Architecture, seen as the experience of space, can be translated through memory and circumstance of the phenomenon as a complex and global meaning, that is not only a sensory or a merely intellectual phenomenon.

We can understand the architectural experience as something circumstantial, as there are many changeable factors and major variables. However, the phenomenon is a unique statement, where the variable Whole, time and space, are relative to the existential fulfillment of Man.

The understanding and reading of the architectural space, being the sum of reflections and the synthesis of knowledge through experimentation - is revealed by successive approximations, in which sometimes the sensitive ones, with a highly sensory impact, are favoured. Light, sound, effect and movement are fundamental parts of the statement, and others approximations, eminently rational, where previous experience and “borrowed” knowledge or culture are the cornerstones of the analysis and understanding.

The fusion of these processes leads us to address and study the perceptual phenomenon and perception per se, to a better understanding of the process of knowledge, the senses and the meanings of the architectural living space. And, despite manifesting itself as a continuous whole, it is through cadence's movement and discovery that it falls into a framework, thus, prone to fragmentation and to the creation of memory.

The idea that architectural space is always something more than its representation, than its analysis by simultaneous statements or frames is a crucial aspect for the understanding of a way of seeing and doing architecture or the space for representation. Although present times only mystify the images, they never translate the aesthetic phenomenon of architecture, since the latter is focused on the living interaction of the architectural space. That is, we still believe, as Távora told us, maybe quoting Zevi, Architecture must continue to be a system of people, not things.

The scenographic component in today's architecture, seen as a system of things, considers the transformation of one type of thinking into a new one, according to today's architectural production; what we call “thought through images”, where the man in action is missing from this space's process of creation.

The field of human spatiality, the project's scenic component and the educational specificity that we are now facing may be only some of the partials aspects, of the fragmented pieces of an “image”, of a “puzzle”, reflections on a synthesis that we will never know. Those aspects will surely help to understand a position, an attitude, on the necessary questioning of what has characterized the production of today's architectural space and its growing approximation to the spaces and buildings of representation, increasingly iconographic and therefore increasingly theatrical.
The theatre has always been linked to architecture, not only for the simple construction of the building, but mainly because, in its essence, theatre resumes itself to making the man to act upon things. The man in space, in his social and psychological relationships, where the problems of acoustics, optics, lighting, colour and geometry are common elements to the art of building space and to the dramatic art.

As such, an architect and a stage designer have always had identical problems to solve and, taking into account that the scene is not the play but it is important to it, architecture cannot be considered life but it is indifferent to it and, ultimately, it becomes the place of action of the drama that is our existence.

So, these spaces are increasingly coincident; these works, these buildings that represent, and increasingly represent ourselves, with the desire or intention of replacing us ... and then, as Thomas Bernhard(1931/1989) said through the character Minetti, we do not know if the place where we live can be seen as maths or performing arts.

Someone once said that, although we do not know what heaven is like, it is possible to represent it effectively through the scenic device and to lead an entire audience to easily identify it. In architecture, the device is located in man himself, and the question that always arises is whether architecture can give us that paradise or just an image of it or a dream without actors for an elusive representation?