

HOUSE PARALLAX: THE PLACE-OF-THE-BEING AND THE BEING-OF-THE-PLACE

*PARALAXE DA CASA:
O LUGAR-DO-SER E O SER-DO-LUGAR*

Jahan Natanael Domingos LOPES
Unicamp
E-mail: jahan_natanael@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

For an ontological view of the house, the sense of parallax (method) is woven as a plumb line for its phenomenology. In this, the house, as a place, admits the Aristotelian dialectic: the place-of-the-being (towards constituting) and the being-of-the-place (towards constructing). Thus, the weave of concepts intertwined with the senses of the house is guided: dwelling (the place-of-the-being) and residing (the being-of-the-place), at the extremes of dwelling without residing (inhabiting) and residing without dwelling (sheltering). Thus, placeness is situated between the economic and political parallaxes, opening up to the scientific parallax. Therefore, in the view of geographic parallax, the historical-philosophical narrative of the house weaves its being: housity.

KEYWORDS:

Geographic thinking. Social geography. Ontology. Economy. Politics.

RESUMO

Para uma visão ontológica da casa, tece-se o sentido da paralaxe (método) como prumo para sua fenomenologia. Nisso, a casa, enquanto lugar, admite a dialética aristotélica: o lugar-do-ser (rumo ao constituir) e o ser-do-lugar (rumo ao construir). Desse modo, guia-se a trama dos conceitos entrelaçados aos sentidos da casa: o morar (lugar-do-ser) e o residir (ser-do-lugar), aos extremos do morar sem residir (habitar) e o residir sem morar (abrigar). Assim, situa-se a lugaridade entre as paralaxes econômica e política em abertura da paralaxe científica. Dessarte, à visão da paralaxe geográfica, entreteceu-se, com a história-filosófica da casa, seu ser: a casidade.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Pensamento geográfico. Geografia social. Ontologia. Economia. Política.

Introduction

[...] would someone establish being the place as a cause for beings? None of the four causes corresponds to it, for it is neither the material of beings (nothing is constituted from it), nor the form (eídos) and definition (lógos) of things, nor the end, nor does it move beings.

(Aristóteles, 2011, p. 88, free translation)

Once upon a time, there were the three little pigs. As they left their mother's house, each of them earned enough money to build their own residences. The first one built a house of straw, the second one built a house of wood, and the eldest brother, the third one, built a house of bricks. Thus, it is understood that: “The houses that the three little pigs build are symbolic of the progress of mankind in history: from a clumsy hut to a wooden house, finally to a brick house.” (BETTELHEIM, 1980, p. 43, free translation). Development is conceived through the construction of the houses, both for the pigs in terms of their ages and their intelligence for construction, from the youngest to the oldest: the first one, the most idealistic; the second one, the most romantic; and the third one, the most materialistic.

Furthermore, this story, whose earliest editions can be dated back to the 18th century, was originally transmitted through the tradition of orality (GUADAGNIN, 2017). Moreover, it is a fairy tale conceived with a moral, that is, a fable, estimating that hard work is more advantageous than lazy work. On the other hand, psychoanalytic concepts are intertwined through the structuring of the psyche: “Internally, the actions of the little pigs show the progress of the personality dominated by the id towards the personality influenced by the superego, but essentially controlled by the ego.” (BETTELHEIM, 1980, p. 43, free translation). The house carries the meaning of the work assigned to it, becoming more secure through dedicated effort. However, when the hungry wolf visits, the first pigs are eliminated – either because they change or because they are devoured – leaving only the third one.

A distinction is made, therefore, between the perspectives of the house tied to both the place of an idea and the idea of a place. Through *The Three Little Pigs*, whose most famous version is by Australian Joseph Jacobs, written in 1890 in his book *English Fairy Tales*, the wickedness of the wolf is irreverent towards the house built for pleasure, as opposed to the house built with reason (JACOBS, 1890). Another more playful version is the 1933 film directed by Burton Gillett from Disney: “In the Disney animation of this tale, there is an interesting provocation towards the figure of the wolf, as the pigs are given a soundtrack where they defiantly sing, ‘Who's afraid of the big bad wolf, big bad wolf, big bad wolf?’” (CORSO; CORSO, 2006, p. 57, free translation). In this case, with each visit of the wolf, the pig from the straw house goes to the wooden house, and then both go to the brick house; while in the book

version, the initial pigs are successively eaten. Thus, there is individual evolution in the literary work, whereas in the cinematic version, there is collective evolution.

Both versions, the book and the film, are tied to two possible parallel thoughts: the first one emphasizes the development of individual stories, while the second one highlights the development of human history. The house carries existential meanings and is even correlated with the temporalities of individuals or collectives. This is stated according to K. Marx (2022, p. 135-136, author's emphasis, free translation): “Human beings return to *the cave dwelling*, but in a estranged, hostile form. The savage, in their cave – that candid element of nature, offering itself for enjoyment and protection – does not feel strange or, rather, feels at home like a *fish* in water.” From this, it is urgent to understand the history of the house as a place, returning to the very cave-like nature before existential workmanship – whether it be straw, wood, or stone.

This reasoning revisits, amidst the discussion of first and second nature, the Greco-Classical thought of place. Specifically, it follows Aristóteles's dilemma (2011, p. 89, free translation): “Place seems to be a container like a vessel (for a vessel is a portable place). And the vessel is nothing of the thing (contained). On the one hand, as separable from the thing, it is not the form; on the other hand, as what contains the thing, it is different from matter.” From this, the distinction between the being of place and the place of being can be perceived, at two extremes. Both the thing that exists in space, granting its reason for being, and the space that allows the thing its reason for existence are directions of reasoning designated in the Aristotelian conception. In this conjunction, it is understood as “how Aristotle circumscribed place with a dialectical definition” (BERGSON, 2013, p. 91, free translation). Therefore, this work is oriented towards the view of extremes: there is a diametrical opposition between two limit experiences stemming from the conceptualization of place.

The place, for a plausible logical understanding, is linked to two distinct and correlated concepts in a dialectical relationship: *τόπος* and *χώρα*. M. Heidegger (2009, p. 50, free translation) further elaborates on this, stating: “Aristotle names what we call space with two different words: *τόπος* and *χώρα*. *τόπος* is the space immediately occupied by a body. [...] The space occupied by a body, *τόπος*, is its place.”¹ According to the same author, it is envisioned that: “In contrast to *τόπος*, *χώρα* designates the space in such a way that it can receive (*δέχεσθαι*) such a place and surround it, contain it (*περιέχω*). That is why *χώρα*

¹ Free translation of: “*Aristote nomme ce que nous appelons espace avec deux mots différents: τόπος et χώρα. τόπος est l'espace qu'un corps occupe immédiatement. [...] L'espace occupé par un corps, τόπος, est son lieu.*”

is a *δεκτικόν* (receptacle) and a *περιέχον* (constituent).² (HEIDEGGER, 2009, p. 50, free translation). Consequently, we shall refer to the place-of-the-being (*τόπος*) as the place of the thing and being-of-the-place (*χώρα*) as the thing of the place. Here, the specific thing to be discussed is the house.

With this course, the discussion is centralized on the contemplation of the parallax of the house. Parallax is derived from the Greek word *παράλλαξις* (*parallaxis*), which means alteration. It is, strictly speaking, the effect of the “apparent displacement of an object (change in its position relative to the background) caused by the change in the observation point that allows for a new line of sight” (FONSECA, 2019, p. 77, free translation). This notion, originating from physics, allows for a philosophical reworking, spiraling into other interpretive possibilities. The parallelism of parallax is present in the sense of place that mediates extremes of opposing divergences. Thus, the sense of place (thing-space and space-thing) is situated within the hermeneutic fabric of existence (ontological) that perceives the being (ontic) of its surroundings based on the differentiability of its geography.

First and foremost, there is the *ontological difference* as the greatest of parallaxes, which conditions our access to reality. Then there is the *scientific parallax*, the irreducible gap between the phenomenal experience of reality and its scientific description/explanation, which reaches its apex in cognitivism with its effort to offer a neurobiological description in the “third person” of our experience in the “first person”. Lastly, but no less important, there is the *political parallax*, the social antagonism that leaves no common ground between conflicting agents (formerly known as “class struggle”) (ŽIŽEK, 2008, p. 18, author's emphasis, free translation).

Finally, we turn to the culmination of the discussion, the parallax of the place of the house and the house of the place. In this guided journey, the house is understood both as the open dwelling (place-of-the-being) and as the residence (being-of-the-place). This distinction pertains to the senses to be imbued in these extremes. There is also the sense of dwelling without residing (inhabiting) and the sense of residing without dwelling (sheltering). These relationships provide an interconnection that leads to the phenomenology of the house as the place. Thus, we will explore the parallax through the ontological, the scientific, and the political: “This triad, of course, is that of the Universal-Particular-Singular: universal philosophy, particular science, the singularity of the political.” (ŽIŽEK, 2008, p. 18, free translation). The geographical parallax corresponds to the sense of the house in its diverse possibilities of vision, here, based on the ontological difference according to the dialectic of place. Through this, we envision weaving together the concepts of the house – the doubles: dwelling and residence; or the opposites: inhabiting and sheltering – through the notions inferred by the parallax.

² Free translation of: “*Par contraste avec τόπος, χώρα désigne l'espace pour autant qu'il peut accueillir (δέχεσθαι) un tel lieu et l'entourer, le contenir (περιέχω). C'est pourquoi χώρα est un δεκτικόν et un περιέχον (un réceptacle et un contenant).*”

In this way, we will delve into the house in the context of the parallax (method) and the trajectory of the phenomenology-dialectic of its concepts. The house as a place is a phenomenon that emerges through the dialectic between the being-of-the-place (in the process of construction) and the place-of-the-being (in the process of constitution). Following this sequence, we will discuss the house in light of its existential richness in two sections: firstly, the house shaped by the political (and economic) parallax, and secondly, the house constructed through the scientific parallax, both guided by a historical-philosophical perspective. Moreover, these sections will open up a historical discussion that further intertwines the individual (through constitution) and then the social (through construction). Ultimately, we will explore the essence of the house as a place: its “housity”.

Place-of-the-being: parallax of the constituted house

*The Props assist the House
 Until the House is built
 And then the Props withdraw
 And adequate, erect,
 The House support itself
 And cease to recollect
 The Anger and the Carpenter – Just such a retrospect
 Hath the perfected Life – A past of Plank and Nail
 And slowness – then the Scaffolds drop
 Affirming it a Soul.³*

(Dickinson, 2007, p. 21)

Discussing the house is a modern theme in geography. In an almost poetic manner, the house as a nest opens up a discussion about its naturalness, according to P. La Blache (1954, p. 215, free translation): “Man, since he felt the need to settle, made his nest with the materials at his disposal and was influenced by them. It is accurate to say, especially in this regard, that matter dictates form.” Regarding the perspective of house construction, in sets and arrangements, it is also a unit of the city, reconstituting the natural environment, approaching the configuring geographical consciousness. In another way, the geographer emphasizes: “Isn't the house, in all countries, one of the faithful signs of the mentality of the one who inhabits it?” (LA BLACHE, 1954, p. 238, free translation). Thus, it reveals both the relationship of construction and constitution, uniting the body and the mind, in a density that elevates the house to physical and metaphysical senses.

It is within this context that the question of the psyche corresponds to the reflection already made about the three little pigs. The house in its materiality, prevailing in form, is dominated by bricks: “The conquest of stone over wood has progressed alongside the advances of civilization.” (LA BLACHE,

³ Free translation according to L. Gonçalves (2010, p. 27) from the following original excerpt.

1954, p. 235, free translation). This thought acknowledges an evolution of materials, although the means open up a discussion about the best techniques. The form arises from the available material, but the circulation of materials across the globe reconfigures both materials and forms, driving global planetarization. With that in mind, the fabric of the economy is unfolded, whose etymology derives from *οικονομία*, combining *οἶκος*, meaning house, with *νόμος*, meaning to manage or administer. Therefore, the house is a fundamental concept of eco-nomy. Furthermore, determinism is broken through exchanges, and as a result, the house becomes the materiality of circulation progress and, in parallax, validates the differential vision of classes according to their power of consumption.

According to etymology, there is an inherent ontological path of the house in its parallax. That is to say, the first to shape the economy through the house is Xenofonte (1999), a Socratic philosopher who lived in the 4th century BC, in his book *Economics*. Thus, in relation to the political parallax of the house, a distinction is immediately recognized – through the internal and the external – between masculine and feminine genders: “Since both the tasks inside and outside the house require work and care, from the beginning, in my opinion, the god prepared their nature, that of the woman for the tasks and cares inside, and that of the man for the tasks and cares outside the house.” (XENOFONTE, 1999, p. 18, emphasis added, free translation). Between the inside and the outside of the house, there is a shift in power, and the functions, strictly according to the philosopher, are attributed and viewed based on sex, the true divider of their domains of administration.

These parallax views of the house, both in terms of region and gender, confer to the place its location on the planet and its power difference between the inside and the outside. Regarding gender, from the house originates the concept of *house-ment* (*casa-mento* in portuguese), wherein, within the aggressive and unequal framework of the patriarchal system: “women are burdened with the practically exclusive responsibility for offspring and the household, thereby automatically reducing their chances of developing other potentialities they possess.” (SAFFIOTTI, 1987, p. 14, free translation). The male parallax confronts the female parallax, and in this perspective, the internalization of the house as a feminine obligation is advocated, often resulting in a situation where women reside more than they truly live, leading to a critical situation. In the Brazilian context, the definition of domestic violence is provided by Law n° 11.340 (BRASIL, 2006, p. 1), commonly known as the Maria da Penha Law: “Art. 5° – For the purposes of this Law, domestic and family violence against women is understood as any action or omission based on gender that causes death, injury, physical, sexual or psychological suffering, as well as moral or patrimonial damage.” Consequently, within marriage, the institution of matrimony can be juxtaposed with the situation of violence, portraying the house as a prison for women.

From the economic parallax, one can infer the political parallax, as they are intertwined. In a phenomenological essence, the economy unfolds through the house and subsequently adjusts the

dynamics of power. Thus, two conceptions of the city emerge in relation to the house within this interregnum: “the *polítes* [Πολίτης] who is dedicated to the great affairs of the community, in order to learn the virtue of the *idiótes* [Ἰδιώτης], the one who occupies themselves with their own things, their house, their family, their heritage.” (BRANDÃO, 1998/1999, p. 222, free translation). The citizen and the idiots are juxtaposed based on the parallax, representing collective and individual thinking, respectively. The house, in its manifestation of power – beyond the discussion of gender – finds its territorial insertion, and the responsibility falls on the call of the State and the community. Therefore: “As we can see, the house is a reflection of the city, and the economic is parallel to the political” (BRANDÃO, 1998/1999, p. 225, free translation). The possibility of individual thought does not separate the house from its social significance; moreover, it is the intertwining of all issues related to the right and dignity of shelter and habitation.

For the understanding of the meaning of the house, there is, therefore, the radiation of concepts that interweave the possibilities of parallax. Thus, the world opens up through the house in a political configuration: “A good house to live in and a better world to live in are two complementary yearnings in the composition of the framework of human values.” (GONÇALVES, 2010, p. 11, free translation). The house of the citizen and the house of the idiots do not dialectize each other, in truth, they are juxtaposed, given that the house allows for insistence on both individuality and sociability: it is the social space of encounter with oneself and with others. In the house, one can be an idiot in the publicity of the world. That is to say, it is acknowledged that “the house is our corner of the world. It is, as often said, our first universe. It is a true cosmos.” (BACHELARD, 2008, p. 24, free translation). This is the virtue of the idiots, to be able to refuse sociability, to choose oneself in one's surroundings, taking into account a house to live in, because a house that only serves as shelter is insufficient, much like a prison.

In the discussion about imprisonment, a specific contention arises regarding a strict sense of the house. This case is further intensified by briefly examining the Panopticon – a circular prison with the central watchtower allowing guards to have a view of all the prisoners in a system of surveillance that disorients the prisoners from knowing when they are being watched – as discussed by Jeremy Bentham, drawing on M. Foucault (2014, p. 196, free translation), who argues: “The weight of the old ‘houses of security’, with their fortress-like architecture, is replaced by the simple and economical geometry of a ‘house of certainty’.” From this viewpoint, the prison shifts its focus from social protection to social indoctrination: it becomes a catechism for the citizen, compelling them to relinquish even the possibility of being an idiot in their own house. Without delving further into the genealogy of power, the intention here is simply to identify the prison as a house of citizen discipline, grounded in surveillance, within a political parallax of utmost power control.

Moreover, the question of political parallax arises, encompassing the issue of the house, particularly from the perspective of the individual's social potential to exist. It concerns the conception

of differentiation within political spaces: “For the individual ‘self’, this world is the home; for the collective ‘self’, it is a public environment such as a temple, a municipal space, or a civic center.” (TUAN, 2013, p. 203, free translation). In this sense, the two modes of being, the egocentric formation of the self (individual) and the consideration of others (collective), intertwine. The geographical understanding of the house enables the aggregation of existence in an individual-collective manner within the same place. The being-of-the-place, an infinite opening, is ontologically contradictory in itself, encompassing both being and non-being as integral possibilities, diverging from the being-of-the-place already conditioned by the entity that contemplates the reality of scrutiny.

In the conceptual distinction of the house and its diverse experiences, we now delve into the observed parallaxes of the resident and the dweller. In order to further comprehend the tension, the following difference is noted: “The observer who explores the place speaks of the house, while the resident of that place lives the process of dwelling. [...] The experience of the resident's scope of horizon can be such a fundamental movement in everyday existence that it is usually not even thought about” (BUTTIMER, 2015, p. 9, free translation). It could be said, therefore, that residing entails the life of the inhabitant, while dwelling encompasses the house of the sheltered. Residing implies dwelling, from the being-of-the-place to the being-of-the-place, while dwelling may not imply residing, as it can exist as shelter without inhabitation. Moreover, it is evident that residing can be so detached from the materiality of the house that it constitutes an extreme mode of dwelling, just as, conversely, dwelling can be so detached from the immateriality of the house that it constitutes an extreme form of sheltering. The ontic-ontological detachment is situational to the specificities of everyday experiences.

Furthermore, it is stipulated that the house as a dwelling (its constituted ideality) and as a residence (its constructed reality) confront each other at every moment in history. It is evident that the capitalist context seeks to transform the house into a problematic issue of intentions. It is conceived: “the basement dwelling of the poor is a hostile ‘dwelling, in itself, as a foreign power’ which he cannot consider as *his* homeland – where he could finally say: here I am at home – instead, he finds himself in someone else's house, in a *strange* house.” (MARX, 2022, p. 136, author's emphasis, free translation). This discussion embraces the relationship of the house to the sense of dwelling as opposed to residing: assessing the limits of a cave dweller as a dweller without a residence and the sheltered as a resident without a dwelling. Definitions linked to the ideas of the house (related to the being-of-the-place) and the materials of the house (related to the being-of-the-place) are being juxtaposed to reinforce the dialectic of housity.

In light of more recent developments, the history of houses as caves gives way to the house as a product of empires. It is important to consider the complete shift in the global sense of home with the advent of capitalism, as stated: “The domestic tasks of urban life – residential, ceremonial, governmental, and religious – gave way to the growing importance of functions for ‘empire building’, such as trade,

finance, and industry. ” (BUTTIMER, 2015, p. 15, free translation). Historically, the meaning of home transitioned from being relative to its agrarian surroundings to being a unit embedded in the city—a referential unit. The house transformed from being ruralized to being urbanized, serving the purpose of fostering imperialism and globalization: the house crossed by spoils. The interwoven concepts of “competitiveness, consumption, confusion of spirits, and globalization” (SANTOS, 2001, p. 46, free translation) are intertwined. The economy intertwines houses within a system of consumption, a class divider, correlated with the complexity of the work system, acting as a barrier of use in the world of exchanges.

In order to further explore the discussion of the house, it is necessary to address another point related to its phenomenology and geographical implications: the scientific parallax, intertwined with the economic and political parallax. The break here, for this parallax, is actually linked to the sociology of knowledge. Each scientist, shaped by their intersecting identities, whether fluid or fixed, approaches the concept of home from a particular perspective, given the profound economic and political dimensions of this phenomenon. On the other hand, within the scientific parallax, the act of painting is intertwined with the mode of observation. As stated: “The ‘way of looking’: the painter – that is, the social scientist – is conditioned not only by their class position but also by other determinants, by other social affiliations beyond non-class [...]: nationality, generation, religion, culture, gender. ” (LÖWY, 1987, p. 204, free translation). The experience of “housity” varies depending on both the person discussing the house and the person being discussed in relation to the house. This encompasses the interplay between the place of being and the being of the place, from a humble cottage to a mansion.

So far, we have traversed the concept of home through various dichotomies: man-woman, citizen-idiot, rich-poor, scientist-layperson. This exploration has encompassed ontological, economic, political, and scientific parallaxes. It becomes evident that there is no innocence in provoking the notion of home! The distinction between residing and dwelling is the tension that underlies these and other potential situations of parallax, moving and guiding the parallaxes of different circumstances. The house holds a significant role in mediating the encounter between the individual and the collective, historically reshaping modernity as the ultimate resolution of capital. The parallax between more idealistic perspectives (focused on form) and more materialistic ones (focused on matter) permeates the phenomenology of the house. Thus, we continue from this tumultuous constitution towards the construction of “housity” as the comprehensive resolution of parallax.

Being-of-the-place: parallax of the constructed house

In complete solitude, no one will decorate or clean their house: they will not do it for their own (wife and children), but only for strangers, in order to present themselves in an advantageous way.

Parallax is a phenomenological characteristic, meaning that phenomena are transformed as perception changes position. Therefore, one could say that geography is imbued in phenomenology through parallax, in a unifying coalition: geographical phenomenology. To further the discussion on the house, we turn to P. Deffontaines's work (1972) titled *L'homme et sa maison* (english translation: *Man and his house*). In this book, there is an extensive discussion of houses in their correlation between culture and nature, focusing particularly on the issue of devices: roofing, water collection, fire, mobility (regarding mobile homes), contact (between the house and the ground, caves and stilt houses), openings (air and light access), food preservation, livestock and other animals, sleep protection, and religious aspects. Chapters unfold in more or less this sequence of ideas, providing a comprehensive view of the phenomenon of the house and its interactions among a multitude of houses. The constructed house is already the being-in-place transcended by parallax.

However, there is a diversity of differences between the senses of place when it comes to discussing the house, and in this regard, languages construct multiple cultural expressions. We can consider examples such as the distinction in French between *Maison* and *Chez*, in English between House and Home, in Spanish between *Casa* and *Hogar*, and perhaps a more relevant comparison in Portuguese between *Casa* and *Lar*. Respectively, we move from the sense of being-in-place (constituted) to being-of-the-place (constructed). Etymologically, the distinction is referenced as follows: “From the Latin *casa* or *casae*, it is the common name for all buildings intended for habitation [...] From Latin *Lār*, *Lāris*, in the plural *Lāres*, the word *lar* originally means the part of the dwelling where the fire is lit.” (RODRIGUES, 2016, p. 13, free translation). Thus, the idea of being-of-the-place implies socio-sentimental, socio-intimate, and socio-emotional contemplation. Between the extremes and their interim, we can observe the materiality of the being of the house, originally derived from the ideality of the being of fire.

The sense of being-of-the-place extends from the ontological to the ontic, both through corporeality and entity. Furthermore, the house is understood in relation to the sense of protection: “It is to ensure this protection during sleep that humans were led to design a dwelling; the house, an essential marker of human geography, was the first and continues to be a shelter for sleep.”⁴ (DEFFONTAINES, 1966, p. 1055, free translation). Fire and sleep come together to provide shelter for inhabiting the shelter. The house serves as a barrier between danger and the protected, encompassing the terror of fire and the terror of sleep, making them friendly within the confines of the house compared to outside. Thus, it is relevant that “the house reveals the landscape from two analytical fronts: from the door outwards and from the door inwards.” (BRANDÃO, 2019, p. 49, free translation). Through this relationship, there is

⁴ Free translation of: “*C'est pour assurer cette protection durant son sommeil que l'homme a été amené à concevoir une habitation ; la maison, marque essentielle de la géographie humaine, a été d'abord et reste tout un abri du sommeil.*”

a being-of-the-place in contrast to non-being-of-the-place, articulating an internal dialectic within the dialectic of itself. Inside and outside are material oppositions to the immateriality of place.

The scientific parallax of the house delves into the question of method. The difference between those who are inside or outside the house is a significant confrontation, as well as those who are from within and are outside and those who are from outside and are inside, but also when the house is not here, but there or elsewhere. In terms of naming, social roles in relation to housity are distinguished: “Those ‘from within’ are people who are in the place, in the community, intimately connected to the place. Those ‘from outside’, on the other hand, are foreigners, outsiders, or migrants. ” (BUTTIMER, 2015, p. 8, N. T., free translation). It is in relation to the house as a reference point that the characteristics of the subjects are revealed. Thus, the discussion revolves around the inside as a place in contrast to the internal and external: “Speaking of ‘from within’ and ‘from outside’, place versus spatiotemporal organization, and other dualisms of this kind can reasonably serve to describe the historical record. ” (BUTTIMER, 2015, p. 8, free translation). Therefore, between occupying and invading, the dialectic of inside and outside extends the economic-political dynamics to its scientific exploration. The phenomenology of the house gains its most distinct dimension through its dialectical construction of the lived world.

In addition to the dual perspective between inside and outside, the derivation of near and far reverberates, adding further complexity to the scientific parallax. Thus, in terms of conceptualization: “What is near is what can be accessed effortlessly, what is far requires an effort and, immediately, a desire to approach. ” (DARDEL, 2011, p. 10, free translation). Scalability extends in all dimensions; one can be looking at the house horizontally from near or far, and vertically from near or far. The externality of the house imposes distance on the outside. The desire to approach is part of the process of being distant, just as the desire to move away is part of the process of being close; however, both are conditions of externality, referred to internally as claustrophobia (feeling distant) and agoraphobia (feeling close) (CARVALHO, 2023; LOPES, 2022). These dialectics allow for an expanded method of scrutinizing the house and the being-in-the-place, which may or may not be in the place, but is always in reference to it, as the orientation of the inquiry.

A discussion of both the perspectives of where one is in relation to the house and the roles assumed in relation to the house exhibit the phenomenological interconnectedness of geography with the understanding of humankind. In this regard, it is stated: “The anthropology of space would have much to discover in each house. However, it is not forbidden to highlight some types that seem essential

in the combination of their meanings.”⁵ (FRÉMONT, 1999, p. 153-154, free translation). From the constituted parallax to the constructed parallax, the geographic parallax is ultimately integrated through the entirety of both. The scientific parallax is commended, delving into the specific parallax of geography and its possibilities for understanding the essential aspects of the house in relation to the interplay between the general and the particular. The situation induces deduction for induced deduction. In other words, indeed, each house is a case, and each case is a house.

Gaining knowledge about the house comes from being in front of the house itself. That being said, the relationships are established through reference in order to discuss the configuration of place. The scientific parallax of geography is precisely the variation of positions and interpretations to conceive the possible, current, and real meanings of the house. In this regard, it is guided by the following: “Every reference is a relation, but not every relation is a reference. Every ‘showing action’ is a reference, but not every reference shows... the ‘relation’ itself, due to its general formal character, has its ontological origin in a reference” (HEIDEGGER, 2015, p. 127, free translation). Therefore, due to parallax, in accordance with the ontology of being in parallax, there is an interconnection of embodied entities. That is, there is the parallax of the observer and the parallax of the observed, there is the perceived house and the perceiving subject. Reference can be given in both cases for parallax: just as one can read the scales of the Moon from Earth and from Earth to the Moon, and in this study, both are different codifications between each other as paradox (LOPES, 2021). Circulating between observing and objecting are two methodological actions for geographic parallax, confronting and reinterpreting through the pursuit of integrated continuous and discontinuous estrangements within the synthetic-analytic framework.

Furthermore, for the discussion of the house, it is important to mention a significant text that provides the conceptual framework of the house. It can be found in M. Heidegger's (2012, p. 125, free translation) discussion titled *Building, Dwelling, Thinking* from his 1951 lecture, where he states: “On the highway, the truck driver is at home, even though it is not his residence; in the weaving shop, the weaver is at home, even though it is not her dwelling... These constructions provide shelter for human beings.” In everyday life, it is evident that sheltering and dwelling are perspectives of the house, respectively, whose meanings lie between residing and dwelling. The significant differences in meaning between dwelling and residing, and between inhabiting and sheltering, are intertwined with the method of inside and outside, and of near and far, encompassing – through the constituted – the constructed foundation of the method of geographic parallax.

⁵ Free translation of: “*L'anthropologie de l'espace aurait beaucoup à découvrir en chaque maison. Il n'est cependant pas interdire de dégager quelques types qui paraissent essentiels dans la combinaison de leurs significations.*”

There is, as always, more to consider. Through the lens of parallax, our aim in this study is to reach its topanalysis: “With the image of the house, we have a true principle of psychological integration. Descriptive psychology, depth psychology, psychoanalysis, and phenomenology could, through the house, constitute this body of doctrines that we designate under the name of topanalysis. ” (BACHELARD, 2008, p. 196, free translation). As a place of existence and coexistence, particularly of intimate connection with oneself, the house is a web of perspective-conceptual analysis of place, as well as a synthesis in parallax. The house appears as a phenomenon, but its discussion revolves around its being through perception. As a phenomenon, it is connected to economic and political parallax, and as perception, to scientific parallax.

This theoretical investiture alludes to a historical discussion to be scrutinized, considering that in the constituted parallax, modernity acts splendidly to promulgate the scientific parallax; however, the constructed parallax reserves a new historiographic linkage to the dawn of humanity. In line with archaeological science, it is stated: “Throughout the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods, communities had the dimension of a village (or transhumant group), with quantitative and qualitative implications. ” (LIVERANI, 2020, p. 108, free translation). The structure of proto-urban villages gives meaning to individual houses without their collectives, and in the urban revolution of the Bronze Age, a process of hierarchization unfolds: “The complementary relationship quickly became hierarchized, with villages structurally dependent on the city. ” (LIVERANI, 2020, p. 108, free translation). In other words, the fabric of houses is intertwined with the fabric of hierarchies, constructing the individuality of the house while transcending its collectivity. Thus, the webs of houses are intertwined with the global network, yet they precede the urban network. Therefore, the hierarchical network of contemporary globalization is the great system of interpenetration of capital ideologies through the differential veins that extend from global centers of power to the huts of the sheltered

Still within the scope of human history, there is an important distinction between rural and urban dwellings in the transition from nomadism to sedentism. In the words of I. Khaldun (1958, p. 206-207, emphasis added, free translation), it is mentioned: “Nomadism, a social state prior to urban life. [...] When the Nomad reaches a level of well-being that city *dwelling provides*, they indulge in the sweetness of living, allowing themselves to be carried away by the current of Civilization. ” Indeed, different urban fabrics depend on human interconnections within different networks, such as those between people from the plains and those from plateaus, specifically in the case of networks close to water bodies (which have always been the majority): “Alluvial valleys host most of the plantations and urban centers. However, they lack raw materials: there are no forests (wood), pastures (wool), nor metals or stones. These resources are mainly found in the mountains and plateaus” (LIVERANI, 2020, p. 50, free translation). Therefore, any notion of geographical determinism is debunked here; the exchange of materials and

forms establishes a reciprocal relationship (inequalities arise, thus paving the way for hierarchies), permeating the transition of materialities and immaterialities, generating a diversity of objects and ideas.

The geographical parallax unfolds as the fabric of houses within networks of houses, from huts to palaces, in the spatiality of houses across continuous and discontinuous regions, encompassing both small and large scales. Each house within the global fabric is both a microcosm of the world and a macrocosm of the planet, just as every house in other fabrics represents resistance, survival, and thriving. In this sense, peripheralization is observed: “People's choices reflect shared values. Others see themselves in similar conditions within the socio-technical system and, with limited home-buying potential, are forced into certain areas.” (PAHL, 1975, p. 68, free translation). Furthermore, due to the persistently glaring capitalist disparities regarding the concept of housing as material and immaterial capital, we project extreme homelessness (or rooflessness): “Other people occupy an even more restricted position within the social system to the extent that they do not even have the privilege of owning a home, and so on. Residential patterns are a reflection of the functioning of the social system.” (PAHL, 1975, p. 68, free translation). Thus, the house is acknowledged as an effective capitalist object (bridging material reality and formal ideals), and its methodological constructions pertain to the constitution of intersecting realities.

The house, ultimately, is perceived in constructed parallax through its phenomena in constituted parallax. Thus, from the place-of-the-being to the being-of-the-place, we have the house in its complementary and interpenetrating facets; the discussion revolves around being in relation to place and place in relation to being, generating geographical parallax. The house is approached through the lens of economic parallax and political parallax, encompassing the circulation necessary to weave scientific parallax. The house is a place in parallax, mediated by the parallax of place. In this sense, it intertwines with intersectionality and methodology (from constitution to construction), aiming for geographical parallax, specifically for a phenomenology of the house in the pursuit of houseness. It can be inferred, in the end, that the house in parallax is the parallax of the house.

Final considerations

In order to investigate the house as a place, its conception is approached both as a phenomenon (constituted) and, above all, as open to perception (constructed). The discussion of the house in this work is guided by the Aristotelian dialectics of place: the place-of-the-being in relation to construction and the being-of-the-place in relation to constitution. Furthermore, it combines the physical perspective with philosophical inquiry, incorporating the effect of parallax: the general change in the phenomenon through the change in the observer's position. The discussion revolves around ontological foundations between parallax and place, between economic parallax and political parallax, mutually configured towards

scientific parallax. Thus, the framework for discussing the house as a dialectical place in the context of geographical parallax is established, encompassing both constituted parallax and constructed parallax.

Throughout the work, the intertwining of concepts that permeate the house in its conception sought to confront limit situations. From the house, we encounter the extremes of the place-of-the-being (dwelling) and the being-of-the-place (residence), where dwelling without residing represents the pinnacle of inhabiting, and residing without dwelling represents the pinnacle of sheltering. Thus, four fundamental concepts are involved in situating the house, aiming to propose dwelling (form) and sheltering (matter) between dwelling (ideality) and residing (materiality). It is through this confrontation of idealism and materialism that the phenomenology of the house unfolds. In ontological parallax, the study of housity is approached both through economic parallax (between *οἶκος*, house, and *νόμος*, to manage or administer; envisioning power dynamics) and political parallax (between man-woman, citizen-idiot, rich-poor, scientist-layperson). This leads us to scientific parallax with the principle of method (between inside-outside, near-far, unity-ensemble, fabric-network). Collectively, this constitutes geographical parallax.

Thus, the ontological sense of housity is associated with the house in dialectical situations between the place-of-the-being (immateriality-material) and the being-of-the-place (materiality-material). In this perspective, the work incorporates a historical dimension of both constituted parallax (by Modernity) and constructed parallax (by Antiquity). In this sense, it first opens up to thinking from capitalism to imperialism and then from villages to cities – encompassing both huts and palaces – both offering opportunities for a parallax reading of the globalization of the planet. The house is not innocent; therefore, a critical reading is essential for understanding geographical parallax, especially regarding this object-idea/idea-object. Between matter and form, the house circulates as the capitalist foundation of society, thus functioning as capital.

Therefore, it is expected that the understanding of the house is better observed, especially in its economic, political, and scientific aspects. In grasping geographical parallax, the method of opening up is the main contribution of this study to the mode of being of the house: housity. Multiple lines of thought have been brought together as an effort of parallax, which creates a certain philosophical cubism that, despite its strangeness, vividly opens up to the theorization of phenomena and perceptions. In this case, between idealism and materialism, a phenomenological-dialectical approach has been undertaken in search of an intense ontology of the house. From psychoanalysis to ontology, the house is a human effort to constitute and construct itself immaterially and materially through the primary place of its existence: the house.

References

ARISTÓTELES. O tratado do lugar e do vazio (Física IX, 1-9). Tradução do grego de Arlene Reis, Fernando Coelho e Luís Felipe Bellintani. **Anais de Filosofia Clássica**, v. 9, p. 86-105, 2011.

- BACHELARD, Gaston. **A poética do espaço**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008.
- BERGSON, Henri. **O que Aristóteles pensou sobre o lugar**. Campinas: Ed. UNICAMP, 2013.
- BETTELHEIM, Bruno. **A psicanálise dos contos de fadas**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1980.
- BRANDÃO, Gabriela. A paisagem e a casa: da porta para fora e da porta para dentro. **Revista Geografias**, Edição especial, p. 41-54, 2019.
- BRANDÃO, Jacyntho. *Econômico* de Xenofonte. **Kléos**, n. 2/3, p. 221-227, 1998/1999.
- BRASIL. **Lei nº 11.340, de 7 de agosto de 2006** (Lei Maria da Penha). Lex: Casa Civil da Presidência da República, Brasília, p. 1, 2006.
- BUTTIMER, Anne. Lar, horizontes de alcance e o sentido de lugar. **Geograficidade**, v. 5, n. 1, p. 4-19, 2015.
- CARVALHO, Caê. A Tragédia e o aconchego: a casa como repouso do ser nos quadros de afecção dolorosa crônica. **Kalagatos**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 1-21, 2023.
- CORSO, Diana; CORSO, Mário. **Fadas no divã**: psicanálise nas histórias infantis. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2006.
- DARDEL, Eric. **O homem e a Terra**: natureza da realidade geográfica. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2011.
- DEFFONTAINES, Pierre. *Introduction à une géographie du sommeil et de la nuit*. In: DEFFONTAINES, Pierre; DELAMARRE, Mariel; JOURNAUX, André. **Géographie générale**. Paris: Gallimard, p. 1055-1062, 1966.
- DEFFONTAINES, Pierre. **L'homme et sa maison**. Paris: Gallimard, 1972.
- DICKINSON, Emily. **Poemas escolhidos**. Porto Alegre: L&PM Pocket Plus, 2007.
- FONSECA, Fernando. Materialismo dialético e finitude ontológica em Slavoj Žižek: da paralaxe kantiana à paralaxe hegeliana. **Kínesis**, Marília, v. 11, n. 28, p. 76-96, 2019.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Vigiar e Punir**. 42ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.
- FRÉMONT, Armand. **La région, espace vécu**. Champs: Flammarion, 1999.
- GONÇALVES, Leandro. O estudo do lugar sob o enfoque da geografia humanista: um lugar chamado Avenida Paulista. 2010. 267 f. **Dissertação** (Mestrado em Geografia) – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, 2010.
- GUADAGNIN, Alana. Os três porquinhos em duas versões. **REI – Revista de educação do IDEAU**, v. 12, n. 26, p. 1-17, 2007.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. Construir, habitar, pensar. In: HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ensaio e conferências**. 8ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, p. 125-142, 2012.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. *Remarques sur art – sculpture – espace*. Tradução do alemão de Didier Franck. **Les Temps Modernes**, Paris, v. 4, n. 650, p. 46-55, 2008.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ser e Tempo**. 10ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2015.
- JACOBS, Joseph. **English Fairy Tales**. 1ª ed. London: David Nutt, 1890.
- KANT, Immanuel. **Antropologia de um ponto de vista pragmático**. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2006.
- KHALDUN, Ibn. **Os prolegômenos ou Filosofia Social**. São Paulo: Safady Ltda, v. 1, 1958.

LIVERANI, Mario. **Antigo Oriente**: História, Sociedade e Economia. São Paulo: Ed. USP, 2020.

LOPES, Jahan. Geografia, escalas e a lua: do geocentrismo à ontologia. **GEOgrafias**, v. 29, n. 1, p. 103-120, 2021.

LOPES, Jahan. Psicologia socioespacial: a existência geográfica no meio ambiente. **Geoconexões** (Online), v. 1, n. 1, p. 170-188, 2022

LÖWY, Michael. **As aventuras de Karl Marx contra o Barão de Münchhausen**: marxismo e positivismo na sociologia do conhecimento. São Paulo: Busca Vida, 1987.

MARX, Karl. **Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos de 1844**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2022.

PAHL, Raymond. Modelos Sociológicos em Geografia. *In*: HEGGET, Peter; CHORLEY, Richard. **Modelos socio-econômicos em geografia**. São Paulo: Ed. USP, p. 48-69, 1975.

RODRIGUES, Susana. O fogo como centro e símbolo da casa. **Arq. urb.**, São Paulo, n. 15, p. 7-25, 2016.

SAFFIOTI, Heleieth. **O poder do macho**. São Paulo: Moderna, 1987.

SANTOS, Milton. **Por uma outra globalização**: do pensamento único à consciência universal. 6ª ed. Rio de Janeiro; São Paulo: Record, 2001.

TUAN, Yi-Fu. **Espaço e lugar**: a perspectiva da experiência. Londrina: Eduel, 2013.

XENOFONTE. **Econômico**. Tradução e introdução de Anna Lia Amaral de Almeida Prado. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.

ŽIŽEK, Slavoj. **A visão em paralaxe**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.



LOPES, Jahan Natanael Domingos. HOUSE PARALLAX:THE PLACE-OF-THE-BEING AND THE BEING-OF-THE-PLACE. *Kalagatos*, Fortaleza, vol.19, n.1, 2022, eK22003, p. 01-17.

Received: 12/2022

Approved: 01/2023