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SUMMARY

The article proposed here reports on reading the master's student's research object using the iconological method created by the German historian Aby Warburg - the Atlas. The research in question has as the main object the reading of works that have the ramp as an architectural notation, a concept created by the Swiss architect Bernard Tschumi. Starting from a quick elucidation on the theoretical basis of the mother research, the process of building the universe of works is explained through searches in large portals for the dissemination of architectural projects, and those that meet the requirements created by the author are selected. Following the initial clarifications, there is a clarification of the German historian's methodology when composing the method that today is known as Atlas. Even though Atlas is a great help tool, it was concluded that secondary analyzes are necessary to bring the researcher closer to objects so that categories are created and from these object-works are highlighted for a more detailed assessment. All of these analyzes are carried out to find these object-works that will be studied to understand the ramp as architectural notation in post-World War II projects.
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This paper aims to describe the methodology and reading used in the author's master's research. The research project in question has the general objective of identifying and discussing the function of Architectural Notation in defining the role of ramps in the constitution of spatialities in selected projects through the adopted approach. Thus, it is possible to establish procedures and protocols for the analysis of object works, having as an initial point an element that conditions a perceptual process of the space in which it is inserted in the same gesture that defines that same space.

Present in a variety of architectural specimens, the ramp goes back to mythological structures, such as the tower of Babel, to classics, such as the Knossos palace of King Minos from 1900 BC in Crete (Koolhass, 2014) and like the castle of Sant’Angelo in Rome from 135 AD that has its resonances reaching into modernity, such as the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and Foundation by architect Frank Lloyd Wright built-in 1959 in New York.

In the technical aspect, the ramp increases the comfort and safety of the users’ walk, frees their attention for the appreciation of their surroundings, and, from the perspective of the conception, it is a vertical circulation device that provides a three-dimensional experience allowing different views of the experienced architecture.

During the 20th century, there was an understanding that the implantation of the ramp was directly connected with an experience that was to be developed dynamically. The ramp helps to overcome obstacles at the same time that it is a scenographic device, of the sequential unfolding of the building’s formal and spatial qualities and a democratic access agent that provides a more gentle ride (Chiambretto and Trillingsgaard, 2016). Circulation medium that links movement to the aesthetic reception of the subject in the work and that enhances the architectural promenade widely adopted and disseminated by the Swiss architect Charles-Edouard Jeanneret-Gris, better known as Le Corbusier.

It is in Villa Savoye that Le Corbusier exemplarily builds the architectural walk, evidenced from the arrival to the high point of the solarium. Maciel (2002) highlights that the concept of architectural fruition developed by Corbusier is materialized through the properties of the materials used in the construction, the proposed paths, the experience from different points of view of the architectural object. Stickells (2010) complements by highlighting that for
the architect the center of the architectural experience was the viewer's movement and the ramp was able to provide a clean route through the building in a smooth way. Such an experience revealed the structural spatiality allowing a constant change of the visual, unexpectedly and carefully, composing significant perspectives.

In this sense, the notion of movement is adopted as a historical-critical foundation as a fundamental issue for the conceptual bases of modern architecture, in its various manifestations. The idea that bodily movement produced different understandings and perceptions of the proposed architecture gains strength. Writings by art historians Heinrich Wölfflin, August Schmarsow, and Paul Frankl, according to Stickells (2010) reinforced the idea that movement is critical to the experience of architecture, the notion of body movement is vital for understanding form and building composition. For Stickells (2010, p. 44) “To see is to move and to sense movement.”

The changes that the world underwent, however, during the World Wars at the beginning of the 20th century ended up generating a series of unprecedented needs until then. On the other hand, the advent of technologies during the second world war ended up impacting architecture since techniques and materials entered the scene that allowed the construction of abstract forms that were previously impossible, or extremely difficult, to be executed. This new technical device helps modern European architecture to be dominated by a “technical-structural objectivity” (Martinez, 2000). For Eisenman (2013) the arrival of industrialization breaks the essence of the balance between man and the objective world, which echoed making architecture increasingly social or programmatic as the functions became more complex.

It is from this crisis of the principle of the modern movement, according to Montaner (2001), that a new posture was established that had its convictions related to technologies, forms, languages, and connections with the context. Challenging the concepts of architectural types that belonged to the academic tradition that formed the basis of the BeauxArts system. The theory of modern architecture refuted the historical forms of architecture. According to Colquhoun, the exclusion of typologies and the belief in the theory of modern architecture “in free intuition can be partly explained by the more general theory of expression that was very widespread at the turn of the 20th century” (Colquhoun, 2013, p.279).

The type implies the idea of change for Rafael Moneo (1978 apud Montaner, 2001) because it identifies that within the structure of the type the transformation takes place. In his text “On typology,” he warns of an overly limited vision that leans towards fundamentalism and is in danger of becoming overly conservative. The fear of the unknown, of the new, could end up harming and restricting the conception of new ideas and, consequently, of a new typology.

Contemporary to Rafael Moneo’s text, another architect appears who seeks a new definition in an attempt to understand the experience of architecture and introduces a new concept. Bernard Tschumi, a Swiss architect, produced the Manhattan Transcripts between 1977 and 1981, which consists of “four exhibitions containing experimental notations of architectural situations” (Sperring, 2011, p.219). Hartoonian (2010) notes that the film editing of Transcripts protects architecture from the aesthetic consequences of “technification”. After questioning the relationship between architecture and the program, that is, between use and
space, Tschumi introduces a new term, Architectural Notation, the idea that architecture is directly linked to the event and the program, in this way “The architect brings, in his projects, the programmatic and formal interests within the architectural discourse and its representation” (PADOVANO, 2001). For Tschumi, the architect not only composes forms, but he also brings in his projects “the programmatic and formal interests within the architectural discourse and its representation” (PADOVANO, 2001).

Bernard Tschumi drinks directly from the source of the American architect Philip Thiel (1920-2014) who publishes a notation system in the 1950s (MARTÍNEZ, 2018). Thiel’s notations are focused on phenomenological issues while Tschumi’s notations focus on the program. Tschumi’s reading of architecture makes it stop being just a polarization of form-function, material-concept object, and becomes more than these two poles together. The architectural notation is a physical and conceptual understanding of the built place. This new concept is structured like the Elements of Composition, “composed of three levels of representation: that of space, that of movement and that of the event.” (SOLFA, 2008), in an interview with Dwyre (2014, pg 13), Tschumi declares that “there is no architecture without movement”. In a very summarized form, according to Saygin (2018), space corresponds to the architects ’conception, the event to the users’ perception, and the movement to their experience.

"although no form of notation [...] can transcribe the great complexity of the architectural phenomenon, the progress of architectural notation is linked to the renewal of both architecture and its associated culture concepts" (FRACALOSSI, 2012).

Through the tripartition that makes up the term coined by Tschumi, he tries to demonstrate that architecture demands a complex reading. Space cannot be just space, it has to be read together, and especially over time. The objective of this tripartite way is to introduce in architecture “the order of experience, the order of time - movements, intervals, sequences - since everything inevitably intervenes in reading” (TSCHUMI, 1994 apud SOLFA, 2008, pg. 11).

For the analysis of this perception to be carried out, the first stage elaborated was the composition of the research universe. Given the countless possibilities and projects available, the established focus focused on three electronic portals that are world references in the search for architectural projects. In chronological order the portals are:

1. DesignBoom _ Founded in 1999 in Milan, Italy by Birgit Lohmann and Massimo Mini, it is considered the 1st digital magazine of architecture and design in the world. It currently has over 45,000 articles online and has offices in Milan (ITA), New York (USA), and Beijing (CHN).¹

2. ArchDaily _ Founded in 2008 in Chile by David Basulto and David Assael, currently, about 190 million pages are viewed per month and receives around 13.6 million visits from architects from all over the world. In addition to the global platform, it currently has three regional platforms in Spanish, Portuguese, and Chinese.²

3. Architizer _ Founded in 2009 as a result of the 2008 financial crisis by businessman Marc Kushner and his partner Matthias Hollwich, the platform was intended to help architects promote their firms and their projects. The site is based in New York, the same city where it was founded, and currently has 65,000 projects, 335,000 architects, and 25,000 firms. In 2013, they created the A + Awards intending to increase the visibility of architecture in the global scope.³

The sites were chosen due to their reach and function of representing and presenting what makes up the architects’ imaginary and what is being designed and built, both conceptually and commercially today. The search was carried out on the three sites using the search tools provided by them and the search term was a ramp in the original languages of the portals. From the results, some criteria for selecting projects were analyzed. First, it should be a project built or under construction, it should be later than the year 1945 due to the changes and revisions that modern principles underwent after that year and to have the ramp as a prominent element. Preferably, projects were chosen that featured the ramp in the photos and not just in the plan, thus demonstrating its importance. Because of the filters imposed by the research, a universe composed of 100 works of different uses was obtained, as can be seen in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Foundation/Museum</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Service</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Hall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Repartition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Author, 2019.

The total dominance of the first place by projects that are Cultural Foundation or Museums was not a surprise. As they deal with a large public, the researcher predicted the need to use the ramp related to accessibility issues. Surprisingly, residences occupied second place with 18% of the works surpassing works with uses such as commerce and services. The residences, as they are private projects, are not obliged to adopt any type of accessibility regulations, therefore, the ramps identified have a great compositional role in the spatiality of the construction.

In terms of geography, the works have some concentrations that were already expected by the author. Due to the origin of the portals and the languages in which they publish, there was coverage of 36 countries, some of them with higher concentrations, as can be seen in figure 2.

Figure 2: World map with geographically referenced works

Concentrations in Europe and Brazil were expected due to the languages in which the sites publish and, as well as, the cultural issues that Europe and the United States of America have, but mainly Europe, as the emitter of the pattern lived and consumed in the rest of the world. The high number of productions identified in Southeast Asia was also expected, perhaps not in such large numbers, but it was known that some copies would appear. High technology and a strong economy make this region suitable for the production of daring and challenging projects.

It was also analyzed whether there was a predominance of any architect or office in the authorship of the selected projects. Those that have more than one occurrence in the list are identified in the table below, also related to the number of countries in which they are
working and to the variety of types of works. In this way, one can analyze the behavior regarding the performance of architects, whether local or international.

The number of architects/offices shows that the Coop Himmelb(l)au office founded in 1968 by the Viennese architect Wolf D. Prix contributes to the universe of research with four works in four countries. The office in question has its headquarters in Vienna (AUS) and branches in Los Angeles (USA), London (GBR), and Melbourne (AUS). Then the Foster + Partners office, headed by the English architect Norman Foster, was founded in London in 1967. Currently, in addition to the London headquarters, the office has branches in Abu Dhabi (UAE), Bangkok (THA), Beijing (CHN), Buenos Aires (ARG), Dubai (UAE), Hong Kong (HKG), Madrid (ESP), New York (USA), San Francisco (USA), Shanghai (CHN), Singapore (SGP) and Sydney (AUS). The internationalization of these offices considerably covers their area of expertise.

Thirdly, we have the Swiss architect Charles-Edouard Jeanneret-Gris better known as Le Corbusier, one of the biggest names in the history of modern architecture. Its impact on theories, aesthetics, and new debates that involved way of life, new structures of society, new architectural and urban demands. Le Corbusier, despite being temporarily displaced from the first two places, is the author of two works that make up the research are located in three different countries demonstrating its importance and relevance at a time when there was no digital media or advertising means that made it possible greater reach of these professionals. Le Corbusier had his first project in 1905 and his last project was in 1961 and it is the Carpenter Center for the Visual Arts make up the structure of Harvard University in the USA, which make up the universe of this research. The least internationalized is the Brazilian architect Vilanova Artigas, his two projects on the list are in Brazil, one in São Paulo (SP) and the other and Curitiba (PR).

**Table 2: Predominance of architects/offices and performance concerning location and typology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architects/Offices</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Álvaro Siza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portugal and Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Himmelb(l)au</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>USA, China, France and South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster+Partners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>China, Italy, and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMP Architekten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vietnam and Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Corbusier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA, Japan and Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>France and USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo Mendes da Rocha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brazil and Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Meier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snøhetta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Norway and England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Holl Architects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA and Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio MK27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brasil and USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilanova Artigas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Author, 2019.
Another analysis that was made before the universe composed of the searches was the question related to time. Locating in time the architectural production selected to constitute the research is important to be able to analyze influences, demands, social issues, constructive techniques, public policies, design practices, plastic and stylistic trends, composition criteria, and architectural trends that are being launched or that continue to be followed. For this purpose, the following timeline was elaborated by the author:

![Timeline](image)

Source: Prepared by the Author, 2019.

Obviously, with the advent of technology and the change in the way of spreading information and advertising, there is a very large concentration from the year 2001 (emphasis in cyan) where there is a considerable increase in the number of projects that were selected by the sites and that ended for meeting all the requirements to compose the research universe.

Even though the sites were launched from the end of the 1990s, the projects selected to compose this research date back to 1953 (Eduardo Reidy's MAM in Rio de Janeiro and Le Corbusier's Curutchet House in La Plata, Argentina) projects until the year 2019. It was observed that there is no work registered between the years 1981 and 1990, the year with the highest occurrences in the year 2015.

After the analysis of these aspects that can be considered bureaucratic, it was still necessary to identify if the projects influenced themselves, that is, if there was any similarity between the works or the identification of compositional patterns in order, if possible, to be able to elaborate typologies from of the assembled universe. Thus, it was decided to compose an atlas through the methodology established by the German historian Aby Warburg, the iconological method.

Aby Warburg was beyond his time, he was the founder and creator of Atlas Mnemosyne, a visual way to present his thesis of visual approximation. He gave up the fortune he was entitled to because he was the firstborn of the family to be paid as a scholar of history.
He immersed himself in the world of history and set up a Kulturwissenschaftkiche Bilbiothek library in his home, which, in the year of his death, had more than 70 thousand volumes (CAMILO, 2019).

The library of his property he ordered “not according to the alphabetical or arithmetic criteria used in large libraries, but according to his interests and his system of thought, to the point of changing the order each change in his research methods” (CAMILO, 2019, p. 54). His fascination with Renaissance art led Aby to study art history in Bonn, Munich, Florence, and Strasbourg. Receiving various influences from great thinkers and prominent figures in the German scene, he used his family’s fortune to fund his studies and in his multidisciplinary investigation of his passion, art history.

In the method adopted by Warburg, it is perceived a “[...] refusal of the stylistic-formal method dominant in art history at the end of the 19th century and with a shift from the focus of investigating the history of styles and aesthetic evaluation to the pragmatic aspects and iconographic works of art” (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 112 apud CAMILO, 2019, p. 58).

Warburg’s criticism as a historian led the field of art history to open its limits to other fields such as anthropology, social psychology, philosophy, among others ”because it is through this interdisciplinarity that archaeology of knowledge is built.” (CAMILO, 2019, p. 60).

Didi-Huberman (2013 apud CAMILO, 2019) classifies the Atlas Mnemosyne elaborated by Warburg as an experimental protocol that starts from a set of images and fragments of graphic materials such as prints, photographs, artistic works, frescoes, newspaper clippings of which from the approximation they were organized in a non-linear way of reading, but that dialogued with each other and with the other images.

With Warburg’s methodology in mind, an atlas was built with the images of the ramps of the 100 selected works. For (CAMILO, 2019, p. 75) “the construction of the atlas allowed Warburg to discover that through its deconstruction, through its dissociation, a susceptible way of analysis would arise to reassemble and reread history” and it is with this intention that the atlas was assembled. To elaborate this iconographic tool, all 100 photos were printed and the atlas was initially assembled in an “analog” way so that it could be photographed and, if there were changes in the positioning of the images, a new photo would be taken to follow the evolution. The atlas remained that way for a week and changed almost daily. It is important to highlight that there was no initial image, the photos were gathered based on the similarities that the ramps presented and then the collage on the wall started. After a week it was decided to make the digital version of it.
It is possible to notice some nuclei where there is a concentration of a strong character on the ramps in the area. The influence of work and the similarity between geographic, typological, and temporarily distinct projects demonstrate the great impact of the project that initiates this plastic trend. The most striking example of this influence is the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museums by the American architect Frank Lloyd Wright located in New York (USA), opened in October 1959, it ends up echoing its shape in projects such as the Reichstag by Norman Foster (1992 - Berlin, Germany), the Mercedes Benz museum at Um Studio (2001 - Stuttgart, Germany), the Broken House by KWK Architects (2002 - Katowice, Poland), the Seattle Public Library at OMA + LMN offices (2004 - Seattle, United States of America), Cocoon HQ from the Camenzind Evolution office (2007 - Zurich, Switzerland) among some others coming to projects like the Innovation and Experience Hub of the HCD office (2018 - Hangzhou, China).

The atlas allows an aesthetic and global analysis of the scope established in the research. However, an approximation of this analysis was necessary so that it was possible to generate typologies so that a new, even closer analysis was feasible. Considering that “the theory of modern architecture rejected all historical forms of architecture” (COLQUHOUN, 2013, p. 281) creating typologies from a set of modern and postmodern works was an undertaking that would not be simple. If Rossi (2001, p. 25) thinks “the concept of type as something permanent and complex, a logical statement that is before form and that
constitutes it” it is up to us to understand this previous statement of form and how it constitutes form. For this purpose, four axes of analysis were established regarding the characteristics of the ramps in the projects: internal x external, program x circulation, topography/shape x sculpture, and plastic suit x space itself. In this way, it was possible to start investigating the features of the projects. Due to the size of the article, the figures for the four axes of analysis were suppressed.

The simplest of axes defines whether the ramp is located inside or outside the project. The predominance of examples with internal ramps is very clear, since it is an element in the circulation repertoire, it ends up being a way of influencing the building. Francis D. K. Ching states that

“The nature of the configuration of a road influences the organizational pattern of the spaces it connects at the same time as it is influenced by them. The configuration of a road can reinforce a spatial organization by creating a parallel pattern. Or, its configuration can contrast with the form of a spatial organization creating a parallel pattern” (CHING, 2013, p. 264)

Because of Ching’s statement, the importance of the location of the road, in this case of the ramp, impacts the organizational form of the project and, consequently, the users’ experience.

Some specimens were placed on the line that separates the two categories because either the ramp passed between the two poles or it was internal (it had the four surfaces - two walls, floor, and floor) but in the project, it was located outside, as the case of Casa Rampa (2002) from Marcos Bertoldi Arquitetos located in Curitiba (PR) and the Iberê Camargo Foundation (2008) by Portuguese architect Álvaro Siza located in Porto Alegre (RS).

It is important to highlight that the projects that fall under the line that separates the categories range from the Carpenter Center for the Visual Art by the Swiss architect Le Corbusier, which dates back to 1959, including projects such as the Osaka Pavilion by the architect Paulo Mendes da Rocha do 1970 and Casa Rampa of 2002, reaching projects such as Mediathek from Laboratory of Architecture # 3 in 2017 and Boxen at Arkdes from Dehlin Brattgård Arkitekter, which is from 2018. It is clear that there is no predominance and that this blending was done at different times in buildings with different uses.

In the second axis of analysis, the difference in the number of projects that were classified under program and circulation is striking. Most remain in circulation, with a few projects being program only. The ramp is part of the repertoire of elements that produce and allow the circulation of people vertically. Ching’s statement (2013, p.290) states that “since going up or down a staircase is a three-dimensional experience, we can say that stairs are three-dimensional components of a building, this characteristic can be explored when we treat the staircase as a sculpture, leaving it loose in a space or connected to a wall plane “can have the term” staircase “replaced by” ramp “without losing its value or meaning.

Ching also states that in the composition of the space “the nature of the configuration of a road influences the organizational pattern of the spaces it connects at the same time as it is influenced by them. The configuration of a road can reinforce a spatial organization by creating a parallel pattern. Or, its configuration can contrast with the form of a spatial organization creating a parallel pattern ”(CHING, 2013, p. 264). Taking into account
what Ching said about the use of the ramp as a program, the refinement necessary for this is clear. Not all programs can comply with this formal decision.

Again, the greatest interest is in the projects that were on the line that separates the two ends of the axis. In the six cases that are in this position, the ramp can mix the program, or part of it, and the circulation. In some cases, there is a symmetry in what each aspect represents, in other cases, there is a greater dominance on one side or the other. The Oslo Opera and Ballet (2007 - Oslo, Norway) of the Snøhetta office mixes circulation with a program by allowing its passers-by to use the roof as a circulation for what would be a lookout and at the same time use it as an audience for outdoor performances. The library of the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Campania (2007 - Aversa, Italy) by the Italian architect Cherubino Gambardella combines the issue of circulation with the collection of a library, thus merging two uses that the first-hand does not seem to be prone to the association. This combination was also made by the OMA office at the Seattle Public Library (2004 - Seattle, United States of America).

The Center for Dramatic Arts in Santa Cruz do Tenerife (2011, Spain) of the GPY Arquitectos office reconciles the issue of circulation and a stage for school performances. Still analyzing the projects that are on the dividing line of this axis, the oldest is the Oslo Opera and Ballet of 2007 together with the Library of the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Campania of the same year, followed by three contemplation projects being Selvika 2012 (Reiulf Ramstad Architects - Finnmark, Norway), the 2015 Sky Walk (Fránek Architects - Dohní Morava, Czech Republic) and the 2019 Camp Adventure Observation Tower (Effekt - Haslev, Denmark). It is noticed that they are not so old projects and that there is an interval of five years before the new wave of projects that cover these two aspects begins. The predominance of use in these projects that are in the middle of this axis is for contemplative use.

The third axis has at one end the ramp as a plastic suit and at the other end the ramp as space itself. In this regard, the predominance is under the classification as the plastic fact. The ramp, like the ladder, can be used in a monumental, sculptural, central way, and in many projects collected for research this is exactly what happens, the ramp has a very strong plastic and aesthetic appeal. At the other end, the ramp as space itself, are the projects that could not be the way they are or would not have the same shape and composition if the ramp did not exist. The projects that are under this classification use the ramp as a space maintainer, it ends up becoming the floor, ceiling, and delimiting the space and emptiness of the building.

The projects that occupy the division of the categories coincide with some of those that occupied the same space in the previous category - The library of the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Campania (2007 - Aversa, Italy) by the Italian architect Cherubino Gambardella and the Center for Dramatic Arts in Santa Cruz do Tenerife (2011, Spain) from GPY Arquitectos. In both cases, the ramp is indeed a plastic fact, something that influences the aesthetics of the space and the stylistic composition and at the same time is a fundamental element in the generation of space, even if it is in the transformed version as in the case of the performing arts center the ramp becomes a stage/scenery. Unlike the previous axis here, the project of the Museum of Image and Sound of Rio de Janeiro (2009, Diller Scofidio + Renfro - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) is still under construction, the facade has its facade
defined by the ramps that connect the floors in an attempt to imitate the waves of the Copacabana boardwalk, the beach on which the project is located.

Temporally analyzing the projects of the dividing line we have the oldest the Museum of Image and Sound of Rio de Janeiro 2009 (Diller Scofidio + Renfro - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) followed by the Center for Dramatic Arts 2011 (GPY Arquitectos - Santa Cruz do Tenerife, Spain) and finally the three contemplation projects: Selvika 2012 (Reiulf Ramstad Architects - Finnmark, Norway), Sky Walk 2015 (Fránek Architects - Dohní Morava, Czech Republic) and Camp Adventure Observation Tower 2019 (Effekt - Haslev, Denmark). In this axis, it is possible to notice that the interval between the projects exists, but it is a little smaller than those of the projects of the previous axis. Again, just like the previous axis, the predominant use of works that were allocated in the middle of this axis is contemplative.

The last axis of analysis proposed polarizes the question of the ramp as a topography/shape and the ramp as a sculpture. The ramp is capable of generating and modifying a place and, according to Montaner (2001, p. 32) “place is defined by nouns, by the qualities of things and elements, by symbolic and historical values; it is environmental and is phenomenologically related to the human body”. The ramp as a topography elevates the body in space allowing for a capable vertical and horizontal displacement and providing the passerby with a much richer understanding of the place. While the ramp as a sculpture becomes the focus of attention due to its plastic, stylistic and constructive aspects.

The projects that are under the line that separates the ends of the axes are the three contemplative projects; Selvika 2012 (Reiulf Ramstad Architects - Finnmark, Norway), the 2015 Sky Walk (Fránek Architects - Dohní Morava, Czech Republic) and the 2019 Camp Adventure Observation Tower (Effekt - Haslev, Denmark) and the Center for Dramatic Arts in 2011 (GPY Arquitectos - Santa Cruz do Tenerife, Spain).

After all these analyzes, the issue of typology began to be debated taking into account all the data collected and the analyzed criteria. For an analysis with great potential, it was proposed to choose works that appeared under the line that divided the axes of analysis or projects that were close to it. This proximity means that the project contains aspects of the two poles of the axis making it richer and more complex. So far there have been only two selected works: The Oslo Opera and Ballet (2007 - Oslo, Norway) from the Snøhetta office and the Center for Dramatic Arts 2011 (GPY Arquitectos - Santa Cruz do Tenerife, Spain).

The Oslo Opera and Ballet is by the Norwegian firm Snøhetta. The Norwegian word that gives the office its name means “a place where no one is, but everyone can go”. The firm started its first project in 1989 which was the project for the new Alexandria Library located in Egypt. The office currently has more than 240 employees and is present in 32 countries.

The Center for Dramatic Arts is authored by the duo of architects that make up the GPY Arquitectos formed by Juan Antônio Gonzáles Péres and Urbanos Yanes Tuña. Both graduated in the 1990s in architecture from the University of Las Palmas in Grand Canaria, where Juan has been teaching since 1993 and Urano taught between 2003 and 2007.

It is hoped that with a greater purification of the data, future readings, and further analysis of the assembled universe, one or two more projects can be chosen that can add aspects to the discussion proposed by the research.
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