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This master's thesis in architecture intends to study the architectural work from a sculptural point of view, based on the belief that artistic influence improves a living space. The title — *Studies on dwelling: the case of Pezo Von Ellrichshausen. Meeting between architecture and sculpture.* — concerns the impression that habitation may not be limited to residential purposes, as it often includes separate programs, acquiring a plurality and ambiguity of functions. Therefore, this work analyses various ways of inhabiting a space starting from the case study of works performed by the architects Mauricio Pezo [MP] (1973-) and Sofia von Ellrichshausen [SVE] (1976-) and always making a comparison between architecture and art. Thus, since it is a master's thesis, the interest was focused in the relationship between architecture and sculpture, and its theme regards the ability to read an architectural work as sculptural piece.
This theoretical research is organized in three chapters, apart from the initial introduction that contains, in particular, the state of the art that briefly summarizes the thoughts of several authors in accordance with the object under study. It emphasizes the point of view of the historian Bruno Zevi, who understands "[...] architecture as a large sculpture carved, into which man enters and walks".¹

To start the analysis of this research and structure our thinking, architecture was divided into two major groups: blob and box.

The blob via, more organic, is studied through André Bloc (1896-1966), an important figure in the 60s that contributed to the fusion between architecture and sculpture. Despite having a degree in engineering in the École Centrale de Paris, France, Bloc has "always [...] [had] a particular interest in anything that could be important in the field of architecture and art." He was an atypical figure since he used to work simultaneously as a painter, sculptor, architect and director of magazines.

André Bloc believed that a sculptor could have an important role in the architecture. In association with the architect, the sculptor could contribute to the quality of an architectural work:

"Architects can receive from the sculptors, if they wish, a very advantageous collaboration, without limiting the role of sculptors to inclusion of their works in architectural environments. Their work could, for example, be focused on the study of the main relationships between volumes, connections and about some details, in particular, stairs, fireplaces, etc. The quality of each detail contributes greatly to the architectural value of a work. Such work would be much more urgent than the inclusion of sculptural objects [...]".²

However, it is necessary to clarify that "André Bloc did not believe that the renewal of architecture could simply be born from the dilation of the sculpture at a monumental scale".³ His intention was not to "replace an architect by a plastic artist, but he considered [...] that the confrontation of the sensitivity of one and the savoir-faire [know-how] of the other could only, if it were frequent, result in the recovery of the general level of architecture".⁴

Although he has worked in collaboration with architects – notably with Claude Parent in the projection of Maison Bloc (1959-1962), France, and in Maison d'Iran (1963-1965) – and besides expressing his ideas in conferences or publications, André Bloc also explored other ways to implement his way of thinking. His work culminated in sculptures-habitacles, which, according to him, are characterized by being "[...] modest architectural trials considered by me as simple extensions of my work as a sculptor. [...] Pretentious, no doubt, but convinced, I take a difficult and agonizing struggle, and try to establish some direct links between architecture and sculpture".⁵ Thus, this designation refers, among others, to Maison à Carboneras (1964), Pavillon du Plâtre (1965), as well as to the buildings
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¹ Bruno Zevi, Saber Ver a Arquitetura, São Paulo, Ed. WMF Martins Fontes, 2006 [1ªed.], p.17
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that he produced at full scale in the garden of his home in Meudon, France: two Habitacles, respectively in 1962 and in 1964, and the Tour (1966). These last three works, unlike the first two, did not have to match any particular purpose, nor were they external orders. They demonstrate the complicity and ambiguity between architecture and sculpture and are examples of projects where the artist had complete freedom to explore a new way to shape the sculpture to become closer to architecture. The sculptures-habitacles, was invented by himself and designates:

"[...] an usable inside space, but not habitable, to the extent that, in the original intentions of the author, there is no aim to integrate daily housing functions."

For André Bloc making smaller scale models of his work was very important. He began by making a sketch of a model on a small scale, then another one at a slightly larger scale and ended in a full-scale and in situ work.

In summary, despite the many efforts demonstrated by André Bloc (whether in organizing conferences and exhibitions, or in promoting the encounter between various artists and architects, particularly within the Groupe Espace, or even in publishing various articles in his journals) "the synthesis of the arts appears as the great utopia of modernity, always sought, never achieved".

In contrast, there is the via box, a more geometric approach which will be analyzed using the work of the artist Donald Judd (1928-1994), US artist often associated with Minimal Movement (despite himself denying it).

Although in his work the relationship between sculpture and architecture is not so obvious, this study contributes to understand a new look at this issue. Donald Judd does not intend a true synthesis of arts, as André Bloc, once it recognizes unique attributes to each discipline, namely the functional character that the architectural work has the obligation to respond. Donald Judd "[...] does not support an amalgamation of art and architecture [...] but rather the establishment of a coherent relationship between the two."

This artist was important for his criticism to museums and galleries. According to the artist, the architects who respected the space to house works of art were rare, so he decided to create in Marfa, Texas, USA, a propitious place to exhibit and save his work permanently (as well as from other authors), something innovative for that time. In fact, this character sought to create "something new". In this sense he no longer made the difference between paintings and sculptures, creating, as he designates, three-dimensional objects (progressions, stacks, boxes). In those pieces there is an insistent demand for repetition, in the work in series, always using simple and recognizable forms (mostly based on the square).
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6 Claude Parent, « Sculpture-Habitacle » in Aujourd'hui – André Bloc, op.cit., p.133
In Marfa, large-scale objects were also found, such as *15 untitled works in concrete* (see fig.083-086) consisting of sixty pieces grouped in a total of fifteen different groups where Donald Judd explores, once more, the spatiality of objects, creating some objects more closed and dark, and others more open and bright. It should be stressed the importance of ambiguity in *15 untitled works in concrete* in the sense of inability to recognize immediately their identity: sculpture? LandArt work? architecture?... Despite its indeterminate function, it is highlighted the fact that each one can adapt to various uses, including a *pergola* – space that offers shadow to simply *be* – approaching, in this way, the architecture domain. Finally, it is emphasized the relevance of its size which refers to architectural scale, a human scale.

Donald Judd outdid himself in the way to present and preserve his works. Regarding three-dimensional objects and, particularly, large-scale ones, the artist himself claims to have found an intermediary balance between architecture and sculpture:

"Contrarily to monotonous art and architecture that currently dominate, I believe that my work has led me directly to something new in these two areas.”

After doing some reflection on the work of these two figures, which, as a matter of fact, do not have any degree in architecture, one comes to the analysis of case studies: Poli House and House of Solo, authored by PVE.

The initial reason for choosing these two works was centred in an article written within the subject *Théorie de l'Architecture VII* at EPFL, Switzerland, taught by Professor Bruno Marchand. This text – "Est-ce une maison? Est-ce une sculpture?" – analyzed Poli House, a work designed by the studio Pezo Von Ellrichshausen, based on the taste and particular interests of the Poli House, as well as the personal belief that art can positively influence the architectural work. The failure to reach a comprehensive conclusion while writing the article was the pretext to continue the investigation, resulting in the creation of this thesis.

In fact, the studio is precisely between an architectural office and an art studio, *i.e.*, it simultaneously produces artistic works (installations, paintings, exhibitions) and architectural ones (especially residential housing). Another peculiar feature is that MP and SVE do not make any distinction between their private and professional life, or between academic and professional life, nor between the two disciplines considering that it is all part of the same creative process:

"We don’t make any distinction between art and architecture, for us it is the same. It is two ways of describing the same, which works more as an institutional distinction. We don’t find any inspirations or any references in works of art as a special element that we want to incorporate in our projects. There are no objects needed to stimulate what we do. We don’t refer to anything but architecture, in fact, to anything but the building we are doing. […] We do not

---

9 Donald Judd, « Marfa, Texas » in Donald Judd, Écrits 1963-1990, op.cit., p.177
use references to develop our ideas. We don’t believe in metaphors, quotes, concept or analogies while developing a project.”

Their taste for art has lead them to read and research a lot about artists, works or topics of interest, however, they claim that it is “more as a way of understanding that intellectual approach to the work. But that inquiry is not as a direct reference for our work.” Yet, MP acknowledges that the experience of a work of art – seen and appreciated as a spectator – ultimately influences your way of being in the world, as any travel or personal relationship. It is the life in its complexity (including art) that builds the individual and influences the artist without his being aware from which such references come; according to SVE:

“I guess all the work of the artists and writers and everybody you like is somehow inside you and maybe somehow comes out but not in a direct reference to them.”

Both of them claim to see the Poli House and Solo House as ‘series heads’ (which is why they are a subject of study in this dissertation). Although SVE remembers that the desire to create series was not a precondition, but a consequence of the practice, she sees as "something gratifying" the fact that the reading of her work results in a series. This term, according to MP, can be understood in two ways: one "projetual family" where a project contaminates and influences another; or the establishment of bases "a repetitive and serialized mechanic" where "a unit applies regular or irregularly within the same work." The fact that it is a system of practice that allows you to read all the buildings as a whole, as well as as the fact that it is a work that can be read as a series in itself, where a particle is systematized in different ways, derives from a serial thinking and from a "methodological insistence" that characterize PVE.

Briefly, the first series of work is very narrow and compact and the separation between inside and outside is clear and well defined; while in the second series the line that defines internal and external spaces becomes more complex and this border becomes ambiguous. Another important difference between the two series lays on the principle of regularity. Houses like the Poli House are based on the asymmetry in both plant and elevation (where there is the use of different ceiling and floor levels) and accept the exception, as opposed to the methodology used at the Solo House, which is based on a symmetric structure. This duality opens different exploration fields, both in appearance and formal materialization, and the logic that produces them. It is difficult to say what is the most regular and complex process: "a system of equal elements arranged randomly?" or "a system of different elements in a regular structure?" More important than finding ways, according to the architects, is looking for a perfect machine adaptable to any project. The authors acknowledge that this consists of something “quite ambitious and
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grandiose, pretentious but valid." Thinking in series is present in their works (both artistic and architectural), particularly in the design of Finite Format – exercise that consists in exploring all possible combinations of an object, making it vary based on strict rules (e.g., three relationships in height, width, length), revealing, in this way, the effects of those small changes. This process of replay and the thorough (almost boring) exploration of multiple possible combinations evokes the various series of Donald Judd. Such as the minimalist artist, architects use straight lines, simple and orthogonal geometries, approaching this way to via box. This repeating exercise also evokes the definition of art given by the Argentine poet Godofredo Iommi (1917-2001): "Always do the same, but never in the same way."

It should be stressed once more that the focus of this dissertation is related to the possibility to read an architectural work as sculptural object. On the one hand, the duality between the disciplines art and architecture is kept, but, on the other hand, it is important to note that it begins from architectural work; more specifically houses, since this investigation is based on the study of the above mentioned works. So, it is necessary to review the concept of housing together with normality – according to SVE:

“We assume the notion of normality in the sense of familiarity, of a place or a building that somehow is perceived as something known and close. There is also a security factor because with normal elements, like normal rectangular doors and windows in normal rectangular walls, you feel you are on safe ground. It is possible that those normal architectural parameters might be necessary if a building assumes certain risks without an explicit distortion of its formal language, which would be closer to a calligraphic exercise.”

Another key feature of this studio is that it is based on the design process that values the sensory aspect, the creation of "rituals" in the life of resident. As mentioned above, the architects are focused on solving "more intellectual functions, more of reading" than to answer a particular program. The taste for domestic scale is related to the willingness to draw up a "proposal as radical as possible" with the simultaneous challenge of ensuring the comfort of "a receiver that operates in reference base". MP and SVE state that "in the case of residential architecture is not so much to invent a way of life, but to translate the way of life of someone who already lives in some way, whether you like it or not".

PVE’s studio, besides articulating the three basic factors in the development of an architectural project - local, program, construction – also adds a fourth element: anti-fitness. Although there is no
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clear hierarchy between the vectors – “none was more determinant than the others” 24 – the term anti-fitness qualifies the work apart from correct and balanced resolution of functional and economic issues, such as SVE said:

“You have to find the correct balance between this information that is given to you, through the site, through the program, through the technology but we also think that it is one element that nobody is asking for the equation that you can also introduce. It is probably your own critical approach to whatever is there. It is not just to keep things at the balance at they need but it’s also to introduce something that introduces a new way of looking at that problem. Of course it doesn’t destroy it, but somehow puts the discussion at a level a little bit higher than just the services or just the safe answer. And it is why we call it anti-fitness, somehow it does not fit in this tight skin but it also collaborates in producing either some new questions about how you are occupying that space. […]” 25

He also adds that this attribute – anti-fitness – is suited to a variety of parameters that a project may include: the distribution and organization within the domestic space, the use of the materials or how it relates to the environment, among others; succinctly: “[...] it is more about what is not expected, it is not the common place or the most direct path to an end.” 26

Since MP and SVE say that PVE’s work “is about interpreting our own context, it’s more intellectual” 27 and give priority to “conceptual argument, intellectual, critic” 28; MP explains:

According to the way of life presented to us, we are interested in establishing a number of relationships that are not given […]. For us, making architecture is an exercise to establish relationship between several elements; spatial relationship and also intellectual relations. We believe that there is a degree of abstraction that turns out to be where the project is. These relationships – the way someone moves, contemplates, views the place, among others – are always a number of lost data that are being articulated.” 29

Thus, the work of PVE consists of constructions that intentionally interpellate and arouse the curiosity of the observer, always using known forms and simple geometries. Ultimately, the fact that they are interested in the more human side that a house can offer – they focus on how to provoke, stimulate and provide different experiences to the resident, rather than worrying about programmatic and functional issues – their works are close to the buildings of André Bloc. This approach should not be understood in the formal sense, but on the functional versatility of the finished work and its abstraction.

In fact, usually PVE’s works do not consist of common residential houses, instead they tend to integrate different programs in the same volume. They explore various typologies within a single building, i.e., using the same module, they seek to reconcile different uses and spatial organizations.

24 in http://www.onarchitecture.com/interviews/mauricio-pezo (02.07.2015)
25 in entrevista a PVE no âmbito do workshop PortoAcademy’15, op.cit.
26 Idem
27 in http://www.onarchitecture.com/content/mauricio-pezo-sofia-von-ellrichshausen
28 Idem
29 Ibidem
Both the issue of materiality and integration on the ground are important. Despite not being the main attribute of work, one can see a concern with the tectonics of the building. They are generally autonomous and compact parts, abandoned on the lot. Also, they usually have free space around it, enough area that simultaneously provides privacy, a certain distance from the neighbors, and can allow the house to breathe. The podium idea is also frequent. In addition, the pieces are shown in an orthogonal and purified way, respecting the motto of PVE: ‘No more, no less’, where the superfluous disappears.

Finally, it is highlights the fact that both case studies – Poli House and Solo House – consist of works where the architects had greater freedom of decision, respectively, as they were the owners of the building or because they got carte blanche by the residence promoter. Referring to these two works, SVE claimed:

“Solo House is a special case because it is a temporary house, like Poli. You can do different things in a temporary dwelling. When it is a temporary residence you can stretch the way of living much more than in a permanent house. [...]”

In this dissertation the analysis of the Poli House and Solo House are developed in detail, in light of sculptural works and are also compared to architectural works.

Poli House (2002-2005) is located in Chile. In addition to being located autonomously near the cliffs of Coliumo peninsula and assuming a podium position in the middle of the landscape where one can experience the feeling of dizziness, the building has the particularity of integrating a mixed program that tries to reconcile two scales, i.e., assimilate not only social spaces but also others more intimate. On the one hand, the Poli House is available for use by its owners – SVE, MP, Eduardo Meissner and Rosemarie Prim – while house; and, on the other hand, it can accommodate a variety of artists (painters, sculptors, photographers, poets, etc.) who rent this space for a limited period of time to create their works. This duality is reflected in the ambiguous definition of the areas, making it almost impossible to identify the function of the different compartments (except the bathroom), which relate in an unusual way. Regarding the comfort and as to its inner organization, the Poli House refers to the principle of Raumpian statement by Adolf Loos (1870-1933). The name of ‘Poli’ reveals its primary concept; architects intentionally chose the Greek word, which designates not only city, but above all plurality.

It should be also noted two essential characteristics of the work: square holes – the vain, always with the same geometry but different dimensions, vary depending on the orientation of the building: in the north and west façades the stepped back vain add density and weight to the monolithic volume, as opposed to the south and east façades, where the windows make the final work lighter – and the particular inside organization – perimeter of about 1 meter wide, which surrounds the work and has vertical accessibility, areas of particular and specific function (kitchen, wc, etc.) and includes also few voids that serve to store the furniture when it is not being used and, therefore, free some space and allow the adjacent division to become as neutral as possible, i.e., adaptable to any function. This type of distribution evokes the concept of promenade, being the home gradually discovered and

30 in entrevista a PVE no âmbito do workshop PortoAcademy’15, op.cit.
31 Hans Ibelings ; Jeroen Lok, op.cit., p.149
accompanied by new visual relationships, as well as “contradictory sensations: open/closed, narrow/wide, dark/light, opaque/transparent”\textsuperscript{32}.

Finally, the sculpture \textit{Homage to Goethe I} (1975) by Eduardo Chillida (1924-2002) is also compared to \textit{Poli House}. Nonetheless, it is important to note that though the architects know and appreciate the work of the Spanish sculptor, the similarity between the works is a coincidence; they deny the direct and immediate reference to any possible inspiration.\textsuperscript{33} The \textit{Homage to Goethe} sculpture illustrates the relationship between nature and construction: a natural stone evokes the cliffs of Coliumo and a carved stone refers to the house. The concern to conveniently install an architectural work in the midst of nature is a fundamental and timeless question in the field of architecture.\textsuperscript{34} In addition, there is a clear relationship in the way Eduardo Chillida sculpted the \textit{Homage to Goethe I} and the volume of the \textit{Poli House} – a cubic mass, with simple and well-defined geometry, where there are also carved openings with a square shape. The notion of mass is also strongly present in this sculpture. In the same way that this piece is carved, \textit{Poli House} is also perforated to allow the light to enter. This last point with respect to light may be enhanced with the use of alabaster in the sculpture – material that admits a certain translucency without losing mass and density character. Thus, the principle of permeability is presented and the idea of mass vs. empty, \textit{i.e.}, subtracting the mass giving rise to empty space is reinforced.

In this study it was also sought to understand if there were similar strategies in other architectural works and it was found that the \textit{Final Wooden House} (2005-2008) Sou Fujimoto (1971) illustrates in a more complex way the ambiguity between read the work as architectural or sculptural piece always within the via box, \textit{i.e.}, maintaining the use of orthogonal and known geometric shapes (like the cube). Although there is a difference in the material (wood), it is possible to see, once more, the subtraction of mass from a cubic volume. In fact, one could even say that Sou Fujimoto was able to realize an architectural work even closer to a sculpture than the \textit{Poli House} of PVE. The architect argues that the success of his work may be associated with the use of wood, since this is a highly versatile material that can be employed for both foundations and exterior or interior walls, roofs, floors, or as insulation, furnishings, stairs and window frames of the vain.\textsuperscript{35} This similarity with a sculpture can also result from the heterogeneity of the vain, being completely impossible to identify the organization of the interior space. The \textit{Final Wooden House} is a repetition and intelligent organization of parallelepipedal wooden beams resulting in a unique space with different levels, despite the fact that they all are interconnected. The ambiguity is also felt inside the work due to lack of walls to separate the different divisions and the lack of furniture; according to the architect: “The wooden blocks Could be the floor or the furniture or the walls, so in that house every definition is melding together […]”\textsuperscript{36} So it is a radical work that abolishes any reference to normal houses, although there is a study to examine the position of an individual regarding the proportion of space, thus avoiding jeopardizing the habitability of space, even for
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temporary use. Sou Fujimoto in the *Final Wooden House* can achieve what he calls "*in between spaces*". This house still evokes the sculptor Carl Andre wooden objects.

While analysing *Solo House* one can make reference to the simplicity and debugging of Mies von der Rohe, as well as to the centrality and symmetry of Andrea Palladio. However, although it seems a very rigid system based on repetition and juxtaposition of the *square*, the *Solo House* is not at all a cold work. On the contrary, the interest in this work relates to the realization of a very sensitive building that awakens the sensorial side of its inhabitants, as well as promotes a privileged contact with nature, inviting to contemplation and relaxation, always using purified and orthogonal lines. As described in this dissertation, the house is a progressive discovery and requires the inhabitants to take various decisions: while entering the house or, for example, while going through the house in a search for sun or, in contrast, shadow. This house shows the series whose *format* is based on a podium and a suspended platform (adapted from a single-family house as *Guna House*, for example).

According to a sculptural point of view, *Solo House* refers the Sol LeWitt *structures* and because of its simplicity evokes an armour. However, once again, it is stated that these formal resemblances are not conscious and deliberate by designers.

This research proved to be enriching. The ampleness and variety of PVE works influence each other which results in more sensitive works, more human and with higher architectural quality. The lack of separation between artistic fields and also from the taste, knowledge and interest that hold the art are also fundamental to his work. Thus, reading the works of PVE as sculptural object is recognized as valid by themselves while they were not designed as such; according to SVE:

"[...*I think it is flattering because I guess it is considered much more than in just functional terms. Yes, I think it is valid [to look at PVE’s work as a piece of sculpture]. But I think architecture it’s much more complex than sculpture.*]"  

Yet, it is important to stress that architects see architecture as a much more complex discipline than sculpture, since it has the capacity to cover various areas; MP explains: "[...*I think the beauty of architecture is that it is more complex, it occupies different dimensions at the same time. Architecture is a synchronic art.*]"

In conclusion, the architecture can indeed be read as sculptural work. In this thesis examples where architecture becomes a habitable sculpture are illustrated. It is found that the influence from art in the architectural discipline, particularly the ambiguity between architecture and sculpture, results in a gain to the architectural design, *i.e.*, promotes a work *richer, more complex, human* and of higher *quality*. As stated by Bruno Zevi, "*every architect should be a little sculptor.*" 
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**Exemplos de finite format (2012-2014), PVE**

Maison Bloc (França, 1959-1962), Pavillon du Plâtre (França, 1965), Tour (França, 1966), Habitacle I (França1962), Maison d’Iran (França, 1963-1965), Maison à Carboneras (Espanha, 1964) e Habitacle II (França1964)

**Progressions, Stacks e Boxes, Donald Judd**

15 untitled works in concrete (Fundação Chinati, Marfa, USA, 1982-1986), Donald Judd

**Exemplos de finite format (2012-2014), PVE**

**Rómon (jogo de 15 vigas de madeira, Roma, 2014), PVE**

Pinturas axonométricas (Solo House e Sem Título), PVE
Poli House (Coliumo, Chile, 2002-2005), PVE

Hommage to Goethe I (1975), Eduardo Chillida

Exemplo de Raumplan - maquette da Villa Muller (Praga, 1930), Adolf Loos

Final Wooden House (Japão, 2005-2008), Sou Fujimoto

Timber Piece (Well) (1964/1970), Carl Andre
Exemplo de simetria e axialidade - planta esquematica da Villa Rotonda (Itália, 1930), Andrea Palladio

Referência de depuração e transparência - Iamsworth House (Illinois, USA, 1951), Mies Von Der Rohe

«LESS IS MORE»


Solo House (Cretas, Espanha, 2009-2012), PVE