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Abstract

It seems like in the contemporary era and with the use of approaches which are formed during a passage from structuralism to poststructuralism, a number of fundamental changes have taken place in the different types of relationships between the works of architecture, their methods of productions and different readings of it along with the differences in the types of research and criticism among them. Such changes are present to a point that the borders between the works of architecture have become fairly vague and their relationships are probable, as these links can extremely question the self-existence nature of the work. We can search a set of orders in the mentioned link with this approach based on the amounts and quality of the connection between the works of architecture. With an assumption that the role of western architecture on the contemporary architecture of Iran can be subject of reading either as: 1. receiving an impression, approaching or arriving for a personal language; in other words, solid Interarchitecturality through a production-oriented process, or 2. as the suspension of a link on a level/surface (layer); in other words it is a type of light Interarchitecturality.

Keywords: Intertextuality, Iranian Contemporary Architecture, Interarchitecturality, Intertextual Relationship, Architecture Criticism

1. Introduction

At the present moment, the relationship between different cultures is beyond a simple encounter, it includes a number of effects and interactions on different layers. In the discipline of architecture, it has a specific signification in case from the viewpoint of architecture criticism to decide how to survey the new conditions of the current and exchanges. To survey such a link in the Iranian contemporary architecture, especially from 60’s decade onward is essential because the modern architecture that was shaped in this era used to be supported by the channel of European architects and their innovating ideas including the International style, school of Bauhaus, works of Le Corbusier, etc. Iranian people who had studied abroad and the students of the fine art university of Tehran has an impact on this field. In parallel with this currentand in the same period, influenced by the liberal movement which strived to leave the western ideas or to try reaching them, the architects by that time had a tendency to introduce a style of architecture that could be identified as the Iranian national architecture.

We can survey two types of links in here, a link between the two western-eastern cultures is established and a type of connection which was trying to explore the architecture in Iran with a local (cultural) context. In this article, different interarchitecturalities are subjected to survey with the intertextual approach; this paper has two major aims to reach for:

1. Typology of the different intertextual relationships in the contemporary architecture, 2. methodical architectural criticism according to the intertextual approach. Works of the architecture are not analyzed for a separate artist at a time due to the very same rules of this approach they are analyzed in relation to the work of other architects and in a network consisting of the works of architecture. It seems that with this approach, in the discipline of architecture, each building with contemporary architecture takes its own benefits from all of the buildings that were constructed before it, this has also transformed it and has turned it into a building in a different time and locality. But when is the time that this transformation leads to a personal language in a way that the link between the works of architecture won’t be reducing the creativity?

2. Research background

The background of the relationships in the architecture of Iran can be traced on the context of Modernist architecture during the first Pahlavi period. As Parviz Rajabi have written about the styles and techniques of the following period as follow: “While the modern architecture in Iran can not turn back on its 2500 years of history, we have to accept the techniques from the contemporary European architectures that it is accepted the socio-cultural systems of the Europe to be able to include all of the socio-cultural fundamentals in the new works of architecture” (Rajabi, 1977: 60). Hooshang Seyhoun explains it as below in 1978: “When I entered the scene of architecture in Iran, it was in the pre-war conditions, such conditions were not only applied to Iran but all the other countries. There is a sign of pre-war architecture which is influenced by the instructions of architecture during years 1936-7. But we should also consider the fact that, a huge movement originated from Germany, it was the same Bauhaus movement which had a great impact on the world architecture. But we were unaware of this movement in Iran and we used to be working based on pre-war instructions and patterns. Some
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signs must become visible to break this seal” (Seyhoun, Ayandegan, 1978).

In Iran, as Mostafa Kiani denotes, this conquest turned into a full transference and caused a break in that seal when the victories of modernism over classicism or the use of tradition was fully touched in the transition from the 20s decade. A period when Tehran was ruled by a number of architects like Vartan Hovanesian, Gabriel Georgian, Paul Abkar, Mohsen Foroughi and others (Kiani, 2015: 167). “The schools of architecture have been imported to the country by the Iranian graduates on their way back from European countries during the late first Pahlavi period. Regarding the Modernism, since it was first analyzed along with the other school in the universities, modernist ideas on architecture used to be published and experimented just as an academic subject, unlike the other phenomena like militarism, or classicism in which the rulers or politicians transfer to the society through the works of architects and to make an outbreak, Modernism was rather a phenomenon in the academic fields of architecture which was then identified by the architects for the society” (Ibid: 171). It seems that a number of fundamental changes have taken place in the relationships between the works of architecture by the passage of time from the 1340 SH [1960 A.D.] onward, in a way that we can find a number of stages according to the quality and amount of connection between the works. These stages can be categorized into at least two forms and subject. It seems that there are no previous critical studies performed on the field of contemporary architecture of Iran with the intertextual relationship approach before this article.

3. Theoretical Concepts
3.1 The Text

The very first point that we recollect after perceiving the world ‘text’ is the written text, as the Latin equivalent of it signifies. Even many of the critics who expand the text into the works, also consider the ‘written text’ as the main pillar or a text. It is described as follow: “Sentences and clauses that included writing or a work”. In the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) this point has a bolder presence because in here the definition of a text is limited to a written text. The American Dictionary of Random House has reduced the text as “the main body of the written text, book, newspaper, etc.” (Definition.1) and have defined its linguistic definition is a “solid oral or written unit which consists of more than once sentence and forms a whole order after all”. In Moein Persian Dictionary, the entry for the word “text” equals “main terms of a book, article, and written material” and it is defined as opposite to exposition and side notes (Ahmadi, 1990: 190).

Paul Ricoeur considers the text as the ‘inscription of the utterances as the writing’. Ricoeur too reduces the text into the writing, he also includes differentiates between the fixed quality of the language and its oral utterances. His idea can be expanded according to a number of ideas that Jack Derrida’s have proposed revolving the written forms. Derrida considers the text as a communicative system which includes pictographic visual and spatial signs (Ibid: 190). Following his antecedent structuralisms, Umberto Eco added a focus on the pragmatic lineage of each text. It means to focus on the communicative approach of the text, it is true that the text would be perceived and interpreted freely, its pragmatic side would work outside of the will of its author, but the point is that the proposed [published] text is distributed with an aim to connect a link in between. The text would be ready to be translocated in a new system of codes (Ahmadi, 1370: 360). Through the viewpoint of post-structuralisms which are rather formed based on the ideas and notions of Derrida and late Roland Barthes during the 60’s and afterward, by entering the idea of the work in front of it and the concepts of … it changes the text into an open realm of the multiplicity of meaning which is constantly deferring and never becomes certain and because of the very same desire on different perceptions they are never satisfied (Sojoudy, 2009: 115). Ricoeur’s definition of the text can resolve by offering a more precise definition because, in his definitions, the focus is on the verbal utterances which are absent as an important point in other definitions of the text (among the four mentioned dictionary definitions). According to Ricoeur and its development, we can state that: a text is the inscription of each utterance in the written models (visual, spatial, graphical) and in a system of phones, generally in any system of semiotics or as a mixture of these systems. A reading of this text equals a process of sensual perception and the perception of the text by the audience in its very general forms of it which go way beyond the “reading of a text”.

3.2 Intertextuality

Kristeva has used the word intertextuality for the first time in her essay with the title of “Le mot, le dialogue, le roman” in 1966, in which she describes the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin. This article was also published in 1969 in her book with the title of “in the search of meaning” which includes a collection of Kristeva’s articles (Namvar Motlagh, 1390, 128). The adjective ‘intertextual’ used to be existing before Kristeva, she used this adjective to coin the term (ibid, 126). In fact, his statement of intertextuality is specifically based on Bakhtin’s polyphony. To be more precise, Kristeva found about the intertextuality when she was reading on the subject of “word” (Namvar Motlagh, 2010: 13). The word intertextuality includes a noun ‘Text’ together with the prefix of ‘-inter’ and the noun-making suffix ‘-ualite’ (NamvarMotlagh, 2010:126). Although people consider Kristeva as the founder of intertextuality, but it is not actually the product of an individual, but rather an impact of movements and the efforts of certain figures who had decisive roles in the formation of such entity (Namvar Motlagh, 2010: 31). One can find its theoretical
contextures can be separated from Kristeva as in a synthesis of the notions of Saussure and Bakhtin than steps forward into its post-structuralist explanations in the writings of Barthes and structuralist Genette and Rifater and have reached for the Feminist, poststructuralist derivations of this term, it will finally end in its implementation in non-literary arts, in the contemporary computer technologies during the present cultural context (Allen, 2000: 18).

‘Intertextuality’ analyses the link in two texts, there two texts can have two general forms according to the cultural notions; or they both come from a specific cultural context in which we call it an intercultural intertextuality. Nowadays, with the increasing awareness about the intercultural relationships, such studies are regularly done (Ibid; 2010:318). Intertextual relationships are categorized into two distance set of intersemiotics or interasemiotics. When the both texts belong to a same system of semiotics e.g. verbal utterances, their intertextuality is regarded as an intersemiotic system, but when it exists in a different sign system the relationship between them would be interasemiotic. Interasemiotic intertextuality paves the way the for the study of relationships the text from different sign systems (Relationship between literature and arts along with the different disciplines of art) (Ibid. 318). John Fiske assumes a difference between what he call horizontal and vertical intertextuality. Horizontal intertextuality is referred to the relationships between two or more number of works which exists at the same level and system of signs. Vertical intertextuality refers to the relationships that link two different system of signs (Rouhi, 2015: 55).

### 3.3 Light Intertextuality, Laurent Jenny

Intertextuality divided into two main branches according to the ideas of Kristeva and Barthes (it was focused on her notions regarding the production and development, but it was more concentrated on the reading of the text and the reader’s perception of it for Barthes). Jenny has a more tendency to the production and development of the work, although he is not indifferent to the reading of the work but his focus is on the productive intertextuality (Namvar Motlagh, 2010, 233). The type of intertextuality that Kristeva puts forward is rather theoretical and the definition he provides for it does not make possible an application for it while to Roland Barthes, one of the most important characteristics of intertextuality is its application (ibid, 232). The meaning of intertextuality always causes a type of delicate problem of identity. When can we claim that a text is present inside one another as a type of intertextuality? Do we survey the plagiarism and it’s simple implicit presence of it as the same way for the quotation? (Ibid. 231). Is each and every reference in a text a case of intertextuality in Gene’s viewpoint? Genette believes into a number of stages for the intertextuality which is shaped to the extent and quality of the links between two texts. Genette believes into a number of stages for the intertextuality which is shaped to the extent and quality of the links between two texts. Because of the fact that the relationship between the two text is only because of their co-presence, he calls this co-existence a ‘light intertextuality’ before it reaches to the depth of contents. In other words; when intertextuality find its expanded volumes when the texts become linked through different aspects of them. These relationships can at least be categorized into two different set of form and subject (Namvar Motlagh: 237). If these relationships stop at a certain level (layer), the intertextuality would be considered as light.

### 3.4 Intertextuality According to Gerard Genette

Gerard Genette paid to new models with the subjects like transtextuality by developing the theories of Julia risteva and Laurent Gene to include all of the intertextual links. According to Genette, intertextuality is ‘Whatever which is implicitly or explicitly links one text with another one’ (Genette, 1982:7). Transtextualite includes three main parts, ‘trans-’ as the prefix, ‘texte’ as the infixing noun and ‘-alte ‘as the suffix. The prefix ‘trans-‘ is used to describe a transmission or transfer for the noun ‘texte’ and it is a more general prefix in comparison with ‘inter-‘; it includes a wider spectrum of relationships/ links. (Namvar Motlagh, 2016: 23). By suggesting transtextuality, Genard meant to identify, categorize and study each and every connection that the text establishes to other texts excluding the first. Thus, transtextuality is nothing but a collection of different sets of relationships between different texts which one of them is called transtextuality (Namvar Motlagh, 2016: 24). Two out of five transtextual relationships of Genette include two hyperintertextuality according to the nexus of derivation and the intertextuality which is based on co-presence they exist closer together (Namvar Motlagh, 2016: 25). To have a clear manifestation, in the case if intertextuality, when there exists no prior text, the second text will be shaped excluding the borrowed elements from the second text. While the relationship in hyperintertextuality is ontological, if there exist no first text, the second can not come into being (Namvar Motlagh: 2016: 29). Genette's first and foremost influential book in the context of intertextuality with the title of ‘rewritable tablets’ discusses the paratextuality, too. He simply defines the intertextuality with the precision of limited methods as the relations of co-presence between two or a few other texts; with the presence of a text into another one (Genette, 1982: 8). Genette’s intertextuality can be categorized into two different categories in the first place: 1. explicit and apparent [evident] intertextuality 2. Implicit, latent textuality (Namvar Motlagh, 1395L 38). According to Nathalie Piegay-Gros’s topology, by following the ideas of Gerard Genette she developed four relationship types for co-presences which are as the following set: 1. Quotation, 2. Reference, 3. Plagiarism, 4. Allusion [innuendo] (Peggy-Gros, 1996).
Table 1.
Analysis of the intertextuality relationships in the terms of intersemiotics (horizontal intertextuality) and intersemiotic (vertical intertextual).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categorization</th>
<th>Type of the Relationship</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>Important Contributing Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intertextuality</td>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>Borrowing an element from text A in the text B as it was in the first text.</td>
<td>Which portion of the text includes the quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Revealed</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Representing [reflecting] another text by reminding the element of other texts based on the conventional system of signs.</td>
<td>Number of references, multiplicity of references according to a function (documentation, aesthetics, verbal economies and savings, legitimization, orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextuality</td>
<td>Plagiat</td>
<td>Secrecy in the intertextual relationships</td>
<td>Extent (the whole work, a portion of the text), as a hidden memory in the mind of the author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit and Hidden</td>
<td>Allusion</td>
<td>The most hidden and implicit form of intertextuality, in which the borrowed element is in an intricate mixture with the new text</td>
<td>Metaphoric, allegorical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source :The Authors)
4. Findings of the research

4.1 Contemporary architecture of Iran between 1961-1977

Three main impactful movements of the first Pahlavi period which included the late Qajar architecture and the classicist Neo-classical method which later on evolved into the main dominant impacting current of the modern architecture during the second Pahlavi period. It used to be supported by the channel of European architects and their thoughtful ideas including International style, school of Bauhaus, works of Le Corbusier, Frank Lloyd Wright, Richard Neutra, Alvar Aalto, James Sterling and others (Bani Masoud, 2010: 267). In parallel with dominant the atmosphere of the architecture and influenced by a number of liberal movements during the 1340 SH [~60’s and 70s in the Gregorian calendar] and 50s [SH], a movement emerged which considers most of the domestic essays/ writings as influenced by the notions and proposed subjects by the European architects of the Modernist movement, which is widely accepted as ‘Postmodern’. The mentioned period was the best-selling era for ‘Nativism’ and ‘Historicism’ in the academic circles of the country (Ibid: 268). From the first years of the 40s (SH) [1962-72 A.D.], a current of new thoughts were proposed to justify the ‘Architecture and the technique’ or to portray the fact that ‘architecture is a reflection of realities’ together with a more emphasis on the human demands, it calls for an attention to the sociology and politics as well (Bavar, 2009: 213). We are also witnessing of two other major events for the architecture during the very same period of time. The first meeting was held on the site of Takht-e-Jamshid, near Shiraz with the title of “A study on the possibility of connecting between traditional architecture with the Modern methods of construction”. The first event was more fruitful for Iranian architects than the second one, mainly because of the presence of Louis Kahn. From the foreign participating architects we can mention Louis Kahn, Paul Rudolph, R. Buckminster Fuller (from the United States), Georges Candilis (from France), Abdullah Goran (From Turkey) and among the notable Iranian architects, we can mention Mr. Mohsen Foroughi, Nader Ardalan, Kamran Tabatabaie Diba and Houshang Seyhoun. In the second conference, foreign architects like James Stirling (United States), Moshe Safdie (Canada) and Kenzo Tange (Japan) and Hassan Fathi (Egypt) were present together with a large number of all Iranian architects, it was for the first time that the university students were welcomed in the conference (Ibid. 247). In the first conference, a number of important questions were raised revolve the “synthesis of the traditional concepts with the modern technology” and Louis Kahn influenced Iranian architects by his presentation on philosophical ideas and poetic taste in architecture. In fact, Iranian architects were not only become involved around the depths of their own Nativism and Historicism through the theoretical discussions of post modernity but through the works of the four famous architects in the world, Louis Kahn, Alvar Aalto, James Sterling and to some extend through Hassan Fathi (Ibid; 275). On the ending of the conference, results from the idea that: “Human establishments can be optimally described using a synthesis of art and science which the traditional societies have reached in the past, and human should be after the very same act”, as follow which is also included in the recommendations of the conference: ‘Perception, preservation and the combination of this civil-cultural wealth with the current contexts of Iranian society and its physical-material environment is unavoidable”(Ghobadian: 2012:267). Proposed discussion topics included the tradition, technology, and Modernism which was presented by Iranian figures and Louis Kahn the famous American architect and together the recommendations of the conference which denoted the vision or avant-garde architects of Iran during the 60’s, it also have clarified a framework for the Iranian Modernist architecture until the Islamic revolution (Ibid: 267).

4.2 Houshang Seyhoun

Houshang Seyhoun was one of the very first students of architecture in the faculty of fine arts, university of Tehran; he was then graduated in 1945. in 1946, he participated in the contest of planning the tomb of Abu Ali Sina and his plan was selected as the best work in the competition. He then managed to move to France to complete his studies and returned to Iran in 1950 at the same time with the construction of Abu Ali Sina’s Tomb (BaniMasoud, 2010: 299). Seyhoun is considered as the head of Modern historicist Iranian architects, the would be no way to fully perceive his works without having an understanding of the architecture in Iran or in the western architecture. He consciously focuses on this subject in which the western technology is what we know as the technology of modality, so discovering about the western technology is one of the ways to revolutionised the contemporary architecture, but this awareness should not stop us from paying attention to our roots and the Persian culture (Ibid; 299). He used to repeatedly focus in his interviews and lectures that copy and adaptation from the western architecture is not the only remedy, but the point is to have a proper understanding of the Iranian architecture and the western technology, try to shape the architecture of Iran and he considered the narrow-minded mimicry of the western architecture as the plague of the contemporary architecture.
Construction plan for the tomb of Avicenna in 1952: in 1946 the founding council of the national heritage called for participants for a contest between the architects with a presupposition of the advantage of integration between traditional and Modern architecture in which his Houshang Seyhoun was chosen with the positive opinion of Andre Godard and Mohsen Foroughi. “The major difference of Avicenna's tomb tower with Gonbad-e Qaboos lay in two points: first, due to the limited space and its spatial arrangement and the gross anticipated expenses, dimensions of the Avicenna's tomb is implemented as the half of Gonbad-e Qaboos's Scale... The other major difference is that the distance between the fractures in the Avicenna's tomb are broad while the building of Gonbad-e Qaboos does not have any opening from the foundation to the top except for the main gate and a small window under the dome, there are no holes in the walls, this innovation is an excellent way to keep the building from the severe winds according to the continental conditions of Hamedan, this point havhave turned the building into a pleasant and attractive structure (Mostafavi: 1977:10).

Farmanfarmaian graduated from the school of fine arts in Paris (Beaux-arts) and returned to Iran on the early 50s. After a number of collaboration with international companies and individuals realized the modality weaknesses in Iran and decided to compensate for such shortcoming by employing foreign technical team and researching his findings... Between the years 1964-1965, in a trip to Mexico city, he was influenced by the stadium in the Mexico, later on, he implemented the plan of construction for the home stadium of Azadi [formerly Aryamehr] stadium by adapting construction elements of the stadium of Mexico. He managed to finish the construction of 100,000 seater stadium development together with Reza Majd, Hirbod and Nader Ardalan in 1971. He moved from Tehran to Paris in 1979 and he is currently living there (BaniMasoud, 2010:311). With a belief in the correct function of the building, and high precision crafts in the details of implementation and the proper use of the material he had in hand as his own maxim together with the high attention to the ..., possibilities and limitations of time and locality as the keys to the success (FarmanFarmaian, 2005). Aldol Aziz Farmanfarmaian considered himself and all other graduates of Boza academy as the direct students of the Bauhaus school in his interview with Mohammadreza Moghtader in 2004. When he entered the field of architecture in Iran, the major architectural projects of Iran was in the hand of foreign companies and engineers and there was not a specific pathway to design the elements and details of architecture in Iran. It was actually a time of passage from the tradition to Modernism. He managed to improve the mentioned shortcoming by using...
the experience of foreign architects and to visit the major global projects in the quickest possible way; so, most of his works include sampling from the works of Modernist architects, as himself focuses on this fact, he have designed a large portion of his works while he was influenced by the works of Richard Neutra, Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier and the tenets of Bauhaus school and the International style (Moghtader, 2004: 58).

4.4 Kamran Tabatabaie Diba

Kamran Diba graduated from the University of Harvard, Washington D. C. in 1965. He had also done a number of studies in the discipline of sociology in the same university between 1965-1966, he returned to Iran in 1966 BaniMasoud, 1390: 315). The tendency to Nativism in the works of Kamran Diba has roots in the aesthetics of Iranian architecture and urbanization, he’s searching for a Modern architecture which is formed together with the Iranian tradition and Historicism. He is after finding familiar images, a type of image which is both including native, traditional culture and the universal culture (Ibid; 317). The architecture of each era is a response to the culture of the corresponding time. The role of architecture is to establish the culture of the time and to purify, it uses innovation and introduction of challenging ideas… We are in the time of progress and we cannot copy/ chase the methods and concepts from the architecture of our ancestors in a narrow-minded manner, but it is undoubtedly essential to learn about their measures at work, their environmental sensibilities and their social lives” (Tabatabaie Diba, 2005: 13-14).

4.5 Nader Khalili

Atypical incorporation of the traditional material in parallel with the modern technology is one of the innovations of Nader Khalili, a point that made him one of the everlasting figures in the world architecture. Alike Hassan Fathi, Khalili too was after reviving the traditional structures. His thoughts are more into human beings, it pays attention to their movements and desires BaniMasoud, 2010: 332). Clay is the shared aspect of Hassan Fathi and Nader Khalili’s viewpoints. These two Nativist architects, were interested into renovation and revival of the old traditions and attitudes, from their significant characteristics after learning about the material and architecture of the old buildings, as the significant characteristic of his style we can pay attention to the use of inexpensive material, easy and fast way of construction, creation of familiar forms and spaces. To Fathi, this approach is to construct houses of clay bricks with arcs without scaffoldings, and to Khalili the construction of very same Arcs and wrapping it with a rather modern approach (Ibid; 333). What makes the clay houses as problematic is their vulnerability to the infiltration of water, persistence and more importantly the lack of durability against the earthquake. By knowing about this issue, Khalili made an innovation even in his way of encountering such issue since the independence of this method from its location is one of the qualities that can present this method on a worldwide scale.

5. Analysis of the findings

5.1 Intertextuality

Intertextuality which is the relationship between one text with another, in the form of interarchitecturality has changed the relationship between one work of architecture and another (Kipnis, 2013). Jeffrey Kipnis calls intertextuality as a prevalent term that is used to have a reading of one work in relation to another work in a discipline. He also notes about the relationship between two literary texts as following: If your read the book of “Anxiety of Influence”, the whole book includes the different cases of intertextuality to a point that you would think that there is nothing as a literary text in between, the only relationship would be between texts together (Kipnis, 2013). According to Genette’s theory of light intertextuality, we can assume a number stages for the quality and amount of the relationship between two works of architecture in aspectum between light and dense intertextuality and to categorize it based on the type of relationship between two works of architecture. In Genette’s theory, it was stated that such stages can be divided into the categories of form and contents. In order to scrutinize and develop this categorization and according to the offered divisions by Smith Capon, these stages can be adjusted and developed in the context of architecture. Capon’s diagram was shaped based on the viewpoints and the proposed principles of Virtuous, and the structure of it consists of a center with a circle around it with a number of radii which connect the surroundings to the center of the circle and have crossed that point, as it was mentioned in the introduction of the book. Center can be a specific building, or a work of architecture or in the words a representation of the discussion topic. The circle stands for the whole knowledge about the subject which we can assume it as a sum of points, each inferring some meaning according to the topic and the radii are the links between the problem and the concepts in its surrounding concepts which show the relationships which are individually observing the spectrum or a subject out of concepts. After studying the relevant interpretations and theories with the maxims of Virtuous, he considered the Form, Function and the meaning as the primary subjects and modality, context and will as the secondary subjects (Capon, 1999: 28). A shape is not only a geometry but it also reflects aspects of beauty which are relevant to the symmetry and proprietary. We can generally assume two structural, perceptual meaning for each shape or form. The structural or formal meaning of each shape is evident and it can be identified and surveyed free from different cultures and approaches, while the perceptual meaning of the shape depends on the numerous factors including the shared general culture of the society, past values, personal and collective consciousness and tastes in complex, environment and the context for the perception of the
form and its skeletal specifications (Dibaj and Soltanzadeh, 1997: 12). The function is sometimes translated as the product or the comfort but it also includes the 'social' characteristic of the Schinkel, and Durant's interpretations of the economy (profit). The meaning reflects some aspects of beauty which are related to the taste, attitude, and ornament, it is pertinent to include 'Historicist' characteristics of the schnickel preferred model. A number of translations like consistency, durability, and integration are taken out if its meaning but they all include Schickel's 'poetic' character. Context is a complex subject which also includes the 'Poetic' quality that Schinkel's refers to; alike the two concepts of locality and sensation which are integrated into the picturesque tradition. On the other hand, human will was developing into a high value, but with a more political character considering the concepts. (Samarghand, 1999:49)

Table 4
Relations between Kamran Diba and Louis Kahn's Spatial diagram.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building description</th>
<th>Plan and Section Diagram</th>
<th>Plan and Section</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diba - Tehran Museum Of Contemporary Art (TMOCA)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>1. A method for organizing the space 2. Centricity in the plan and segment 3. Use of the light wells (in Diba's segment light wells have changed into the windcatchers) 4. Connection of spaces in the plan 5. Circulation between the spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn - Palace of the Council in Bangladesh (1962-1973)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn - Dormitory of Pennsylvania 1960-1965</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kan - Palace of the parliament cathedral of the parliament in Bangladesh 1973-962

Kahn - The University of Tel Aviv 1968

Diba - Jondi Shapoor Mosque 1969-1974

Diba - Niavaran Palace cultural garden 1971-1979

Kahn - Civic Center of the Salk Institute 1959-1965

Kahn- Auditorium and library in New York 1959-1967

1. A method for organizing the space
2. Using the central yard
3. Centricity in the plan
4. Light wells on the ceilings (in Diba’s segment light wells have changed into the wind catchers)
5. Connection and making the spaces joint together in the plan
6. Circulation between the spaces
1. A method for organizing the space
2. Quad divisions and the symmetric geometry of the plan
3. Using the a central yard
4. Centricity in the plan
5. Lightwells on the ceilings (in Diba’s segment light wells have changed into the windcatchers)
6. Connection of spaces in the plan
7. Circulation between the spaces

Diba - Secretary building of Niavaran palace 1971-1979

Kahn - Mill Creek building complex 1952-1962

Kahn - Dormitory in Pennsylvania 1960-1965

(Source :The Authors)

Table 5
The relationship between the exterior forms and the interior architecture in Diba’s approach to architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building description</th>
<th>Internal image</th>
<th>External image</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diba - Tehran Museum Of Contemporary Art (TMOCA)</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1. Role of the natural light on defining the space 2. Use of the material according to their applications 3. Symbolic use of windcatcher as the lightwell 4. Cohesion and fluidity of the surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn - New York library and the amphitheater 1959-1967</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep Lluis Sert – Barcelona Center for Contemporary Arts 1975</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Role of the natural light on defining the space
2. Use of the material according to their applications
3. Purity of the masses and geometry of the building

(Source: The Authors)
6. Conclusion

According to the proposed topics, the result can be offered in two contexts; the first context is the criticism of architecture based on the intertextual approach: according to Genette’s theory, intertextuality is an approach that is limited to a relationship of co-presence between two or more number of texts, it happens when a text is present in another one. Genette’s intertextuality can be categorized into two different sets: 1. Major, implicit and evident intertextuality and 2. implicit, hidden intertextuality. We can also define four different relationships of co-presence according to Genette: 1. Quotation, 2. Reference, 3. Plegaria and 4. Allusion (innuendo). Quotations are the most explicit, verbal and traditional types, which is described as the formal type of intertextuality. Quotation objectifies the appearance of a text into another one, it is an explicit/ clear presence of a text inside another text. Alike quotation, referencing is an explicit form of intertextuality. It doesn't describe another text, but it rather makes references to it. The relationship between the plagiarized text and the plagiarist is in the category of intertextuality and the difference between the explicit types of intertextuality, especially the quotation and the plagiarism is the borrowing without indications, but it is still in the verbal form. Stealing a work of art is to make use of a part of it, without mentioning its author. The allusion is the most implicit, latent type of intertextuality because the borrowed element has been mixed with the new text in a way that it is difficult to separate them. To scrutinize and expand this categorization and according to the suggested categorization of David Smith Capo, these can not be conducted and developed in the realm of architecture. After studying different interpretations and theories related to the maxim of Virtuous, he found the form, function, and significance as the primary subjects and modality, context and will as the secondary subjects. Form, function, significance and modality are the subjects that can link two works of architecture and survey the strength of this relationship on these subjects defines the stages of intertextual relationships between two works, and the context or the will of the author are the two subjects which are limited to a single work, by researching these subjects in the four co-presence relationships of Genette, we can make an interarchitectural criticism on a work of architecture. In the second context, the interarchitectural relationships were surveyed among the notable architects between 1961-1977, their sources, contexts of influence were analyzed and are offered precisely in the form of charts and diagrams.
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