Classifying architecture in relation to theater and the special role of both disciplines within the arts

Abstract

Traditional definitions of architecture determine that it is a discipline that creates useful buildings that survive the architect (Gordon Graham, Christoph Baumberger, Stephen Davies, Robert Stecker, Roger Scruton). We also find examples of architecture that favor minimal or immaterial interventions that focus on the receiver’s experience or even recognize transversal uses for spaces designed for other functions (Hans Hollein, Susanne Hauser, Gernot Böhme, Adolf Loos, August Schmarsow, Theodor W. Adorno, Jacques Rancière). These last considerations acknowledge architecture as an experience, phenomena, or as an infrastructural act. There are some architecture’s production or reception elements considered this way that may have been learned from time arts such as theater or performance. How does the concept of architecture change when compared with other artistic disciplines?, what happens if we connect it with theater?, What would be the projectual mechanisms in the limit between architecture and theatre?, and how has architectural reality be changed through “Inszenierung” in the western world from 1968 to the present time?

Architecture and theater both have always been deeply rooted in human interaction; they are both a social phenomenon and a way of communicating. Understanding the relationship between them generates a new artistic concept. Their creative processes and the concepts used in the production of ideas are mutual since despite their different materializations, their respective mechanisms of projection have both a common basis. This essence undoubtedly points out the existence of an "architectonic turn" in several theatrical events produced today that are rooted in the creative liminal experiences from the sixties in the Western context.

These reflections help us defining and expanding the boundaries of architecture. Thanks to this confrontation with theater, we can gain criteria for analyzing architecture in relation to some current concepts of art considered in this study.

In addition, through an ontological_and not only metaphysical_analysis from architecture that addresses its transcendental properties, we try to answer whether construction, or the generation of a place (versus adapting to a place) is the only way to create architecture. Or, on the contrary, if these ‘new places or structures’ created produce specific situations but not necessarily architecture.
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