

on houses

Angelo Bucci
2017

published in THEMATA

fact 1: we are mostly the same

The more I listen to people's requests and how they dream of their house, the more I believe we are mostly the same. We all share same basic needs and live in a similar way despite of all cultural nuances. A house intends to fulfill clear requirements: a single person, a couple or a family and so on. If we are mostly the same, it makes sense to consider that we could live in similar houses.

fact 2: each site is unique

The uniqueness of a site was imprinted by geomorphology, climatic conditions, natural landscape. Each site is unique even by definition: no matter how minimum it is, there is just one single spot with the same longitude and latitude. More than this, we stressed that primordial uniqueness since the very first artifacts was displayed on a precedent site. As a result, both things, nature and artifacts, were bonded as a constructive culture. The more we built, the more we distinguished. This is because actions were enchainned with clear purposes [and it seemed to be like that since the tectonic forces] with no possibility to coincidences or chance. Any mountain is like no other, no city is like the other. Just to say that each site is unique.

* * *

Both facts seem to lead us to a contradiction or an impossibility: even if we spread thousands of identical houses around the world, or in a same neighborhood, they would become immediately different to each other or as unique as each site where it was displayed. If one sees two of them as the same, it is just because disregarding everything but the house.

Thus, what if we disregard the house but the site?

Indeed, if the goal of a drawing is to make clear specificities [of a house, in this case] it makes sense to allow the uniqueness of the site informs it much more than the similarity of its dwellers. What is interesting is the fact that by disregarding the house we are able to see the inhabitant not as the generic human being but as a person placed in a unique site therefore who holds a specific voice while talking to the world. This corresponds to believe that we can find the universality of the house [and people] through the uniqueness of the site, more than this it is as if a house could be occupied even actually before existing.

It is clear, the work of an architect when designing, or even building, a house would never achieve more than deliver just a kind of support or infra-structure. A true house will come just after people living there for decades, imprinting their lives on those rooms, just after that it will be meaningful house as if had been designed by daily steps of dwellers arriving and leaving every day, by the sound of their voices, by the smell of their food, their remembrances on the walls.

Yes, in one hand a meaningful house had to charge decades of life. On the other hand, we all know, a house like that will not be reset easily because its uniqueness is like no other, impossible to be replaced.