

Architectural -Spatial Analysis

Mamatha. N*

Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture, SOA, DSATM, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.

***Corresponding Author**

E-mail Id:-mamathan.arch@dsatm.edu.in

ABSTRACT

What architecture adds to building: The concept is to set out the definition of architecture. The argument is that apart from being the basic necessity of bodily protection, buildings also contribute to the social needs. The two social needs being the social organisation of everyday life and the spatial configuration of space in which the function is imbibed. The social dimension of the building and the habits cultivated by human mind and practices are handled unconsciously and intuitively in the same way to handle the structures of language intuitively. The configurations are in general “non-discursive” meaning and is not talked about even if we are using it actively. In vernacular buildings the “non-discursive” is treated same as the grammar of language. In vernacular architecture the building reproduces cultural, spatial and formal patterns. Architecture is not practiced as the reduplication of these cultural patterns. Architecture is a speculative abstract thought to the non-discursive aspects of building, it’s also the application to the social and cultural contents of buildings.

Keywords:-*Social, cultural, non-discursive, discursive, configuration.*

INTRODUCTION

In understanding what exactly the definition of architecture and its intent in realizing the built environment. The question arises here, whether both architecture and building are one and the same? (Architecture - in general it is the art or practice of designing and constructing buildings) or in what way it is different and by that sense, what is the contribution (value added thing/feel) to the building?

The arguments, on definition of ‘Architecture’, as the taking into reflective thought of the non-discursive or configurational aspects of space - form in buildings. In vernacular traditions, the idea of culture is taken for granted. In Architecture the idea has to be generated. Spatial and formal configuration in designing building matters as a cultural reproduction and imaginative enquiry. It

follows from this definition that architecture is an aspiration with respect to the context and other related factors for quality living space, not a given (by culture). The underlying principles provide the conscious thought of spatial and formal patterns which transform the culture through buildings, and the possible alternatives to adapt culture. Architecture should always be an added feature to culture and it should not be devoid of culture. Thus it’s a creative and intellectual work. It requires not only the conceptualization of pattern and configuration in space, but also comparative knowledge and reflective thought. This is why architecture is a reflective as well as an imaginative scheme, one which seeks to replace-or at least to add to-the social knowledge content of building with an enquiry into principles and possibilities.

The essence of our definition must reveal “what architecture adds to building?” The commonest ‘additive’ theory is that architecture adds art to building. The building is practically and functional activity to which architecture adds an artistic impression to the preoccupation and respecting the original function to which the building as to cater.

Architecture involves both a thing and an activity. The systematic intent is experienced in the form of thing. The building is an evidence, where we can judge both that a building is intended to be architecture and, if we are so inclined, that it is architecture. That’s why the definition of architecture is so difficult.

Because it is the taking hold of the non-discursive contents of building by abstract, universalistic thought, it is at once an intentional mental act and a property we see in things. It is because we see in things that objectify record of such thought that we name the result architecture.

Understanding buildings, then we understand it both as a product and as a process. The revelations of the cultural and cognitive complexity architecture of a building should go beyond the process by which the culturally sanctioned non-discursivities are embedded in the spatial and physical forms of buildings. The possibility to ‘go beyond’ such a process?

The key concepts are set out on the way to a definition of architecture. The argument is that in addition to functioning as bodily protection, buildings operate socially into two ways; they constitute the social organization of everyday life as the spatial configuration of spaces in which we live and move, and represent social organization as physical configurations of forms and elements that we see.

Every social group has their own practice

(culture) with respect to their spatial organizations i.e., buildings with configurational in nature and it is the habit of the human mind to handle configuration unconsciously and intuitively. Our minds are very effective in handling configuration in this way, but because we do work this way, we find it very difficult to analyses and talk rationally about the configurational aspect of things. But when we go through the history of vernacular architecture (space configuration), also acknowledge the analytical thought process in developing and adopting to an appropriate designs based on the context, usage and comfort factors (More research on this aspect is needed).

Creative intention fails as a definition of architecture by reference to positive attributes of things, just as positive attributes of things failed by reference to intentions.

The architecture means both at times. The idea of architecture is at once a thing and activity, many a times it is the attributes of building. Product and process are not, it seems, independent. Judging architecture, we note both the attributes of the thing and the intellectual procedure by which the thing is arrived at.

The answer is in the form of question virtually. The configurational aspects of form and space through buildings cultural and social objects treated as unconscious rules to be followed and raised to the level of conscious thought in this way to be made part of the creative attention.

The non-discursive-adds dimensions to the built form and the cultural reproduction creating awareness and form the normative to the analytic, the latter meaning are sanctioned by vernacular that all possibilities rather being permutations and phenotypical innovations. It is also one which transforms the idea of knowledge

from cultural principle to theoretical abstraction. But when we see the scope of architecture is limited to only genotypic /phenotypic since architecture is not included city planning or Landscape architecture, thus we now think of holistic (multi-dimensional) approach to deal with architecture and not as limited to one subject as per the present academic scenario.

The interpretation of vernacular architecture is not only based on just transfer of social knowledge of a culture from generation, since the innovations within the vernacular architecture and from the respective cultures continued based on their experiences of different space context, local materials and development of methodologies including the knowledge of weather/climate protection aspect at appropriate (possibilities) time period as sustained development in the field of vernacular architecture (Research also needs in this area to understand underlying theories/principles).

Enquiring “What architecture adds to building?” we are not able to make holistic conclusion on the same since architecture is encompassing multidisciplinary area and whether an architect only is taking onus on architecture?

In finding appropriate answer to “What architecture adds to building?” we come across, Practical and functional v/s architectural super imposition of artistic/aesthetics preoccupation which respecting practical & functional, is restricted by neither, the discourse on architecture is a thing or activity, building is a product or process and also relation with space, built areas and configurational implications, society, social knowledge and analytical knowledge, building process in comparison with traditional and others. So finally we will end up with questions

like, do we need of some principles/theories of architecture in combination of normative and analytical sense which leads to further discourse on related topics with scientific, experimental and evidence based rather than simply based on social knowledge without much needed basis and evidences.

Also architectural theory should be broadened with context of community/ neighborhoods; city level including the landscape architecture based and not as a building and its aesthetics as generalized one, since the relativity of each parameter with respect to the context of varying parameters. Hence we still seek more knowledge on all related topics holistically to discourse on “What architecture adds to building?”

CONCLUSION

Architecture is defined as a creative paradox. Individuals create architecture and is valued as a product of unique creativity. Passage of time makes any architecture as a product of time and society. This aspect does not lower the valuation but in fact appreciates the social sense of the architecture.

It can be said that Architecture is a retrospective shift which arises due to the social art brought by time which was always experienced. The social art of architecture can be expressed by the social purposes are in same sense a product of time and place.

Public spaces are no longer constructed smoothly, changing yet readable by careful arrangement and orientation of buildings. The outcomes are never course intentional. Contrary of intensions to use forms of space to create new community. Mutated intensions first making the futuristic vision and invention of community by spatial engineering then imaginary urban past.

The theoretical knowledge is the alternative form, the attempt to make the non-discursive and discursive knowledge that its errors cannot be easily perpetuated in solution typologies. This is the analysis project of architecture and architectural theories are the same project. Architecture oscillates between the theoretical and social knowledge. There is clarity that we can become aware of non-discursive being fully aware, following the hidden dictates of the society.

REFERENCES

- 1) Hillier, B. (2007). *Space is the machine: a configurational theory of architecture*. Space Syntax.
- 2) The discussion on additive theory by Roger Scruton in *The Aesthetics of Architecture* in the chapter one in the book 'Space is the machine' (Hillier, 2009).
- 3) Rossi, A., & Eisenman, P. (1982). *The architecture of the city* (p. 130). Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- 4) Girouard, M. (1978). *Life in the English country house: a social and architectural history*. Yale University Press.
- 5) Markus, T. A. (1993). *Buildings & power: Freedom and control in the origin of modern building types*. Psychology Press.
- 6) Ravetz A. (1984), in conversation. Ed. N. Cross, 'New Developments in Design Methodology', Wiley.
- 7) Lawson, B. (2006). *How designers think: The design process demystified*. Routledge.