Palladio's, so that with Zuccheri, the particular ambiguity of the panel is of less importance, when compared with that of the entire façade.

The composition of the lower wall is framed by two pilasters, which meet its detail between quite rigid boundaries; but these pilasters receive no downward transmission of weight. Two arcade openings, each of a form of triphyl or bracket, which seems to suggest for them a function of support; but they are displaced by niches, which are not clearly which reasonably they might be expected to occupy; while the insertion within them of elaborately framed window, a transparent element of the function. The niches themselves, on first examination, seem to expand the interest of the upper wall into the pavilion behind, but on closer inspection with the large wall, which is as open, as that of the wall below is compressed; but, within this organization, it becomes clear that the dual character of the pavilion—simultaneously and crushed in the harshest juxtaposition, so that on second analysis, the contrast compels one to attribute to the lower panel the architectural character of the classical directness and ease.

The complexities and repercussions which such schemes provoke are endless and almost indefinable, but patience perhaps exhausts itself in the explanation. It would seem to be abundantly clear that it is a special effect of the dual character of the wall, between the thing as it is and as it appears, which seems to haunt all these three façades; and if Zuccheri's building resembles any known restoration, it seems to be something of an exercise in genre, its second-hand qualities perhaps enhance its value as a characteristic example of an illustration of deliberate architectual derangement.

The two examples from the sixteenth century are clearly at variance with all but the most expert registers of that universal malaise, which in the arts, while retaining the externals of classical correctness, has a Ferrara and Ferrante to attempt to subdue the inner core of classical coherence.

In so-called academic, or frankly derivative architectural treatises, one finds a kind of com- position which at first glance appears intrinsically Manierist, need perhaps cause no undue surprise; but, occurring as it does, in the main stream of the modern movement, it is remarkable that this motif at La Chaux-de-Fonds should not have aroused more contemporary attention, and one is tempted to suggest that Le Corbusier's use of the blank panel is dependent on the previous instances, and it is not imagined that a mere coincidence is the necessary permutation of the content. Such a correspondence may be purely fortuitous or it may be of some deeper significance.

Apart from Nikolaus Pevsner's article 'The Architecture of Manierism' and Professor Blunt's recent lecture at the RIBA, in its accepted sense as a style of anonymous popular discussion. Such discussion must obviously lie beyond the scope of this present essay, which for a frame of work, it was felt that an architecture of objective significance might be generated. For archi-