

Phenomenology of the Formation of “Meanings” in Architecture

Lyudmila Molodkina *

Abstract: The content of the article presents a philosophical and phenomenological analysis of the specifically expressed perception of architectural space as a culturally defined *locus* (“place”) with a multitude of included social and individual personalized meanings and other meanings that form the basis of architectural intersubjectivity. The author formulates own position on the basis of the phenomenological methodology of E. Husserl, R. Ingarden, M. Heidegger and other philosophers. The scientific stimulus for writing the article was also the interesting heuristic judgments of representatives of architectural phenomenology: C. Norberg-Schulz, S. Holl and other well-known modern architects.

Keywords: “place” / *locus*, intersubjectivity, architectural space, cultural meanings, constructing subject, meaning constitution process, corporeality

SOURCES OF THE CONCEPT OF “PLACE” IN THE COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF ARCHITECTURE

The loss of space is part of the global environmental crisis, which, as a whole, can be deprived of integrity. The world around us has become source that is not used through interconnections, consequences and meanings. Such a development is possible to be changed only by understanding places, because almost lost integrity is that inherent in the place in any of its manifestations – whether it is a landscape formation or a simple house. (Christian Norberg-Schulz)

We attempt to apply phenomenological methods to the study of architectural space as a “place”, with its subsequent consideration as an intentional subject of phenomenological analysis. An inspiring source of this choice was the acquaintance with the theoretical works of both phenomenologists and modern architects, concerned about the devaluation of the value of architecture in a society embraced by the ecological crisis, which resulted in the loss of the uniqueness of the “place” and the total sense of its disappearance. The inversion of the

* Lyudmila Molodkina (✉)

The State University of Land Use Planning and Management, Moscow, Russia
e-mail: Lmolodkina@hotmail.com

theoretical views of architects towards phenomenological philosophy attests the growing role of philosophy in contemporary culture. It is noteworthy that the search for the “place” of the architecture itself was led by the Norwegian architect-phenomenologist and architecture historian Christian Norberg-Schulz to the phenomenological interpretation of architecture as *Genius Loci*¹. The concept of “genius of place” in ancient Roman religion denotes the “spirit of the place” as the patron of a particular place, linking intellectual, spiritual, emotional phenomena with their material surroundings. “The genius of the locus” in architecture is seen as a kind of intangible spiritual substance, impregnating and spiritualizing the “place” of architectural arches in their fusion with landscape-natural framing in their uniqueness. Human beings tend to develop and improve the unique characteristics of their environment, and to adapt to the spirit of the place in which life flows. Individual personality qualities were formed under the influence of the environment and due to the inseparable connection with the spirit of the place, filling it with meanings - both personal uniqueness and social significance.

Space, as a unique symbiosis of geographical, social, demographic and other characteristics, requires a very careful attitude in the process of its artificial transformation. Norberg-Schulz drew the attention of modern architects to dangerous entrainments with the grandeur of architectural projects, charged with a high probability of oblivion of the history of this place and all the myriad events that ever occurred there. In his opinion, any architectural project should be a reflection of the place, if possible, maximally preserving the entire range of “local” events. It is precisely the comprehension of the “meaning of place” that avoids the “alienation” of a person in his own environment, the loss of a sense of unity with nature and man-made objects. And to this requirement - the consistency of the integrity of the landscape and its history - today not all buildings answer. Often they are not at all tied to the terrain and its history, and exist as if in “emptiness”. The sense in architecture is composed, first of all, of harmony and proportion - both in the architectural structure itself and with the surrounding landscape. Feeling of the semantic content of the environment allows a person to feel “at home” and fully feel the meaning of the being. Norberg-Schulz argues that the birth of any meanings in architecture is the

¹ See Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Intentions in Architecture*, 1963; *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*, 1980.

identification of a person with a “place” and an acute sense of “belonging”.

To a large extent, under the influence of Martin Heidegger’s hermeneutic ontology, one of the first to enrich the utilitarian and functional significance of the architectural and spatial matter of the “dwelling” with the semantic novelty of “place” (Heidegger 1971, 141-169), Christian Norberg-Schulz built his own phenomenological theory of architecture, understanding the architectural space as a “locus”, saturated by the meanings of human existence. The goal and main objective of architecture, according to Norberg-Schulz, is the understanding and specification of *genius loci* in the design and construction of a building “that takes the qualities of a given place and brings them closer to a person. ... We proceed from the child’s idea of architecture and the movement towards understanding the place, and if this process is successful, we learn” to see “our own place, and also to appreciate and comprehend other places” (Norberg-Schulz 1995, 30).

The growing number of followers of Christian Norberg-Schulz testifies the inexhaustible scientific-theoretical and project-technical interest in the architectural and phenomenological methodology that does not contradict the technical language and the “dialogue” of engineering structures that substantiate the architectural and spatial texture, but is the spiritual quintessence of intersubjective “dialogue” theory and practice in architecture. A whole generation of famous modern architects such as Steven Holl, Nader El-Bizri, Thomas Thiis-Evensen and many others - who were developing the theory of Norberg-Schulz - created a philosophical and phenomenological school for the study of architectural space as a “place” filled with a lot of deep personalized meanings and socially determined values.

In the galaxy of phenomenological ideas of outstanding philosophers who strive to seriously embed philosophical phenomenology into architectural creative activity, it should not be exaggerated to single out a very bright and distinctive contemporary American practice architect, Steven Holl, who can reasonably be considered the founder and apologist of practical phenomenology in architecture and the author of the autopoietic approach of the architectural design. Understanding the architecture of S. Holl as a world of color phenomena, smells, sounds, textures, etc., aesthetically “playing” in space, brings together the concepts with environmental aesthetics - comprehension of harmonic consistency and integrity of all components of the environment. Perception of the architecture’s

phenomena by a modern recipient, the “awakening of feelings” to architectural and town-building values, including such an ideal variation as “place”, is what inspires the experience of space. Fascinated by the ideas of the famous French phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the architect with the mind and soul of the philosopher admits: “I immediately discovered the connection between the texts of Merleau-Ponty and architecture. And I began to read from him everything I could find” (Holl 2000, 302). Applying phenomenological methods to architecture, S. Holl also appeals to the ideas of Hans-Georg Gadamer, who considered phenomenology to be a practical philosophy. To practical knowledge, along with architecture, were also included poetry and painting, close to the ancient Greek concept of “*techne*”. It was in the context of substantiating his own architectural practice that phenomenological ideas were so consonant with S. Holl.

Phenomenological categories of “body”, “rootedness”, “limitations”, “uncertainty”, “chiasm”, “parallax”, “spirit of place” - the ideal components of the “vital world” of architectural creation - in the architectural and phenomenological theory of S. Holl acquire a conceptual and methodological significance. “Place” in architecture is represented as “rootedness” and “restriction” in reality. The idea of “limited concept” reveals a rich semantic palette of “place” as a local unique situation, which is a contextually rooted object. Such “restrictions” are very positive for the architect, because, without really limiting the creative and methodological possibilities, they allow him to reveal the uniqueness of the “place” as a concrete situation. The “spirit of the place” is implanted and rooted in the very existence of man, being the condition for his “living” in the world, and therefore the architecture is able to change the image and principles of our life.

“Place” as a phenomenon, Holl believes, always requires a cultural context in which the conceptual idea of “rootedness” constitutes an aura of space, reinforcing and retaining attention to the uniqueness of the “place” in its local-chamber situationality. The importance of the cultural context in architecture, from the point of view of the Holl, is conditioned not only by the requirement of articulation of the historical, memorial significance of the “place” - a clearly marked cultural paradigm is a powerful stimulant of the subject’s experience of the situation and the atmosphere of the “place”. Holl aims to create emotional contact with the terrain, the surrounding landscape and their historical content, while emphasizing the importance of sensory

experience of the architectural and landscape whole: “It is important to hook on the idea that hovers in the air of each place. It can be anything: stories passed from mouth to mouth in living folklore, no secondary humor. After all, the original and authentic elements of culture are so strong that they make us forget about the style” (Holl 2012).

Holl enriched the phenomenological concept of “place” with the introduction of a specific concept of “parallax” understood as the movement of the body in space and the displacement of perception. “Parallax” is described as a liquid space and a changing landscape: “Architecture is a phenomenological discipline, and I believe that we are able to understand it only realizing the moment when our bodies move through space” (Ibid.). As an architect-practitioner, S. Holl tries to explain the dynamic and unstable character of the perception of the space of architecture by changing light during the day or by the age of materials, etc. For example, “parallax” of the architectural space of the House as “place” shows its dynamism and mobility, existence in time (temporality). “The house is not an object, it is a dynamic relationship of the terrain, perception, sky and light, with special attention to the internal scenarios of the movement ... Even in a small house you can admire the superposition of perspectives that arises from motions, displacements, changes in illumination” (Holl 2007, 16).

Under the influence of the phenomenological judgments of C. Norberg-Schulz, S. Holl, and other architects-theorists and practitioners, we disclose the significant factor in addressing the phenomenological experience of the “vital world” of the architectural space as a *locus*, “screaming” antinomies of a personal and social nature that affect many Muscovites - the theme of “renovation of housing.” The urgent need to modernize aging housing is conceived as a complex process of dramatic change in the whole utilitarian-significant structure of residential real estate. The radical nature of such metamorphoses undoubtedly entailed the transformation of this event into a tense social dialogue with high emotional intensity. The dwelling as a topological type of architectural space became the subject of doubt and fear of losing the sense of privacy of the home as a “place” as a “life world” in social everyday life with a great variety of meaningful variations of not only the primary utilitarian and consumer content, but also the deepest individualized and nostalgically unique intentions-senses. Phenomenology, as a method of studying the semantic content of architecture, is the most heuristic, from our point

of view, since it allows us to find new ways of representing the architectural space in its personal and social dimensions.

THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL GROUNDS FOR STUDYING ARCHITECTURAL REALITY

Phenomenology is interested in studying entities. Architecture is the potential to return them to availability. (Steven Holl)

Interpreting the concept of “place” in the architectural sphere in philosophical and phenomenological language, it is necessary to initially represent architecture as an ideal object, endowed with multiple meanings. Let us emphasize that the visual complexity and intricacies of the engineering-constructive visibility of the structure are not at all identical to the complexity of the phenomenological comprehension by the transcendental subject of synthetic semantic unity inherent in the architectural object as an ideal object.

Any architectural creation in its conceived expediency is always utilitarianly “designated”; this is the main property of architecture as an artificially created combination of different structures. Architecture is an empirical vision with all the evidence of its structural, compositional and spatial forms, as an object that can be conceivable. Truth arises in the case of the experience of the coincidence of existing, present facts and the same facts, but conceivable, that is, their meanings.

The architectural object is firstly experienced as a relation of things, constructions, volumes, forms, and then the meaning of these components becomes the object of experience. Quality, for example, of a personal character, aesthetic and artistic value, historical memory, religious and cultic ideology or quality, generated by the skills and professionalism of the author-architect, these qualities are acquired by the architectural structure as a result of a specific intentional synthesis carried out by consciousness in the course of perception. Very close to the phenomenological interpretation of architecture, we see the judgments of VL. Glazychev on the historical dialogicality and experience of “quality” in architecture: “Probably this sense of quality is given to the trained mind of a professional immediately. The Parthenon marble acquired its shape at the expense of the blood and groans of the ‘allies’ of Athens, but this form itself is already free from the circumstances that gave rise to it and carries Quality in itself. We learn it in the buildings of any time and any people, even one whose

name is unknown or debatable. Quality connects today’s work with the works of any moment in history, because, being formed by history, it is free from it” (Glazychev 1986, 490). Fundamental and stable in structure of the phenomenon of quality, generated by consciousness, initially still looks like potentially possible objects; but later they are transformed into real, phenomenological constituted transcendental objects with semantic content (temple, theater, palace, father’s house, etc.). Synthesizing in a single sensory-mental “bundle” of intentions, these qualities are historical, for they constitute “astonishment, admiration for the semantic connections that stretch through the centuries to the tasks that other architects have set and solved ... The amazement with the history of their activity raises a healthy consciousness of a professional, gives them the remarkable rights of a legitimate heir” (Ibid., 489). This is the cognitive function of architecture, including the historical one, which allows, in the process of perception, to formulate new, transcendental objects; so to speak, to perceive and experience the architectural space, giving it meaning that can “sink” and hold in the experience of consciousness. In the natural setting of consciousness, the architectural structure is perceived as the phenomenological integrity of all its “bodily” components: the form, the interior, the exterior, the surrounding “background” landscape, etc. To penetrate the deepest semantic layers and multilayered values of the architectural image created through heavy masses and constructions, it is necessary to renounce the naive orientation toward objectified architectural objectivity and to turn the research gaze to one’s consciousness by carrying out a specific act reflection in one’s own experience. Husserl called reflection the operational basis of “the creation of meaning” (Smirnova 2014, 51). The result of such a reflexive procedure is the birth of a new intentional object, of which I think I perceive, reflect or imagine. In the socio-phenomenological perspective, the principle of intentionality is transformed into the notion that consciousness is directed to the subject of human interest, endowing it with meanings that are not inherent in it (Ibid., 50).

The philosophical concept of “place” in its architectural expression, in our opinion, can be manifested primarily through the prism of the phenomenological comprehension of meanings and meanings attributed to the transcendental consciousness of the subject to architectural space as such with all its constituent structural attributes - both spatial and temporal: material-constructive, artistic-aesthetic, natural-landscape, family-household, etc. “Understanding the place

requires a broad understanding of architecture. In principle, this happens in two ways: first, when the building organizes a space for keeping the place, and the second, when the content is revealed through the expression of the form”, argues Norberg-Schulz (1995, 31). From his point of view, the phenomenological foreshortening of understanding architecture provides the development of an irrational vision of the whole in a real and potential architectural image. The feeling of giving integrity should, in theory, always accompany the author-architect, designing the structure and its recipient-consumer. “Therefore, our profession requires a new approach; it requires a rethinking of the design basis. Modern narrowness of thinking and specialization do not contribute to the development of a sense of the whole. Understanding the place gives us an advantageous point from which we can reverse negative development and restore architecture to its true role in society” (Ibid.).

Before the semantic status of a place can be found, the architectural and spatial object overgrows with various semantic series generated by the creative activity of the interpreter or his everyday activities, both in the personal continuum and in the social sphere. In the language of the phenomenological aesthetics of Roman Ingarden, the architectural structure with its spatio-temporal character must be freed from all sorts of being naturalness and passed through the “abyss” of the transcendental consciousness, and having passed this “thorny path” of attributed “labels”: evaluations, desires, lusts, tastes, memories, etc., turn into an intentional subject (Ingarden 1962). Such an operation is a transcendental-phenomenological reduction, “bracketing” the variety of meanings of beingness and psychological predicativity, which are present in the “natural setting of consciousness” (Smirnova, 52-53). Applying this phenomenological rule to architecture, we note that the opening of access to the pure consciousness of the transcendental Ego is a universal norm for constituting any ideal objectness, including the intentional birth of an architectural object as a “place”. The transcendental-reduced architectural sphere in the human mind is represented as “purified” from the reference and eliminated from all predicates of existence (the structure as such in its being basis of heavy masses and constructions is “bracketed”), and, on the contrary, it opens new cognitive horizons of meanings and values. This is what Husserl calls the “horizon” of the transcendental Ego, and Ingarden - the “specification” of the architectural work:

The horizon of the same transcendental consciousness is by definition wider than the horizon of experience of the empirical subject, since it covers the whole variety of potential objectifications, possible worlds of the subsequent objective mastering ... Phenomenological constitution, thus, is similar to the formation of virtual objects - as a constant appeal to the horizon of possible experience - without any references to its ontological status. (Smirnova, 57)

Depending on the way of perception and emotional impressionability, each perceiving personality has its own unique concretization of architecture: “there are many specifics of the architectural work ... For there are many viewers of the same work and many different processes of perception taking place in different ways. Any set of interconnected perceptions, if not all perception, entails as an inevitable result the definition of its intentional equivalent, of some intentional object” (Ingarden, 255). Intentional semantic objectness of “place”, in fact, can acquire any structure or the whole architectural ensemble; all depends on a certain type of possible perceptions of construction, on the forms and special properties of experiences, which in their inherent integration produce an equivalent intentional object.

By observing the same building, cathedral, old town hall or castle, studying their various destinies, their different uses and different circumstances, then we begin to delve deeper into its special unique essence, as it was, special, unique, hidden behind all these forms and modes of existence individuality – the individuality of a work of art. And then we understand that it is by its hidden essence that everything we manage to open in the process of communicating with, it is developing. (Ingarden, 260)

The penetration into the essence of an architectural work with the aim of knowing it looks like a kind of breakthrough “a loose mass of concretization”, which determines the possible boundaries of cognition of architecture as such. In other words, architecture as an integral representation of “place” is an ideal objectness, constituted by consciousness on the basis of a whole array of transcendental-subjective specifics and horizons. Under certain circumstances, based on the transcendental experience of the subject - experience in retention (remembering) or imagination - the architectural object or its component part acquires a new significant palette of colors with a variety of semantic nuances, generating the appearance of an intentional object called “place”.

INTERSUBJECTIVITY OF THE EXPERIENCE OF ARCHITECTURAL SPACE AS A “PLACE”

The connection of man with the place and through the place with space is enclosed in a dwelling. (Martin Heidegger)

As was noted in the previous paragraph, the concept of “place” in architecture expresses the ideal objectness of nature and culture with predicates of high and complex spiritual semantic fullness. However, the diversity of meanings that arise permanently on the infinite horizons of consciousness and on the basis of various specifics of the architectural space overwhelms the intentional reservoirs of the architectural objectivity of the “place”. The phenomenological configuration of the “place” goes beyond the horizon of its own ego. “Place” is transformed into an idealization of infinite openness, which is transcendental to the purely subjective locus of consciousness. And this means that the whole meaning-semantic array of an intentional object called the “place” sends our Self to the Other as a kind of accomplice in determining the meaning of “place” as an ideal object. Thus, the “locus” architectural space is an intersubjective community in which the independence of the Other and the independent existence of a common intersubjective world are co-constituted. The existence of “place” is a being-for-us, the meaning of which appeared with the appearance of the Other.

In the light of this cognitive practice, the problem of experiencing architecture as a “place”, a sense of the architectural space-locus and the generation of new semantic layers (“strata of time”, according to Likhachev) come to the fore. Intentional experience of architecture in the form of separate objects or in the form of complex-ensemble architectural and natural landscapes implies the allocation of their diverse cultural-meaningful meanings and social-semantic meanings. The articulation of the semantic aura of “place” in the architectural continuum as chamber-closed in its privacy and in the widely accessible social context always accentuates the “life world” of the structure, the world of the “natural setting” identified with a naive point of view in the so-called pre-reflective consciousness and everyday-practical thinking.

Proceeding from the previous arguments about architecture as a “place”, we try to formulate a typology of meanings, phenomenological constituted in the process of experiencing the

architectural space. Preliminary it is necessary to outline some difference between categories “sense” and “value”. If the value is represented as “a stable system of generalizations, behind a word that is the same for all people” (Luria 1979, 53), then the meaning is represented as “the individual meaning of the word, isolated from this objective system of connections; it consists of those connections that are relevant to this moment and to this situation” (Ibid.). Understanding the fundamental multiplicity of potentially possible interpretations of “place” as “open horizons” (for example, memorial-biographical or other situational determination) led to differentiation into two main groups of meanings and meanings. The individual-personalized “collection” of meanings is brought to the fore in the phenomenological typology of “place”, which is undoubtedly connected with the primacy of the subjective ego and with the introduction of “subjective aspects of meaning according to a given moment and situation” (Ibid.). The second semantic group is directly connected with the first according to the phenomenological dyad “I” and “Other” and denotes the “factory of meanings” of “place” in the sphere of social everyday life. The famous domestic phenomenologist N. M. Smirnova, exploring the phenomenological creativity of Alfred Schütz, notes that, in contrast to Edmund Husserl, the philosopher and social phenomenologist sociologist made the “main object of scientific interpretation” a temporarily eliminated natural setting of consciousness: “The main object of attention to the phenomenology of the social world is not the pure consciousness of the transcendental subject, but the everyday consciousness of man in a natural setting” (Smirnova, 284).

In the mind of a perceiving architectural object, a large number of semantic series of intentional objects of experiencing architectural spaces as “places” are constituted. The following semantic entities can be classified as such: “nostalgic attraction”, “play in the past”, “memorial trace of the past”, memorial event, subject-event memory, habit of the native place, sensory-cognitive experience of the past event, chamber-closed space of the individual souls, place as a reflection of the soul’s secrets (“soul-darkness”), lust, etc. In this semantic individual-drawn continuum, there are other implicit meanings of “place” - often hidden and implicitly expressed, but very often sub-able and anticipated, requiring a language frame and a communicative environment. It is the language as the main means of personal identification that “allows not only to surpass the uniqueness

of personal experience, but also to consolidate, to stabilize it". In fact, it is the experience, "besieged" in the memory of experience of human experiences, which constitutes the individuality of a person, his "biographical situation" (Smirnova, 229). In an individually personalized semantic field, there is also an intentionally expressed everyday and everyday experience associated with human activities, the everyday life, which to some extent has a social coloring. For example, the acquired material wealth is a very powerful lever of the individual's attraction to his native place, but at the same time this motive is socially conditioned. Therefore, in order to understand this category of semantic types of "place", from our point of view, an anticipation of perception and experience is very suitable, which helps to "realize an imaginary" rehearsal "of someone else's perception" (Ibid., 236); so, to anticipate the upcoming meeting with the architectural object in its infinite set of nuances of "place" as a concrete situation. Intentional objectness of "place" as a subjective reality is sometimes represented by "absolutely personal property" with shades of intimacy, unreasonable experiences, which, according to M. Scheler, are very difficult for verbalization. This is probably the situation where a silent contact with "place" means more than the exchange of experience and impressions in a living verbal conversation. If the "place" is identified with the homeland, home, dwelling, etc., that is, with those benefits that are necessary and accessible to everyone, then the meaning of "place" is to introduce subjective aspects of meaning according to a specific moment and a particular situation. The phenomenological image of the House is inimitably depicted in A. Schütz essay, in a magnificent translation by N.M. Smirnova:

Home life means for the most part life in actual or potential primary groups, that is, in general with other space and time, in the general environment of objects as possible goals, means and interests based on a continuous system of relevances. To live at home means to perceive the other as a unique person in the living present, to share with it the anticipations of the future as plans, hopes and desires, and finally it means a chance to restore relations if they were interrupted. For each partner, another's life becomes part of his autobiography, an element of personal history. (Schütz 1997, 209-210)

On the intentionality of the "typically life situations" into which concrete architectural and landscape objects are transformed,

“manifested” themselves as “places” for man, C. Norberg-Schulz wrote: “The life situation” of the arrival “means that the place has manifested itself”; further follows the situation of “meeting” “with the inhabitants of the place”; then “meetings require special places. The area is the most suitable place for this, while the street is the place for other kinds of meetings. In general, the urban space is the space of a certain kind of meetings” (Norberg-Schulz, 26-27). A single semantic image of the brightest and most memorable places is born, in which not only the aesthetically expressed visual properties of architecture and the surrounding nature are reflected, but also absolutely typical everyday situations of everyday life – “arrival”, “meeting”, “expectation”, etc. These are chronotopes, understood as an essential interrelation of the temporal and spatial relations, as Mikhail Bakhtin wrote².

As already noted the semantic typology of architecture as a “place” is, from our point of view, a dual character. However, the boundaries between the individual-personalized group of meanings and the social-everyday meaning of the “place” are very unsteady and are formed by analogy with Ego and Alter Ego. It is undeniable that the most important and significant architectural space for a person in everyday life is a home:

When something happens, we say: This is the case. ... The phrase shows that life and place are one. Life does not exist in a vacuum, it needs appropriate spaces. Sometimes we find these spaces in nature, but more often we create them ourselves as architects. Thus, architecture is the creation of a place for life. (Norberg-Schulz, 3)

The meaning and meaning of the home (home, apartment, etc.) as “places”, and in an individual-personal intention (as a chronotope) and in a socially communicative and meaningful environment (property relations in real estate) are incomparable. Everyday life of a person is full of many social intersubjective contradictions between the “I” and the “Other”. Semantic connotations of “place” in the modern socio-cultural situation often acquire the property character of “playing real estate”; or, for example, the renovation of dwellings. Considering the fact that renovation is first and foremost a cardinal change in the life of an individual as well as of entire communities, itself being a very

² See Mikhail Bakhtin, *The forms of time and chronotope in the novel. Essays on historical poetics. Questions of Literature and Aesthetics*, 1975, pp. 234-407.

contradictory process, it painfully affects both the subject and the community as a whole.

From the position of the so-called symbolic interactionism which is close enough to phenomenology, renovation can be interpreted as a complex situational “constellation of institutions, roles, status positions, organizations, norms, values and expectations” formed by a certain culture and organization, according to which individuals and entire social groups carry out their actions and actions” (Smirnova, 299-300). Renovation of the dwelling, despite the good intentions of its adherents, entails the destructive and inevitable destruction of the traditional meanings and meanings of the home as a “place”. The renovation process, involving the demolition of not only dilapidated buildings, leads to a destructive change in the semantic content of chronotopes and typical life situations. The value of previous creative searches and efforts diminishes or disappears altogether. There is a devaluation of the creative principle and the heuristic potential of the empirical individual interpreter, both in the person of the author-architect and the consumer. Renovation of the dwelling as a “place” is able of destroying entire strata of economic and engineering-building memory of past years – for example, the memory of the Soviet-era housing culture. But it is well known that the phenomenon of Soviet architecture has a unique grandeur of forms and ideological content. Unfortunately, creative efforts and the search for solutions to pressing social, everyday and other problems do not always lead to a positive result in the situation of neglecting the meaningful fullness of the “place”.

Communicative function of the architectural *locus* in its intersubjective sounding is realized in the process of perception and co-experience of the historical architectural heritage by a modern recipient in communicating with invisible quasi-interlocutors from past times. In doing so, the previously mastered objective meaning of the Ego is represented by analogy as a new semantic range, associatively and spontaneously grasped by the Other as Alter Ego. Such “Another” can act not only as an individual, but also as a cultural community that has some relation to “places” as the realities of past times. A good example of “loci” with their “life world” that is unattainable for us is the many historical and memorial Russian estates, fine Italian villas by Andrea Palladio in the vicinities of Vicenza or English and Scottish castles, as well as the most beautiful palaces and gardens of the unmatched Alhambra or unsurpassed in its

volatile natural light and color coloring of the Jordanian Petra. In these silent stone monasteries against the background of a mysterious or pomposity-pretentious and sometimes even severe heroic landscape, “the silent voices” of the former inhabitants - Alter Egos -, which are perceived in the spatial mode “there” and in the temporal mode “then” and with which our “I” located in the modes “here” and “now”, enter into “conversation”. This mental dialogue constitutes in the imagination on the basis of intuition “as if I were there and pairing associations” - similar in meaning and meaning to intentional objects. Therefore, let us make small adjustments to the concept of “Another” and, in accordance with the declared theme, let’s call it “Another of the Past”. Undoubtedly, the role of imagination - associative thinking, analogous to apperception, anticipation - is important in the constitution of “The Other from the Past”.

Perhaps, it can be said without exaggeration that in this way, thanks to the mobility of the constituted intentional objects produced by the intersubjective action of the “I”, “The Other” and “The Other from the Past”, we find an architectural plot of “place”, an architectural narrative with a set of embeddable emergent connotations of metaphorical nature. Of course, such intersubjective semantic configurations of “place” reflect the possibilities of architectural speech communication, which requires a clearly expressed language interpretation. But this topic needs further studies.

REFERENCES:

- Glazychev, V. L. 1986. *Evolution of Creativity in Architecture*. Moscow: Stroiizdat.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1971. “Building, Dwelling, Thinking”. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, pp.141-160.
- Holl, Steven. 2000. *Parallax*. New York: Birkhäuser.
- Holl, Steven. 2007. *House - Black Swan Theory*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Holl, Steven, Juhani Pallasmaa, Alberto Perez-Gomez. 2007. *Questions of Perception: Phenomenology of Architecture*. 2nd edition. San Francisco: William Stout Publishers.
- Holl, Steven. 2012. *Color, Light and Time*, with essays by Sanford Kwinter and Jordi Safont-Tria. Lars Mueller Publishers.
- Ingarden, Roman. 1962. *About the Work of Architecture. Studies of Aesthetics*. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Literature.
- Luria, A. R. 1979. *Language and Consciousness*. Moscow University Publishing House.
- Norberg-Schultz, Christian. [1991] 1995. Life takes place: News of higher educational institutions. *Architecton*, No. 1-2: 24-31. Translation from English by V. I. Iovlev.

- Schütz, Alfred. 1997. "Returning home". Translation from English by N. M. Smirnova. *From social metaphysics to the phenomenology of the "natural attitude"*. Moscow: IFRAN, pp. 206-213.
- Smirnova, N. M. 2014. "Cognitive analysis of the phenomenological concept of intersubjectivity". In *Intersubjectivity in Science and Philosophy*. Moscow: Canon +, pp. 47-69.
- Smirnova, N. M. 2014. "Intersubjectivity of speech communications". In *Intersubjectivity in Science and Philosophy*. Moscow: Canon +, pp. 226-248.
- Smirnova, N. M. 2014. "The communicative meaning of intersubjectivity: phenomenology and cognitive sciences". In *Intersubjectivity in Science and Philosophy*. Moscow: Canon +, pp. 271-302.