

Aurosa Alison

Aesthetics and Architecture: Living is the answer.

Allow me to begin this contribution in a probably unethical way. In the current situation¹ we are forced to live in our homes, to introject the world that awaits us outside, dream and remember spaces and places we have lived in. Childhood, adolescence, the seasons of life that have involved us in internal environments, in urban contexts, in atmospheres, are all, in this strange moment, a valid hold to the reality. In this particular moment, to introduce a section dedicated to the relationship between Aesthetics and Architecture, in a very particular moment, I would like to use a metaphor, starting from a recurring dream I have.

The main subject of my dream is a building. It always has the same form: a massive and dark stone. Objectively, it should inspire fear, but instead invites to enter. Its interior is fascinating, often filled with junk, sometimes with toys, sometimes is entirely in the shadows, sometimes is illuminated by daylight. The building manifests itself in my unconscious as a place to return, not necessarily to do something in particular, but only to *feel*.

This short description of my dream can highlight the *sensorial* relevance of living places. In this regard, architecture provides the possibility to analyse the relationship between the human being and the experience of living, which pre-exists to any kind of judgement. It is well known, in fact, that man learns to be in the world likewise in the same way as he learns to inhabit²: “*I dwell, you dwell. The way in which you are and I am, the manner in which we humans are on the earth, is Buan, dwelling. To be a human being means to be on the earth as a mortal. it means to dwell*” (Heidegger, 1971, p.145). This pre-existence suggests a further exploration of the ways in which men inhabit their life, whether public or private spaces.

Intro: Community and Salvation as antipodes of Living

¹ We are referring to the global crisis due to the pandemic caused by the covid-19 virus (March/April 2020).

² Cfr. M. Heidegger, *Building, dwelling, thinking in Poetry, language, thought*, tr. By A. Hostadter, Harper Colophon Books, New York 1971.

In describing the original dwelling, Vitruvius identifies fire as the man's first approach to nature, a natural element from which to defend himself:

Therefore, as the occasion of fire began to arise among men, the gatherings [...] some began to make roofs out of foliage, others to dig caves under the mountains, and others to imitate nests, and swallows' houses, to make mud and virgules into places that could be sheltered, then reflecting on the houses of others, and adding their own ideas of new things, went to the day improving the houses. (De arch., II, 1).

The will of salvation (Severino, 2003), which presupposes the need to take refuge, leads man to want to build his own environment in which to identify himself and find comfort. In equal measure, the condition of living presupposes *socialization* within communities that are created around the same fire, through the use of language. As a result, the condition of community makes use of the same principle of living and building.

In 1954 the Italian philosopher Enzo Paci focused on the concept of "city". How are "Communities" born? How is the City born? Echoing the words of Giambattista Vico "*ingens sylva*", the urban space is the one that stands out from the peasant one. The social role of the city is to be first and foremost the fulcrum of society, or that of the relationship between a closed infinity and an open infinity. This means that the primordial condition of living, presupposes the basic needs of the human being. We should refer to Hegel who affirms through the concept of "symbolic" the absolute role of architecture, which refers in all its forms to the Spirit, the ultimate and highest meaning of existence. The history of man takes place in parallel with an Architectural History, where the *sensus* of both is found in their mutual relationship. In this regard, with the aim of identifying with one's own lived space, the community as well as the individual, they need a structural balance, that is, an aesthetic harmony suggested by the architectural construction itself. The polis as well as the Pyramids stand up as symbols of reference from a historical point of view but also for the dense theoretical meanings that they sublimate. In this case the meaning of "Living" represents a wide range of social experiences that are repeated over time in different ways. These can be declined through the History of Art and Architecture. Currently and especially after the post-modern crisis, the Living models have changed considerably and so has the relationship between time and space.

In this regard, we would like to explore the experience of living and consequently the reality that occurs thanks to the relationship between Architecture and Philosophy. In this way we would like to highlight the importance of the experience not only of architecture *tout court*, intend-

ed as a shell or merely an enveloping space, but, we would like to focus our attention on the *moods* that architecture materializes thanks to a series of daily activities. To better present our topic, we would like to use two archetypes (as sets of images) common to all of us: the *house* and the *city*. These two apparatuses, although hyper-real, constitute the collective imagination, as well as a shared reality. The house will be explored through the set of experiential and sensitive faculties suggested by Gaston Bachelard in the *Poetic of Space*, the city through the eyes of Benjamin's *flâneur* and on the Situationists psycho-geographic maps.

1. The house as the universe of Living: The poetics of space by Gaston Bachelard.

In 1957 Gaston Bachelard in the *Poetics of Space* (Bachelard, 1957), illustrates the dynamics of a re-appropriation of what is usually called "space". Before questioning architecture, or the modalities of architectural ensembles, we have to pose a fundamental question about what inhabiting means today. In this way the awareness of an urban whole is based on an *existential* awareness of the lived space. The original considerations about space are defined in an Era characterized by the concept of liquidity where everything merges and mixes. Defining the *habitat*, as well as the *oikos*, is a task to be carried out in a logical and detailed way. In fact, the world of Gaston Bachelard's images and poetics, often demonised or accused of fantasies without logic, turns out to be an excellent expression of how the space to live, share and remember. The images imply a key to access space, conceived by Bachelard as a place of experience.

Starting from the corpus of images of the house, we can trace a first line of the *intimate* space. Bachelard draws the images of intimacy through the daily activities of each individual and through the original suggested by nature. Through the images the primordial way to inhabiting such as the nest, the shell and the womb, Bachelard introduces the fundamental concepts of the primigenial inhabiting. The image of the house defines, according to Bachelard, the ways in which to live space. In this regard we will illustrate three fundamental characteristics of inhabiting in the house: the *topoanalysis*, the *intimate immensity*, the *dialectic of inside/outside*.

– For our house is our corner of the world. As has often been said, it is our first universe, a real cosmos in every sense of the word (Bachelard, 1957, 2004, p.26).

– Life begins well, it begins enclosed, protected, all warm in the bosom of the house (Bachelard, 2004, 29).

The archetype of the house gives us the coordinates to define the terms of inhabiting. The intimacies of the hidden, the secret, the deep, are mixed with the dialectic functions of the inside/outside and the intimate immensity. Based on its own dynamics, on a series of dialectical relationships, the house constitutes an image that lends itself to a wider consideration of space.

In *Poetics of Space*, the dynamics of the house are based on two dialectics: that of the inside/outside and that of the intimate immensity. Consequently, the image of the house, according to Bachelard, constitutes a dialectical universe which unfolds, along a vertical axis between the polarizations of the high and the low, from the cellar to the attic. Intimacy is released through a subjective involvement of the soul that the philosopher describes using the name *Topoanalysis*. Through Topoanalysis we can therefore access the fundamental principle of the function of inhabiting: that of finding ourselves in a happy, protected and intimate space. In this regard, the first point for a Phenomenology of the intimate space is that of Topoanalysis, through which the pivotal points of living meet the main characteristics of the soul. Our soul corresponds to the structure of the house.

Bachelard mentions the use of the house as an instrument of analysis for the soul, taking up Jung's thesis on the relationship of the soul with the earthly matter. The earth and the soul are linked by an archaic principle, where the dominant image of the earth represents that of the hidden and primordial nature. The original imprint, given by the earth, sediments in the soul and enhances its structure.

In the famous chapter, *The Earthly Conditioning of the Soul*, Jung argues that the house is a tool to decipher the structure of the soul:

We have to describe and to explain a building the upper story of which was erected in the nineteenth century; the ground floor dates from the sixteenth century, and a careful examination of the masonry discloses the fact what it was reconstructed from a dwelling-tower of the eleventh century. In the cellar we discover Roman foundation walls, and under the cellar a filled-in cave, in the floor of which stone tools are found and remnants of glacial fauna in the layers below. That would be a sort of picture of our mental structure.³

³ C.G. Jung, *On the relation of Analytical Psychology to the Poetic Art*, in *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, trans. By H.G. & Cary F. Baynes (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928). Bollingen Series vol. XV, pp.118,119 (The passage is taken from the essay entitled "Mind and Earth" – cit. in G. Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, p.20,21.

Intimacy is a growing value from the oneiric house to the chests. The more poetics becomes deeper the more the images double giving life to the intimate space and build up norms and archetypes. Intimacy is what allows the subject to meet his soul and is situated at the core of each individuation. Through the conception of intimate space, the house is a model through which to come to the knowledge of the space of the self and of the surrounding space.

In the eighth chapter of *Poetics of Space*, Bachelard describes the intimate immensity as a relationship with space, thanks to which we can introject the reality that surrounds us. Through the analysis of the term *vast* in Baudelaire's poems, Bachelard takes the opportunity to emphasize an external spectacle that helps to unfold an intimate greatness, to demonstrate that this greatness is inherent in the human soul can be discovered through the *rêverie*. Bachelard argues that the intimate immensity owns the character of the intensity of being which unfolds in a vast perspective of intimate immensity. Intimate immensity bears neither the value of the finite nor that of the infinite; it is timeless, however remains a category of poetic imagination and not just a general idea formed in the contemplation of magnificent spectacles.

Immensity is within ourselves. It is attached to a sort of expansion of being that life curbs and caution arrests, but which starts again when we are alone. As soon as we become motionless, we are elsewhere; we are dreaming in a world that is immense. Indeed, immensity is the movement of motionless man. It is one of the dynamic characteristics of quiet daydreaming (Bachelard, 2004, 202).

The intimate form of space becomes concrete through the possibility of a continuous reproduction, as a concept of external globalism. In this way the phrases "*I can only meditate on the things of my country*" or "*The immensity is in us*" serve as an example of openness to the reality that envelops us and at the same time, to become aware of a universal spatial aspect.

Another fundamental characteristic of inhabiting is conducted by the dialectic of the inside/outside that Bachelard illustrates in the ninth chapter. The architect and the urban planner, have to acquire the equipment to compose the vital space. This equipment, must take the form of unity, all inspired by a biological rigor, the only one capable of performing the various tasks. This theory reminds us of the fact that the condition and conception of space depends on living experiences. The subject is in relationship with space from a sensitive condition. Everything is compressed into a "lacerating" dialectic of the inside and the outside.

Entrapped in being, we shall always have to come out of it. And when we are hardly outside of being, we always have to come out of it. And when we are hardly outside of being, we always have to go back it. Thus, in being, everything is circuitous, roundabout, recurrent, so much talk; a chaplet of sojournings, a refrain with endless verses. But what a spiral man's being represents! (Bachelard, 2004, 229).

The activity of the subject that Bachelard detects in the chapter, the dialectic of the outside and the inside, corresponds to men's way of being: a spiral that has neither a beginning nor an end, neither inside nor outside, that constitutes and contains space. At the end of this chapter, the philosopher offers a possibility to the being to have a more correct denomination of the outside-in character, that of the ajar. The being wants to manifest and hide itself, the movements of opening and closing are so numerous that, as Bachelard writes: "*Man is a half-closed being*" thus affirming a theoretically ambiguous character. This means that a first approach to inhabiting is understood through the fundamental characteristics of inhabiting the house.

2. The aesthetic experience of the city: Walter Benjamin and Guy Debord, flâneurs and urban explorers

"*The problem of the architecture is not that of being seen from without or that of living within. It is in the dialectical relation interior-exterior, at the level of urbanism (house-streets) and at the level of the house (interior-exterior)* (Debord, 2006). Guy Debord, the father of the *Théorie de la dérive*, introduces a key concept for the interpretation of inhabited space, namely the permanent relationship that exists between: our conception of intimate, everyday and shared spaces. These ways of living are supported by the same phenomenological and aesthetic scheme of *feeling*. all those characteristics that constitute our perceptions.

In this regard, though the iconic figure of the *Passagen-Werk* (Benjamin, 1982), Benjamin describes exactly what Debord argues: the correspondence between the inside and outside of the intimate space and the shared space within the city. Benjamin's analyse of the bourgeois interior of the 19th Century illustrates the power of domestic places to depict the characteristics and cultural transformations of a social group in a certain historical context. He points out how the domestic interior was built for the "private citizen in contrast to the workplace" by structuring the separation between the public and private spheres in a peculiar way. This would be the result of modern industrial and

economic development, which led the bourgeois individual to an intensification of his public and productive life. From this space one expects to be “cradled in one’s own illusions”.

At the same time, around 1850, Baudelaire argued that traditional art was inadequate for the new and dynamic complications of modern life. The social and economic changes caused by industrialization required the artist to immerse himself in the metropolis and become, in Baudelaire’s words, “a *botanist of the sidewalk*”: an analytical connoisseur of the urban fabric. He minted the terms referring to Parisians, the *flâneur* (the one who loiters/walks) and the *flânerie* (the one who loiters/walks) that are associated with the sensitive experience of the city and the environment, which leaves room for unhurried and unplanned exploration.

Walter Benjamin adopts this concept of the urban observer both as an analytical tool and as a lifestyle. He describes the flâneur as a product of modern life and the industrial revolution. Benjamin became his own main example, collecting social and aesthetic observations from long walks along the streets of Paris. The flâneur in his urban sensory inspection uses the dialectical image: a sudden, flashing image in which past and future illuminate each other starting from the present. The dialectical image appears where past, present and future suddenly manifest themselves in the light of a “true synthesis” in which appears what Benjamin – taking up a fundamental term of Goethian (Goethe, 1810, tr. 1970) morphology- calls an “*original phenomenon of history*”. Dialectical images counter the threat of preservation (tradition) by virtue of the interruptive force they are understood to impart to experience as a consequence of the instantaneous temporality of the now: what Benjamin famously called now-time, *Jetztzeit*: “*The dialectical image is an image that emerges suddenly, in a flash* (Benjamin, 1982, tr. 1999).

Our investigation proposes to show how, as a consequence of this reifying representation of civilization, the new forms of behavior and the new economically and technologically based creations that we owe to the nineteenth century enter the universe of a phantasmagoria. These creations undergo this “illumination” not only in a theoretical manner, by an ideological transposition, but also in the immediacy of their perceptible presence. They are manifest as phantasmagorias. Thus appear the arcades- first entry in the field of iron construction; thus appear the world exhibitions, whose link to the entertainment industry is significant. Also included in this order of phenomena is the experience of the flâneur, who abandonshimself the phantasmagorias of the marketplace. Corresponding to these phantasmagorias of the market, where people appear only as types, are the phantasmagorias of the interior, which are constituted by man’s imperious need to leave the imprint of his

private individual existence on the rooms he inhabits. for the phantasmagoria of civilization itself, it found its champion in Haussmann and its manifest expression in his transformations of Paris (Benjamin, 1999, 30).

The flâneur, has the function of the urban observer but is also the witness of the intensification of urban experience, through the conception of his own intimate space. The flâneur's experience in the city becomes more and more intimate to the point of coinciding with the same modality of one's room. The eyes of the flâneur make the urban experience the vehicle for the antipodal experiences of inhabiting: the landscape and the room.

– Paris created the type of the flâneur. What is remarkable is that it wasn't Rome. And the reason? Does not dreanring itself take the high road in Rome? And isn't that city too full of temples, enclosed squares, national shrines, to be able to enter tout entiere-with every cobblestone, every shop sign, every step, and every gateway- into the passerby's dreanl? The national character of the Italians may also have much to do with this. For it is not the foreigners but they themselves, the Parisians, who have made Paris the promised land of the flilneur-the "landscape built of sheer life;" as Hofmannsthal once put it. Landscape-that, in fact, is what Paris becomes for the flâneur. Or, more precisely: the city splits for him into its dialectical poles. It opens up to him as a landscape, even as it closes around him as a room (Benjamin, 1999, 417).

– The phantasmagoria of the flaneur. The tempo of traffic in Paris. The city as a landscape and a room. The department store as the last promenade for the flâneur. There his fantasies were materialized. The flânerie that began as art of the private individual ends today as necessity for the masses (Benjamin, 1999, 895)

For this reason we can realize that the contextualization of the experience of inhabiting is at the centre of the illustration of the surrounding reality. Through the eyes of the flâneur, the Benjamin's descriptions of the bourgeois interior and the city, are two crucial examples of an experiential approach to living in the city.

In this case, the individual through his own feeling not only takes possession of his inner space but also of the shared space of the city. In the same way, Guy Debord's *Théorie de la dérive* (1956) accompanies us in a personalizing description of the urban context.

In order to deepen the urban concept of Situationism psychogeography is defined as the "Study of the precise effects of the geographical environment, consciously or unconsciously arranged, which acts directly on the affective behaviour of individuals".

Psychogeography could set for itself the study of the precise laws and specific effects of the geographical environment, whether consciously organized

or not, on the emotions and behavior of individuals. The charmingly vague adjective psychogeographical can be applied to the findings arrived at by this type of investigation, to their influence on human feelings, and more generally to any situation or conduct that seems to reflect the same spirit of discovery (Debord, 1955).

In this sense psychogeography belongs to the environmental determinism, born with Friedrich Ratzel in the mid-nineteenth Century. The relations between environment and nature are considered and analysed in a unique way. It must be understood as a game and at the same time an effective method for determining the most suitable forms of deconstruction of a particular metropolitan area. The technique of psychogeographic exploration is the *drifting*. Drift is opposed to the classical notion of walking or travelling, it is much more similar to the behaviour of that product of the Industrial Revolution that Charles Baudelaire and Walter Benjamin call “flânerie” (the walking).

– One can *dérive* alone, but all indications are that the most fruitful numerical arrangement consists of several small groups of two or three people who have reached the same level of awareness, since cross-checking these different groups’ impressions makes it possible to arrive at more objective conclusions. It is preferable for the composition of these groups to change from one *dérive* to another. With more than four or five participants, the specifically *dérive* character rapidly diminishes, and in any case it is impossible for there to be more than ten or twelve people without the *dérive* fragmenting into several simultaneous *dérives*. The practice of such subdivision is in fact of great interest, but the difficulties it entails have so far prevented it from being organized on a sufficient scale (Debord, 1958).

– The spatial field of a *dérive* may be precisely delimited or vague, depending on whether the goal is to study a terrain or to emotionally disorient oneself. It should not be forgotten that these two aspects of *dérives* overlap in so many ways that it is impossible to isolate one of them in a pure state. But the use of taxis, for example, can provide a clear enough dividing line: If in the course of a *dérive* one takes a taxi, either to get to a specific destination or simply to move, say, twenty minutes to the west, one is concerned primarily with a personal trip outside one’s usual surroundings. If, on the other hand, one sticks to the direct exploration of a particular terrain, one is concentrating primarily on research for a psychogeographical urbanism (Debord, 1958).

In the famous *Naked City* diagram (1957), Debord illustrates the concept of an emotional deconstruction of the city, through the interweaving of several places that independently of each other, pursue the same concept: to inhabit the city.

The correspondence between Benjamin's *flâneur* and Debord's *dérive* is logically consequential and linked by the basic concept of wanting to inhabit the city again and again. The phenomenological and aesthetic reading of the city gives everyone access to all the hidden sides of places apparently accessible to all.

3. Living: pre-cognition or sensitive consequence?

The current debate on the concept of atmospheres⁴ introduced by the psychiatrist Hubertus Tellenbach and the philosopher Hermann Schmitz, legitimized in the world of Contemporary aesthetic philosophy thanks to the philosopher Gernot Böhme and introduced in the international and national scene by the philosopher Tonino Griffero, is still in progress. The interesting contribution of the concept of atmospheres in the world of contemporary aesthetics is linked to its being in between the context of introspectivity and perceptive aesthetics.

The concept of atmosphere can be connected to the approach to the world of an everyday aesthetics that becomes more and more concrete thanks to the theoretical formalization of this concept through the philosopher Yuriko Saito's thought (Saito, 2008). Saito, in the contextualization of the aesthetic environments of everyday aesthetics, recognizes as a sensitive experience that of architecture as a discipline that does not stop at simple visibility:

Everyday aesthetics encourages attention to these non-visual experiences, which helps sharpen our sensibility. Attention to these sensory experiences is also critical in architectural practice and urban planning which tend to be dominated by the visual orientation (Pearson 1991; Pallasmaa 1999)⁵.

At the same time, the lived space issue is widely covered by Griffero⁶, who defines the atmospheres as a category of lived space, philosophically and we could certainly add *aesthetically* meaningful: *A phenomenological aesthetics of atmosphere must also rehabilitate the so-called first impression* (Griffero, 2014, 34).

⁴ Cfr. T. Griffero, *Atmosphere*, in International Lexicon of Aesthetics, Mimesis, Spring 2018; Y. Saito, *Aesthetics of the Everyday*, in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Winter 2019.

⁵ Y. Saito, *Aesthetics of the Everyday*, in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Winter 2019.

⁶ T. Griffero, *Atmosferologia. Estetica degli spazi emozionali*, Mimesis, 2010; T. Griffero, *Il ritorno dello spazio (vissuto)* in Sensibilia 3 – Spazio fisico/Spazio vissuto, Mimesis Sensibilia, 2010, p.29-51; T. Griffero, *Il Pensiero dei sensi. Atmosfere ed Estetica pratica*, Guerini e Associati, Milano, 2016; T. Griffero, *Felt-bodily communication: a neophenomenological approach to embodied affects* in Sensibilia 8 – Embodiment, Mimesis Sensibilia, 2017.

While physical space made of places and measurable distances enjoys an abstract uniformity (isotropy and Euclidean three-dimensionality), “lived” space claims to have an absoluteness and an irreversibility constrained to the felt-body (above/below, right/left, up/down) and to our actions¹⁸—as revealed, although with all due differences in a phenomenological-psychopathological sphere and also in an anthropological-existentialistic one (Heidegger, Binswanger, Minkowski, Straus, Dürckheim, Merleau-Ponty, Bachelard, Bollnow) (Griffero, 2014, 38).

At this point it is interesting to understand, within the relationship between aesthetics and architecture, how the world of Architecture has approached that of aesthetics through the consideration of atmospheres. In this case we refer to the work of Juhani Pallasmaa who, with extreme clarity, illustrates what can be conceived as sensitive or *experienced* in Architecture.

Indeed, in a recent interview (Amundsen, 2018)⁷, Pallasmaa, answering some questions on the relationship between architecture, aesthetics and atmospheres and he focused his attention on the perceptive relief of atmospheres in a room or in the city mentioning Griffero’s work:

The ambiance or atmosphere of a room or an urban space is the overall feeling and tuning of the experience. It is a non-material or peripheral experience (a “quasi-thing”, as Tonino Griffero calls the phenomenon) that tunes our minds in a specific way. We feel atmospheres immediately and without being conscious of the process (Amundsen, 2018, 2).

The importance of precognition is absolute as we approach the sensitive understanding of space. The question becomes even more interesting when Pallasmaa answers the question of how to design an Atmosphere during the design of a building:

A talented architect internalizes his/her design and works with it in an intimate and multi-sensory manner, as if it were a part of him/herself. A gifted designer senses the hidden tactility and materiality, as well as the emotional and atmospheric impact. A mature architect does not compose a drawing, but the experience of the project in real life. The final target of the architect is not the physical building, but its impact as a lived experience. This is what John Dewey taught us with his seminal book “Art as Experience” in 1934 (Amundsen, 2018, 3).

The primary concept of this statement is in the experiential aspect of the project: to design what will happen in a given space. This does not mean using a pre-sensory understanding, but on the contrary, deciding the purpose of the sensitive impact represented by the project. In his

⁷ M. Amundsen, *Q&A with Juhani Pallasmaa on Architecture, Aesthetics of Atmospheres and Passage of Time*, in “Ambiances” (Online), Since October 2018.

relationship with the world of Philosophy, Pallasmaa is based primarily on the general theory of aesthetic experience introduced by John Dewey, but often uses as his references: Aristotle, Gaston Bachelard, Martin Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty.

In Space, place and atmosphere: peripheral perception in existential experience (Pallasmaa, 2014), Pallasmaa, focuses on atmospheres in architecture and on artistic and literary production. On this occasion he illustrates space through the sensitive experience of places, introducing an essential element for our reading: that of the sixth sense (Pallasmaa, 2014, 245). In this way, the simple visit of a cathedral immerses the viewer in a sensitive four dimension where not only the vision but also the touch, the smell, the body penetration participate in a common feeling. In accord to this, *The experience of the place* (Hiss, 1991), another text quoted by Pallasmaa, seems necessary to illustrate the simultaneous aspect of perceptiveness, as if to say that the zero point of architecture is sensitive perception.

The relationship between atmosphere and architecture detects the presence of a creative imagination, the atmosphere is therefore an experiential dimension that belongs to the sensitive presupposition. The call that Pallasmaa launches to the world of architecture is of: a common collaboration, a Gestalt understood as a common link to *feeling*.

Last but not least the architects who, according to Pallasmaa, introduce the concept of Atmosphere in the contemporary Era into their projects are: Glenn Murcutt, Joy Architects, Williams & Tsien Architects, Patkau Architects and finally Peter Zumthor, upon whom we dwell briefly.

Pallasmaa mentions Peter Zumthor as an architect who recognized the importance of the Atmospheres in the world of Architecture, referring in particular to *Atmospheres: Architectural Environments. Surrounding Objects* (Zumthor, 2006). The Atmosphere, says Zumthor, speaks to our emotional perception, it can never err or betray our first feelings. So if we have an empathy, an emotion aroused by what is happening in a square, the emotion disappears when we remove the square. This means that the Atmosphere or perception of it is closely linked to what triggers it. Another interesting element is what Zumthor mentions about the architect's duty: to be first and foremost a craftsman. Creating atmospheres in architecture means having "craft". This means that the essential characteristics of the project start from our sensitive experience of reality: the body, the material, the sound, the temperature, the objects, the inside-out, the light and intimacy, according to Zumthor, are all the necessary points to operate the

contribution of atmospheres in the world of architecture. In this regard, in the context of Atmospheres, Zumthor calls “degrees of intimacy” what the architect would call dimensional scales. In the principle of inside/outside, for example, the relationship between the intimate and the public sphere is what not only architecture is based on, but as we have seen in the first paragraph of this contribution, also our mood. Finally, the contribution of Pallasmaa and Zumthor, in this connection between the world of atmospheres and that of architecture seems to be providential to our argument. These two examples make us understand how important transdisciplinary or even multidisciplinary dialogue is, in which there is mutual exchange, as in the case of Aesthetics with Architecture.

Conclusions

It is oddly difficult to conclude this contribution, perhaps because the path taken seems to us, at this moment, to be infinite because so closely linked to our experiential capacity. We have seen that the liveability of a place, of a house, of a city, we have seen, is closely linked to the principle of habitability. Through the theories of Gaston Bachelard, Walter Benjamin and Guy Debord we have tried to offer a philosophical and theoretical evidence of what we mean with the experience of inhabiting starting from the aesthetic contribution of sensitivity. Through the contextualization of Atmospheres in the world of Aesthetics and Architecture we have tried to provide a concrete outcome.

Perhaps the right choice for now is to leave the discourse ajar on the image introduced by this contribution: my recurring dream of the building. I tried to analyse what it meant or what it represented in my unconscious: myself? My fears? Or on the contrary my sense of protection towards myself? No answer satisfied me, perhaps because there are not always answers to *feelings*. One cannot rationalize an empathy or the goosebumps for a place or an encounter. Just like such an intimate hidden image can't be made rational.

So I would like to conclude in this way: by quoting a phrase by Zumthor that impressed me a lot: *I enter a building, see a room, and – in the fraction of a second – have this feeling about it.* It is this fraction of a second that changes everything. It changes our being, as well as a dream or an architectural project. I firmly believe that architects should no longer be afraid to feel places, just as philosophers should no longer insist on theorizing what is not and will never be theoretical.

Just as *living*.

Bibliography

Ábalos, I.

2017 *The Good Life: A Guided visit to the houses of Modernity*, Park Books, Switzerland.

Adorno, T.

1970 *Ästhetische Theorie*, Suhrkamp Verlag.

Alison A.

2019 *Epistémologie et esthétique de l'espace chez Gaston Bachelard*, Mimesis France, Milano.

Augé M.

1986 *Un ethnologue dans le métro*, Paris, Hachette.

1992 *Non lieux*, Paris, Editions du Seuil.

Bachelard G.

1949 *La Terre et les rêveries du repos*, José Corti, Paris.

1957 *La Poétique de l'espace*, Puf, Paris; tr. *The Poetics of Space*, Penguin Books, New York, 1964.

1960 *La Poétique de la rêverie*, Puf, Paris.

Benjamin, W.

1950 *Berliner Kindheit um neunzehnhundert*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main.

1963 *Städtebilder*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt.

1982 *Das Passagenwerk*, ed. by R. Tiedemann, *Gesammelte Schriften*, volume V, 1 e 2, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a.M.; trans. Eiland H. & McLaughlin K., *The Arcades Project*, Cambridge, MA. & London: Belknap Press, 1999.

Bollnow O.F.

1963 *Mensch und Raum*, W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart.

Böhme G.

2006 *Architektur und Atmosphäre*, Fink, München.

Chiodo S.

2001 *Estetica dell'Architettura*, Carocci, Roma.

De Fusco R.

2001, *Trattato di Architettura*, Laterza, Roma.

Debord G.

2006 *Unpublished notes on Architecture*, Gallimard, Paris.

1955 *Introduction to a Critique of Urban Geography*, trans. Ken Knabb, "Les Lèvres Nues", n°6.

1958 *Theory of Dérive*, “Les Lèvres Nues” n°9, 1956, trans. Ken Knabb reprinted in *Internationale Situationniste* n°2.

Dewey J.
1934 *Art as experience*, Balch.

Goethe W.
1810 *Zur Farbenlehre*; tr. *Theory of Colours*, Mit Press, 1970, United States.

Formaggio D.
2018 *L'Arte come idea e come esperienza*, Brescia, Morcelliana.

Griffero T.
2016 *Atmospheres. Aesthetics of Emotional Spaces*, (2010), Routledge, London.
2016 *Il pensiero dei sensi. Atmosfere e estetica pratica*, Guerini e Associati, Milano.

Griffero T., Somaini A. (directed by)
2006 *Atmosfere*, “Rivista di Estetica”, XLVI, n.s. 22.

Heidegger M.
1927 *Sein und Zeit*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main.
2000 *Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main.

Hiss T.
1991 *The Experience of Place*, Random House, New York.

Holl S., Pallasmaa J., Pereze-Gomez A.
1994 *Questions of perception. Phenomenology of Architecture*, William Stout Publishers, San Francisco.

Masiero, R.
1999 *Estetica dell'Architettura*, Mimesis, Milano.

Merleau-Ponty M.
1945 *Phénoménologie de la perception*, Gallimard, Paris.

Norberg-Schulz C.
1979, *Genius Loci – Landschaft, Lebensraum*, Baukunst, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta.

Pallasmaa J.
1985 *The geometry of feeling: the phenomenology of architecture*, “Encounters”, p.86-97.
1996 *The Eyes of Skin: Architecture and senses*, Academy Editions, London.
2009 *The Thinking Hand: Existential and Embodied Wisdom in Architecture*, Wiley, Chirchester.
2014 *Space, place and atmosphere: peripheral perception in existential experience*, “Lebenswelt” *Aesthetics and philosophy experience* – n°4, p.230-245.

Pallasmaa J., Robinson S., (directed by)
2005 *Mind in Architecture: Neuroscience, Embodiment and the future of Design*,
MIT Press, Boston.

Panza P. (a cura di)
2014 *Estetica dell'Architettura*, Guerini e Associati, Milano.

Saito Y.
2007 *Everyday Aesthetics*, Oxford Press, Oxford.

Severino E.
2003 *Tecnica e Architettura*, Raffaele Cortina Editore, Milano.

Simmel G.
2019 *Philosophie der Landschaft. Ästhetik der Alpen. Rom, Florenz, Venedig*,
Mahler Verlag.

Vitta M.
2008 *Dell'Abitare. Corpi spazi oggetti immagini*, Einaudi, Torino.

Vitruvio
1486-87 *De Architectura*, Eucharius Silber, Roma.

Zumthor P.
2006 *Atmospheres: Architectural Environments. Surrounding Objects*, Birkhäuser,
Switzerland.

Bibliography Journals

- “Aut Aut”, n°333, Enzo Paci. *Architettura e Filosofia*, Milano, Il Saggiatore, 2007.
 “Les Cahiers Philosophiques de Strasbourg”, n°46, Galland-Szymkowiak M.,
 Labbé M., (directed by), *Atmosphères. Philosophie, esthétique, architecture*,
 Strasbourg, Presses universitaires de Strasbourg, 2019.
 “Phantasia”, n°5, Galland-Szymkowiak (directed by), *Architecture, espace, ais-*
thesis, Bruxelles, Université Saint-Louis, 2017.
 “Sensibilia”, n°3, Di Monte M., Rotili M. (directed by), *Spazio fisico/ Spazio vis-*
suto, Milano, Mimesis, 2010.
 “Sensibilia”, n°8, Pedone S., Tedeschini M. (directed by), *Abitare*, Milano, Mi-
 mesis, 2014.
 “Sensibilia”, n°9, Pedone S., Tedeschini M. (directed by), *Genius Loci*, Milano,
 Mimesis, 2017.

Aesthetics and Architecture: Living is the answer.

This paper wants to focus the main topics of inhabiting in three dimensions concerning the relationship between Aesthetics and Architecture: 1) The intimate space of the house, 2) The shared space of the city and 3) The felt space of Atmospheres. In this way we would like to introduce the concept of lived space as an important field of the Architecture project and, at the same time, we would like to illustrate how Architecture approaches the world of phenomenological and aesthetically sensitive inhabiting space.

KEYWORDS: Intimate space, Topoanalysis, Flâneur, Drift space, Atmospheres.