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“The relationship between linguistics and form in Peter Eisenman’s Cubic House (III): generative structures for an endless architectural discourse.”
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This paper deals with the linguistic idea Peter Eisenman and his studio based themselves on when they set out planning their first house in the “numbers” series. Based on Chomsky’s linguistic theories – that grammar was an innate quality of humans, it was universal and generative – they imagined a house which could “speak”, so to say, to its inhabitants. In the introduction, we are reviewing the existing literature on the topic with the due reference to Chomsky’s principles and how the two interacted in the first house the Eisenman studio built. In the first paragraph we are going to examine some interesting structural examples from house III, namely, the living room pillar, its peculiar windows, and the distinctive 45-degree rotation between its two bodies. Criticism from the house’s neighbours, about the actual unlivability of the building and on the enormous cost for building it, is included and discussed. In the conclusions, we are going to explore the heritage this building series left in the following years and we state our opinions on the opportunity of having two so distant domains of knowledge (linguistics and architecture) dialogue and if this dialogue is fruitful.