Introduction

In architecture, the concept of “limit” is generally inquired based on a substantialist approach. Inquiries using this approach, however, have become problematic in current architectural researches during recent years. The substances, or pre-defined fundamentals are put in relations with each other, as like the relations happen outside of them. Accordingly, substantialist approach differed, as like it has become a transactional one where relation exists as a pseudo of it. Pseudo-trasactional or pseudo-relational means a sort of illusion in which a thing is not what it really is. Therefore, this research is to inquire limits in architecture based on transactional approach instead of a substantialist one. Transactional approach involves a shift away from thinking a concept as a singular categorical expression. Accordingly, the terms need to be acknowledged within their relations, rather than ontological entities. The distinction of transactional approach is that “it sees relations between terms or units as preeminently dynamic in nature, as unfolding, ongoing processes rather than as static ties among inert substances” (Emirbayer 1997, 289-295). In fact, what is relational and how dynamic relations could be indicated is demanding for an inquiry. The term “limit” has several meanings, which could be arranged through their delineations by substantialist and transactional approaches. For example, assuming there is a “limit” separating x and y from each other, substantialist point of view defines “limit” as the division where x is separated from y. That sort of analogous definitions of limit by a substantialist approach conveys a negative understanding of one being out of the other. However, “limit” cannot be positioned outside a relational structure. Also, if we define the relationship as a separate entity from x and y, it may only appear as transactional but it is, in fact, actually focused on substantialism. In case of acknowledging the relation between x and y as a third entity, pseudo-transactional approach emerges, which is also substantialist. The essential differentiation between a substantialist and transactional point of view is shown as in Figure 1. Accordingly, an approval of a third entity, as a limit, is not necessary to acknowledge the yellow and grey areas. Both grey and yellow areas exist within their own becoming.

Conceptual Inquiry

The article aims to inquire limits in architecture by a transactional approach. However, the difficulty of transactional
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inquiring arises where “a limit specification” is demanded. Hence, this article is conducted to consider the transactional approach by borrowing some ways of doing and thinking, such as Actor Network Theory (ANT) for grasping network relations.

Latour (2004) explains ANT as a theory about how to study things when those things change fast and boundaries are fuzzy. Therefore, ANT could be against to have a standpoint as a well-defined, absolute method. However, it is not about standing on a point, but having various viewpoints from the same positioning, which are essentially changeable: “The great thing about a standpoint is, precisely, that you can change it” (Latour 2004, 65). In this regard, ANT suggests a relational approach, by mentioning that we must follow objects in action. Ontologically, humans are not substances or essences in regards of Latour’s theory and humans are not superior to non-humans as actants. Thus, Latour does not make a division between a child and a table’s role as an actor but he accepts all as entities. An actant is not limited to human individuals but it is a term that is extended to non-human entities as well (Harman 2009, 14-15). Accordingly, an actor or an actant do act, as the words themselves suggest, and they are not ready-made essences or substances but events which are fully deployed (Latour 2004, 73). What is stated by the concept of relations in the article of Emirbayer stands as a parallel approach to what Bruno Latour mentions by network.

In fact, ANT suggests looking at the network relations, and Latour’s consideration of “actors and actants” denies the prior role of humans where the frequent considerations are distorted.

**Blurring as an Architectural Act**

“Blurring limits in architecture” is considered by architectural exemplars with a transactional point of view. Emphasizing the exemplars as “architectural”, however, does not mean to limit the inquiry based on architectural works, but also relational discourses, intents, and processes. In fact, the exemplars to be discussed do not mean to change their standing circumstances as a threshold; but they should be considered as challenges to acknowledge the well-defined limits and suggest beyond. Accordingly, the act of blurring needs to be considered as a process instead of reaching its possible results.

A blurry image could be perceived as a mistaken one that is generally out of focus. Besides, seeing blurred is a defined visual impairment, called as “blurred vision” in which vision refers to a lack of sharpness. A person with blurred vision means that he is unable to see details. However, the contemporary visual studies define blurring as a method today, by which various types of blurring are mentioned. Shown as in Figure 2, five images indicate different types of blurring where the first one, original image, is shown among its blurred versions. As the images represent, the act of blurring in visual arts might transform a detailed image to an indistinct, a less
detailed, a motion-effected, or an ambiguous one. The first image turns out to be a new image after it is blurred.

Blurring, as an act, seeks to undermine the well-defined limits in architecture within frequently referred notions and binaries. In fact, **blurring explains the process as an act that takes action; and not used as an adjective such in “blurring architecture”**. **Blurring does not define a completed fact that represents what has already been “blurred”**. In his book entitled as *Blurred Zones*, Eisenman (2003) defines blurring as a conceptual activity in regard to architecture, by underlining that it takes many different definitions such as “the between” and “the interstitial”.

He outlines an “unmotivated motivation” which he defines as “a movement from the fullness of motivation to something less motivated – a between condition”. Pointing out that there can never be a total lack of motivation; he gives the example of 16th year architectural discourses as motivated conditions. Eisenman’s comments about motivated conditions might be considered as a criticism on the limits held by pre-defined motivations. In fact, he suggests going beyond the motivations that are pre-defined, which involve descriptions of shelter, enclosure, stability, ground, et cetera. This act advocates neither to be dependent on the former narratives nor to devoid the meaning, but to reside between the two: “where other forms of meaning, and meaningful situations, can occur” (Eisenman 2003, 7-8).

Eisenman (2003) mentions habits while talking about considerations that are based on former narratives. Tschumi (Tschumi & Walker, 2006) also mentions architectural habits as they are generally predetermined and involved with received ideas. Accordingly, approaches in regard to architectural periods are more about that sort of habits. Tschumi mentions that he wanted to develop conceptual tools before entering the practice. In this regard, he underlines that he couldn’t have started with practice but with conceptual inquiries. Therefore, his approach to start with conceptual inquiries could be mentioned as an attempt not to repeat these architectural habits (Tschumi & Walker 2006, 28).

Correspondingly, habits are limits and the act of blurring presents an unmotivated motivation, rejecting status quo. Blurring suggests an in-between condition, in which the limits are queried such in Eisenman’s consideration of architectural habits and Tschumi’s statement about his necessities to start with conceptual inquiries. Toyo Ito (2000), on the other hand, refers to “blurring” in regard to describe an architectural approach where the inquiries on physical circumstances are not strict. Ito’s *blurring architecture* is an image of an indefinite architecture. Ito (2000) refers to blurring both literally and contextually, where **blurring architecture** is defined as a kind of soft architecture. According to Ito, three elements should be present for a blurring architecture:

1. Architecture with soft boundaries, which can react in response to the natural environment;
2. Architecture transforming the programme in a room; and
3. Architecture striving for transparency and homogeneity, but also making possible special features of the location. The first element is described within modernism, where the attitudes of both being enrolled to nature and being detached from the
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nature are outlined. Responding to nature and having a flexible boundary for that availability are assumed essential. Second one is more about the changes and transformations where strict programmes would no longer respond to varying necessities of present-day. What is significant for Ito with the second element is the removal of the boundaries based on simplifying functions, and establishing a superimposition of spaces. By mentioning the last element, Ito suggests a space with a transparent and homogeneous grid in which eclipses appear through the floating. Through the action of various streams, homogeneity becomes distorted and different places appear (Ito, 2000, 2013).

By way of Blur Building has become one of the main references about blurring in the field of architecture, Diller and Scofidio object a contextual approach in which an experience is suggested within the act of blurring. Blur Building is designed as a media pavilion for Swiss Expo 2002 (Figure 3). The architects, Diller and Scofidio define Blur Building as a pure atmosphere instead of a building, where the immersive potential of blurring is examined through an environmental scale. Although it is stated that metaphorical tale-type stories through a spiritual manner is out of their objective; the building has become a commentary ground for analogous comments. The visual dependency has been their focus during the design process, resulted with a project that offers little to see. The objective is defined as to weave architecture and electronic technologies together, while exchanging the properties of each for the other (Diller and Scofidio, 2002). Wolfe (2013) comments on this relational objective by mentioning that the project has valued the difference between perception and communication. According to his approach, Blur Building conveyed that difference as art. Therefore, the interactions have taken the attention as an art object.

Consequently, “Blurring Limits in Architecture” stands as a progressive approach, rather than defining an impairment such as blurred vision, or a sort of malfunction in architecture. Blurring limits embody an unmotivated approach, that the frequent motivations of architecture are examined. In fact, blurring is more about an on-going process, rather than signifying a completed act such the word blurred represents. Architecture cannot be blurred as a physical realm, but the limits of architecture might be. Therefore, blurring inquires the limits and blurs them by changing; transforming, altering and transgressing, where the opportunities of an “in-between” space might be emerged. For a further understanding, three exemplars are chosen to define those acts. These exemplars represent three acts of blurring limits in architecture, involving a discussion with some other artworks / installations / projects et cetera:
1. Altering

Altering differentiates the existing as a new entity by blurring its own limits. It has its own limits to be altered, which might exist as a finished object, or a completed work, or a traditionally accepted fundamental, or an acknowledged approach. Design through physical alterations appears as one of the foremost discussions. For example, inquiring the role of transparency is still an ongoing discussion where the outside is assumed relational with inside. Besides, modern architecture has a strong relationship with the concept of transparency and that complex relationship between architecture and transparency has been changed through many parameters such as the technological improvements in frame-structure systems. That, also, affected many theoretical texts and built works. In his book titled “Glass in Modern Architecture”, for example, Korn (1968) declares the use of glass as “the disappearance of the outside wall”. Today, outside-wall consideration is also changed.

First exemplar to be discussed is James Turrell’s works, who is an American artist creating artworks by using light and space. Turrell aims to engage viewers with the limits and wonder of human perception. His works exemplify the act of altering by providing differentiated perceptions for an existing building or providing a new spatial experience to acknowledge a natural environment. Thus, Turrell’s works introduce either alternative ways of perceiving an existing space or encountering a new space to be perceived (Figure 4). In his works held in New York Guggenheim Museum, Frank Llyod Wright’s architecture has been re-perceived through Turrell’s installations as the building has become the canvas of his artwork. As Turrell’s works at Guggenheim are all involved and overlapped with the space of Wright, his works alternate the experience of Guggenheim as a museum. A series of interlocking cones lined with LED fixtures were used at the installation, surrounding the core of daylight through the ramps of museum. The apparatus that creates those effects are mostly hidden from view, “encouraging viewers to interpret what they see by means of their own perception” (Turrell). In fact, Turrell’s works involve their standing spaces as actants, while suggesting a dynamic relation with visitors.

The material characteristics, such as transparency and reflectivity of a material, might obtain an ambiguity where the use of those materials is considered as a blurring act. A visual connection is usually mentioned as an aftereffect of relational consideration in which outside and inside are considered relational.

Figure: 4
However, transparent material use on a façade might suggest a visual connection while not providing a spatial one. In this context, transparency would be involved to a pseudo-transactional assembly of relations. Translucent building skins, on the other hand, might create cyclical variations in the character of interior and exterior spaces by its altering relations during the day. As seen in the Figure 5, Beinecke Gordon Bunshaft (library) suggests an alternative material to glass, which is stone, to be used at the façade. The library has explored the potential translucency of stones for an altering spatial experience.

While protecting the rare books from the damage of ultraviolet, the use of stone as a translucent material provides a controlled daylight for the library. Hence, transparency might indicate a substantialist limit while a translucent, or an opaque material might provide a dynamic relation between an inside and outside.

Altering, in fact, does not propose a focus on materiality or visual roles of the materials. It is more about blurring the previously repeated motivations, by acknowledging them as substantialist limits. Thus, altering differentiates the existing as a new entity and suggests a new meaning to an existing one. Each existing entity could be altered, by technological developments or by critical approaches affecting the standing approaches. What the act of altering demands is the comprehensive consciousness of the existing through an in-between positioning.

2. Transforming
Transforming is the act of a major change, a marked differentiation in appearance or character, where one turns into another.

As an act of blurring limits in architecture, transforming is referred to changes that do not alternate an existing entity but changing it as a new one. The first exemplar for that inquiry is an experimental theatre called Sleep No More. The spatial necessities of a differentiated performance blur the limits of the acknowledged approaches to design its space. The performance does not only suggest an inquiry on the frequent understanding of a theatre but also the changing demands of the experience and its spatial responses.

Sleep No More is a site-specific theatre, rendering Shakespeare’s Macbeth as the performance. The performance is first produced in London and later in New York, where company announced the building as McKittrick Hotel (Url-1). The so-called hotel is an adjoined building, including three warehouses with five floors in Manhattan. Each floor has many rooms designed with a specific concept based on the performance to be held there (Figure 6). Thus, the performance space is designed by transforming an existing building into the performance space of Sleep No More. However, the performance space is not chosen as an exemplar of transforming in regard to the word’s literal meaning, but it outlines a transforming that is both spatial and experimental. The open office plan with high ceilings, for example, makes them decide to have an outdoors (performance) space located on a higher floor, which establishes the orangery and the walled garden there. The claustrophobic spaces that are dark and oppressive are thought to be the supernatural spaces of the performance. Barrett (2014, 29) talks...
about the design process by sampling the method of an oil painting: “We don’t build models in advance or make rendered diagrams – it’s more like working layers into an oil painting.” In fact, not only the finalized performance space but also its design process has transformed the standing approaches of a performance and its spatial necessities.

“Howing out the masks is like assigning seats in an auditorium. It establishes each individual as part of an audience, and creates a boundary between them and the action” (Barrett, 2014, 24).

The performance as well as its site-specific space indicates dynamic relations. The space of the audience is not committed by a physical separation but by a symbolic mask that the members of audience have to wear during the performance. The actors do not perform in definite rooms as they also move towards different rooms as well as floors based on different scenes. Some members of audience might prefer staying in a room and explore the space by interacting with it. Sleep No More has a structure, and an “unseen text” which is not presented verbal but with a choreography. Barrett (2014) points that the performance is very structured but they wanted to make the members of audience to experience the acts as if they are spontaneous. Accordingly, it could be mentioned that the conventional structure of a performance is transformed to a non-linear storyline that is not narrative-based. As the structure provides the possibility for each member of the audience to choose what to experience during the performance, each one’s experience differs from the other. The fragmental structure, repeating three cycles during three hours, conveys the opportunity for each one to comprehend a different storyline at the end. In fact, structure of a performance, its spaces, as well as the audience’s role and actors’ defined zones are designed within a relations network, in which former considerations of each role and space are changed. Transforming the frequent acknowledgements of a performance space has brought a new understanding, wherein the (substantialist) limits of a fixed stage has turned to be a mask that is worn by the members of audience.

Brook (1996, 124-125) mentions the significance of incomplete design, which he defines as a design having clarity without rigidity. As reviewed with the exemplar of Sleep No More, the stage conveys an incomplete design in which experience of an audience member is optional but not narratively directed. The fragmented structure provides an optional experience, breaking the rigidity of a so-called complete design. Besides, blurring limits of a theatre experience demands modifications in its spatial necessities. Accordingly, the
design process differs, as the building becomes an actant by partaking a significant role. A stage-design by Didier Faustino, who is both an artist and architect, might be considered as another exemplar for such an inquiry (Figure 7). The stage includes a series of inflatable interlocking latex pillows and a dynamic surface of segmented metal pieces. Dynamic structure of the floor acts with the performers during the performance. The pieces could be raised and lowered in small clusters, while being manipulated into complex geometries. Hence, the work is entitled as “choreography of architecture” in which architecture is considered dancing with the performers. Faustino calls the work as an experiment in movement and time and a means of generating new architectural knowledge (Url-3).

Incomplete design provides an in-between space where the frequent motivations or approaches might be blurred. However, it should be mentioned that not all dynamic structures or moveable surfaces could be considered as an attempt to blur limits. Transforming, in fact, does not indicate a change in a structure or an appearance; but also its meaning, roles and characteristics. From the point of architecture, that sorts of open systems and incomplete designs face some problems; such as how Parc de La Villette conveyed the difficulty of being completed in regard to Tschumi’s conceptual approach. Tschumi (Tschumi & Walker, 2006) mentions that “nobody knew where or when to stop” during the building process. Accordingly, La Villette has been a significant project to indicate the possibility to blur limits by transforming the frequent and repeated approaches:

“None of the early projects, from La Villette to Le Fresnoy, follow the compositional rules of architecture; they are about transformational rules. What they all have in common is a process-oriented analytical approach. In other words, one could add and subtract, densify or rarify, within a given abstract structure” (Tschumi in Walker and Tschumi 2006, 63).

The programs, and pre-defined functional necessities for a program strictly define the process in which the frequently acknowledged approaches are submit-
ted. Tschumi’s approach stands as transactional, where the process leads the works as Tschumi suggests another ways of organizing architectural programs. Tschumi’s drawings as the operative diagrams represent the variety of activities. The diagrams are more than representative tools indicating what to be built and how. Shown as in Figure 8, there are cubes as small buildings, follies, which are capable of accommodating a variety of activities. In fact, follies are considered as actants, as well as activators of space rather than isolated sculptural objects. In this regard, follies marked the beginning of an attitude toward architecture. Evident at La Villette and later at Le Fresnoy, these projects developed a sensibility for acknowledging the architecture’s situations based on their standing periods (Walker and Tschumi 2006, 60-75).

Transforming as an act of blurring the limits mean changing the boundaries of conventional spatial definitions or pre-defined programs. According to functional roles that are assigned to some architectural elements, Sendai Mediatheque project by Toyo Ito might be discussed as another exemplar. The project is the winner of a competition that requested a complex of an art gallery, library and audiovisual center. Ito’s early schematic drawings demonstrate his conception of a building that is made of three elements: floor plates, structural tubes and skin. Without hierarchy, everything is designed as uniform where the uniformity is differentiated from that of a grid. Floor plates, structural tubes and skin are designed directly relational with the whole space, in which the space might accommodate various activities anywhere (Figure 9).

Indicated as the act of a major change, transforming creates a differentiation in appearance or character of an existing entity where it turns into a new one. In fact, a major change does not only consider a partial differentiation, but it affects the whole process. From an architectural point of view, transforming does not consider a basic change in a structure, or a shift in a program, or a visual illusion et cetera. It is a contextual change in which all design, its processes and users’ experiences are released.

3. Transgressing

Transgressing is defined as the act of a radical change, infringement. Compared with alteration and transformation, transgressing involves an activist approach where an ambiguity is left for further possibilities. It does not reflect a transformation at the present time, or an alteration of an entity but a sort of future projection. Transgressive acts of architecture might be seen to be pushing at the boundaries of what architecture is and what it could / should be. In fact, what is transgressive depends on the context, such as Duchamp’s Fountain and its transgressive role at 20th century art practice (Jonathan and Mosley 2014, 15). While both innovation and transgression share a common ground, transgression stands apart from innovation with its focus on crossing social and political boundaries. Castle underlines her foresight for architecture as following:

“High-risk design research that is prepared to transgress all known boundaries, given limits and conventions will become particularly necessary if architecture is to become fluid enough to reorganize and reshape itself in the shifting tides that new technologies bring” (Castle, 2014, 5).

Transgression is temporally conditioned, which means that a transgressive act in a previous time might not be transgressive today (Mosley and Sara, 2014, 36). In this regard, transgressing as an architectural act cannot be foreseen or generalized. Although it is possible to give some examples based on their transgressing roles, similar examples might not be considered transgressive in another context. As the example of Duchamp’s urinal confirms, the urinal as an artwork has been an event based on a transgressive act; however, a similar approach would not be considered transgressive in a present time.
Bernard Tschumi’s essay entitled “Architecture and Transgression” was written in 1976, as an attempt to provoke architects and theorists to explore the rules of architecture (Mosley and Sara, 2014, 32). Tschumi (1976) states that transgression is like the boundary between life and death, it is always there and “what changes is its type or nature”. By declaring architecture as a field that is inherently transgressive, Tschumi underlines transgression as overcoming unacceptable prevalences (Tschumi, 1996, p.67). Tschumi also talks about the domination of the image in relation to the philosophical triad of concept, percept and affect. When architecture is thought as a field of constructing images, it loses its transgressive quality, as images are almost never transgressive.

“The emphasis of architecture as a production of image suggests that the architect is limited to the roles of conservative or critic, since the role of revolutionary is concomitant with direct action allied to radical intent. ‘Most architects today see themselves solely as form-givers in an existing society, rarely as critics, and hardly ever revolutionaries’” (Mosley and Sara, 2014, 34).

What would be transgressive in regard to architecture, in fact, might be considered as useless, or meaningless in today’s conditions. However, the critical approaches based on substantialist limits and conventions involve a significant meaning for the future of the field(s). Rachel Whiteread’s sculptures, as an exemplar, mirror architectural spaces from a reversed perspective. Her approach is transgressive as a radical act for both art and architecture.

As an artist, Whiteread casts the negative space surrounding or within an object like the void of a room in a house, or the space in and around a myriad collection of books. The materials she typically uses are plaster, resin and rubber. What makes Whiteread’s works significant for architecture is not that she uses architectural objects, but she gives us an opportunity to inquiry the in-between existence of those objects.

Whiteread explores the inner life of rooms and objects where the emptiness and in-between spaces are filled (Breuer 2001, 21). In the book entitled The Art of Rachel Whiteread, Townsend (2004) mentions that in the works of Whiteread, things like past/future, public/private, and presence/absence collide. Accordingly, Whiteread’s works can be characterized as an attempt of engraving the invisibility of architecture, materializing those traces and signs of identity which are largely ignored by both individual and society but are fundamental to irrational or intuitive perception (Mari 1996, 62-64).

Rachel’s works such as House render the absence as the visible (Figure 10). Things collide and gives rise to what could be mentioned as “solid void” or “present absence”. Franck (2007, 20) mentions that, by filling the entire house with concrete and removing its walls and roof, Whiteread made an inside into an outside, an occupiable space to a hard visible surface. By doing this, Whiteread has given the significance to the invisible ones, by bringing it to our attention as the
solid, the form, and the visible object. In fact, it becomes both the absent house and the work called as House that together constitute the house as sign per se (Lawson 2004, 74). Accordingly, her works do not represent a direct dichotomy or a complex interpretation of what “inside/outside” or “public/private” refers to but a critical way to consider both. From an architectural perspective, Pallasmaa (2005) mentions that Whiteread’s architectural embalming make us intensely aware of boundary surface that delineates an object or space where the spectator is pushed out of the space and forced into the position of an outside observer: “The viewer gazes at the enveloping boundary of intimacy, unable to see; the experience is a combination of curiosity and guilt, excitement and frustration” (Pallasmaa, 2005, 22).

Consequently, transgressing is the act of a radical change, and it does not have to generate a threshold but a sort of reversed perspective based on its own contextual becoming. What is transgressive in regard to architecture might not be considered as architectural, such clear as Duchamp’s urinal’s role in arts. However, what could be called architectural is also on debate today. Since what architectural boundaries are or what submits as an architectural work could not be strictly defined today; a meaningless, or useless work could have an effective role in the future of any other work. Within this point of view, a transgressive act involves potentials of unknown changes, by rejecting an engagement of any mainstreamed consideration. Also, the act of transgressing emerge comprehensive affects, which are mostly undefined.

As a Conclusion
Transactional approach for an inquiry obtains to avoid the illusion of a relational consideration such in pseudo-transactional approaches. What is defined as relational, in fact, becomes problematical in contemporary researches. In the field of architecture, the approach for an inquiry is highly significant today, where pseudo-relations are declared, relieving a substantialist consideration. As discussed by some exemplars; materiality, transparency and its spatial reciprocity might be assumed as relational in terms of transparency’s visual characteristics while the spatial experience might exhibit a pseudo-relational condition. On the other hand, an opaque material such as a stone could provide an unexpected relation between an inside and an outside. However, the focus should not be limited with materiality and its visual aspects. Design by a transactional approach suggests inquiring whole relations, in which the process, the users as well as the design itself are equivalently involved. Defining the network relations between design, actors and actants become more significant as humans are not given a prior role. Rejecting the hierarchy between actors and actants, in fact, provides an inquiry that is based on the acts rather than the results of them.

Blurring, as an act, seeks to undermine well-defined limits in architecture that comprise frequently referred notions and binaries. “Blurring limits” reject to embody a motivation or categorization, as the frequent motivations and accepted categorizations of the fields are queried. As architecture cannot be literally blurred, blurring should be considered as the act in which substantialist limits are subjected.
To inquire those limits in architecture, three acts are suggested based on a transactional approach: altering, transforming and transgressing. The three acts involve bi-directional relations with each.

Altering is defined as the act of acknowledging the existing for its alternatives. Turrell’s works, for example, provides a new perception where the spatial experience of Guggenheim Museum differentiates. The rotunda of the museum becomes the canvas of Turrell, combining architecture and arts. Altering, in fact, does not only suggest an alternative experience of a current space, but it involves the space as an actant where dynamic relations emerge.

Transforming is about the major changes where the existing turns out to be a new entity. It is a convincing act in which all the process is affected. Thus, it needs to be considered as a contextual change that all the design, its processes and users’ experiences are released. As discussed with the exemplar of Sleep No More, it is not just a differentiated theatre experience, but also a new consideration on possible spatial responses for changing acts to be held there. The projects such as Ito’s Sendai Mediatheque, or Tschumi’s Parc de la Villette, blur substantialist limits by questioning what a structure, or a program, or a publicity meant before. Accordingly, the roles given to the space and its users differ than a repeated audience-stage consideration. Lastly, transgressing is defined as the act of an activist approach for future projections. Thus, it does not aim to achieve a meaning in today’s world, but stands as a critical approach.

Both three acts provide a differentiated disposition in regard to blurring a substantialist limit. In Figure 12, a grey cloud represents a (substantialist) limit, where it turns out to be such a new entity, represented by the color of yellow. However, these sorts of relations should not be considered as if they are linear and/or one-directional. As shown in the Figure 12, 1, 2 and 3a-b illustrate how the acts and their relational basis are defined. On the other hand, 4-5 and 6 illustrate the other possibilities of relations, in which 4 represents the possibility of a blurred limit being (re)blurred again. Darkened grey clouds represent the possible cases if a (substantialist) limit is stable that is not blurred but changed by time. Time, in fact, is a significant factor that defines the context of relations, such the relation 6 represents how a blurred limit might become a substantialist one again.

Consequently, the approach suggested by blurring limits aims to inquire the substantialist considerations of limits in the field of architecture. For example, a substantialist limit could be a repeated notion affecting a design process, or an architectural element that is to be transformed by technological developments, or an approach that generates the architectural processes. Blurring these limits would suggest a new way of thinking in architecture where dynamic relations could be held.
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