoes of the architecture of German expressionism of the 1920s, a movement of diffuse, but genuine spirituality. Finally, the surfaces reveal reminiscences of the North African mosques Le Corbusier had seen in the 1920s.

The unexpected novelty of the Ronchamp chapel disconcerted admirers loyal to his earlier aesthetic. Others wondered how a religious unbeliever could create a Roman Catholic monument. Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that Le Corbusier had never given himself over entirely to rationalism, but retained an intuitive, even mystical component. His creativity, he felt, flowed from the dialectical interaction of rationality and intuition.

In 1953, overcoming some initial misgivings, Le Corbusier accepted the invitation of Father Alain Couturier to design the Dominican monastery of Sainte-Marie-de-la-Tourette, near Lyon. While the architect remained an unbeliever, he was attracted by the concept of the monastic community as a union of the individual and the collective, a vision that had first gripped him at Val d’Ema in 1907. At La Tourette, which has a sharp drop on one side, he also may have been thinking of the cliff-hanging monasteries he had seen at Mount Athos in 1911. Couturier recommended the monastery of Le Thoronet as a model. Indeed, the austere, unadorned shapes of this Cistercian complex, set in a remote area of Provence, did appeal to the architect. Using raw concrete he was able to evoke the spirit, if not the details, of the medieval model.

His Cistercian interest continued. In 1956, Le Corbusier supplied a short preface for a book of photographs by his friend Lucien Hervé of the monastery of Cîteaux.¹⁷ The structural and decorative austerity of Cistercian monasteries, of which Cîteaux was the first, embodies the Romanesque emphasis on parsimony, an aesthetic of these buildings that carried over into the Gothic period.

From the highly decorated walls of Trecento Florence to the austere mural structures of the Cistercians was a long journey, occupying half a century. Le Corbusier’s engagement with the Middle Ages, though shifting and diminished in later years, was nonetheless a key component in his overall development.

NOTES

1. See G. Germann, *Gothic Revival in Europe and Britain: Sources, Influences and Ideas* (London, 1972), 167–179; and more generally W. R. Dynes, “Gothic Aesthetics,” in *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. M. Kelley (New York, 1998), II, 326–329.
2. See K. Curran, *The Romanesque Revival* (University Park, PA, 2003).
3. See *Encyclopedia of World Vernacular Architecture*, ed. P. Oliver (Cambridge, 1997).
4. For a different take on the architect’s medievalism, see P. Vaisse, “Le Corbusier and the Gothic,” in *Le Corbusier before Le Corbusier: Applied Arts, Architecture, Painting, Photography, 1907–1922*, ed. S. von Moos and A. Rüegg (New York, 2002), 43–54.
5. For an insightful account of the trip, see H. A. Brooks, *Le Corbusier’s Formative Years* (Chicago, 1997), 95–116. This volume offers the fullest and most reliable presentation of the Jeanneret phase.
6. J. Ruskin, *Mornings in Florence: Simple Studies of Christian Art for English Travelers* (New York, 1875), 24.
7. See P. V. Turner, *The Education of Le Corbusier* (New York, 1977).
8. See *Encyclopédie Perret*, ed. J.-L. Cohen (Paris, 2002).
9. Le Corbusier, *The Decorative Art of Today*, trans. J. L. Dunnett (Cambridge, MA, 1987), 202.
10. See Le Corbusier, *Lettres à Auguste Perret*, ed. M.-J. Dumont (Paris, 2002).
11. Le Corbusier, *Decorative*, 203–204.
12. The treatise has been reconstructed: Le Corbusier, *La construction de villes*, ed. M. E. A. Emery (Lausanne, 1992).
13. Le Corbusier, *Journey to the East*, ed. I. Žaknić (Cambridge, MA, 1989). For the notebooks, see Le Corbusier, *Voyage d’Orient: Carnets* (Milan, 2002).
14. Le Corbusier, *Decorative*, 204–205.
15. W. J. R. Curtis, *Le Corbusier: Ideas and Forms* (New York, 1986), 102.
16. Le Corbusier, *When the Cathedrals Were White*, trans. F. E. Hyslop, Jr. (New York 1947), 3. As A. Erlande-Brandenburg suggests in the witty title of his book, *Quand les cathédrales étaient peintes* (Paris, 1993), medieval cathedrals, not unlike Greek temples before them, were not uniformly white, but displayed significant elements of color in the sculpture and stained glass, and some architectural features.
17. *La plus grande architecture du monde, Cîteaux* (Paris, 1956).