future. Now concrete is also widely used, however, it is gradually superseded by modern metal designs and finishing materials.

So, clubs from their inception played the important role in a society. And today this type of constructions is interesting to be developed by architects throughout the world.

References

1. Щербаков В.В. Архитектору кинотеатров / В.В. Щербаков и др. - М., 1955. - 165 с.
2. Архитектура рабочих клубов и Дворцов культуры / Быков В.Е., Домшлак И.П. и др. - М., 1953. - 306 с.
3. Милашевская Е.К. Клубы / Е.К. Милашевская, М.Е. Прянишников, М.Р. Савченко. - М.: Стройиздат, 1990. - 248 с.
4. Куцевич В. Еволюція формування об`єктів культури та дозвілля: Частина 2 / В. Куцевич // Українська академія мистецтва: Дослідницькі та науково-методичні праці. - 2007. - Вип. 14. - С. 248-260

SEMANTIC FEATURES OF CURRENT CITY ARCHITECTURAL IMAGE FORMATION

STOIKOVA DARYNA, MD student

O.M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv

The purpose of architectural theory is to research laws of morphogenesis in architecture, content-richness and figurativeness of architectural forms, to remain relevant for understanding creative processes and the practice of architecture. Architecture as a kind of art, reflects all sides of society being (i.e., political system, level of culture, preference in a fashion and style). Pithiness and definiteness of architecture from time immemorial identify signs and symbols as the most concentrated resources, transmitting information [4].

According to many researchers, the end of the XXth century and the beginning of the XXIst century are distinguished by the current crisis in a stylistics and figurativeness of a modern architecture, resulting in both destruction of direct and inverse relation system between architecture's object and consumer and deprivation of modern architecture traditional signs-symbols. Moreover, the isolation of architecture from current reality and also its separation from external environment was caused by the current negative trend, inherent to architects and town-planners. The reciprocal misunderstanding occurs between consumer and creator of modern city architectural environment. Mechanisms, that have been tried and tested for years and united by strong thread of consciousness of architect and citizen, have been lost. In a modern architecture some departure from traditional understanding of such terms as *sense, symbol, sign and emotion* has been noticed [3]. "Three foundations" that are basic for historical style architecture, without which it is now an architectural space, presenting nothing more than a set of piles of glass and metal, have been lost.

A significant amount of works have been devoted to the consideration of the mentioned above issues at each stage of architecture development (e.g., D. Broadbent, R. Venturi, C. Jencks, B. Zevi, U. Eco, C.Schulz, M. Tafuri, R. Fusco, S.

Gurin, S.Ivanova, K. Lynch, V. Markuzon, E. Rossinskaya, Y. Stepanov, B. Uspenskii, I. Lejava, A. Marder, O. Tiz, A. Fomenko, S. Shubovich, V. Shilin, J. Yankovskaya, etc). The purpose of this research is to trace semantic regularities and mechanisms of architectural environment perception within the modern city's space.

The city environment, as cultural phenomenon, represents accumulation of messages, containing certain information. Thus, we find both different texts in an urban culture and various informational languages, different codes, necessary for their adequate reading. The urban environment reflects the dynamics of notional flows.

The city (i.e., environment), human (i.e., society) and text (i.e., information) are the three components, complementing each other and. thereby, mutually changing summands of a life process. Symbolism of the city correlates mythopoetic structure with iconic framework and puts forward itself as inherent parameter (i.e. communicativeness). Semiotics defines the mechanism of communication as language or code, transformable into speech or message [7]. S. Shubovich notes that code is formed like signs' system, expressed by text [6].

Semantic approach to research of architectural city image is caused by information-communication essence of architecture. Hence, this paper addresses to semantics (i.e., part of semiotics - science about signs and signs systems) as a research method of architecture sign functions. Thereby, architectural image of urban environment is determined as a system of visually perceptible signs, forming semantic model of reflecting architectural environment's objects in a human's consciousness [2].

Image of the city and architectural environment are formed in the citizen's (i.e., carriers of aesthetic and cultural anthropological norms and preferences) mind by means of certain images, symbols and signs. In his turn, human being, perceiving his own habitat, renders inverse impact on it, largely influencing the process of it designing and structuring.

Whatever city you visit, all of them are filled with semantics, which doer decodes subconsciously. It is dual by its nature. According to S. Gurin, "On the one hand, city appears as universal symbol, archetype. But on the other hand, the city is a place of senses production, creation and operation of symbols"[1].

The information, encased in city, spreads like an information object in a space.

The perception of architectural environment by human occurs via affordable stimuli, generated by it. They (i.e., *time, space, color, sound, light, factors and quality of shape, character and form properties*) are environmental stimuli, engendering aesthetic reaction. V. Shilin highlights functional, esthetic, emotional, informational ecological and technical stimuli. Herewith, in a correlation with the quality of human influence, they can perform activating, soothing and neutral roles [5].

In the process of perception and the reading of urban architectural environment, stimuli affect different human senses (vision, hearing, smell, touch).

They, in turn, create feeling and kinesthetic response, as a result fostering thinking, imagination, logic and analytics.

In a human consciousness, while perceiving the environment, an image-standard - the archetypes of environment - is being formed. Figurative language (i.e., the image of the place) is gaining typical characteristics.

Consequently, there are four basic phases of values perception mechanism: a)orientation - search and detection of signals (signs, meanings); b)interpretation - specification of signals (signs, meanings), revelation of the relationships between signs; c)identification of signals (signs, meanings) - specification of the values identity; d)cognizance - recognition of signals (signs, meanings) - establishment of the correlation of the incoming signal with a given system of standards (factors) with their subsequent decoding.

Thus, the specification of precise semantic features and ties in architectural environment affects both the adequacy of perception and simulating the special scale, expressing the distinctive characteristics of a modern city.

We cannot generally only "read" architectural space or interpret it. Because during the passage of time urban space has to grow and develop not only substantively and but also territorially, expanding both physical boundaries and boundaries of semantic fullness. Only consideration of urban space in a complex of various accentuations of architectural language can save from impoverishment of language cultural heritage for generations to come.

Considering issues of semantics and semiotics, modern researchers have to reveal coordinating orientation of semantic fullness of urban spaces and create a picture of a new attitude, establishing the basis for formation of a new architectural image and semantic content of architectural spaces of the city.

References

1. Гурин С.П. Образ города в культуре: метафизические и мистические аспекты [Электронный ресурс]. URL: http://www.comk.ru/HTML/gurin_doc.htm.

1. Иванова О. А. Семиотический аспект формирования архитектурной среды столичного города [Электронный ресурс] / О.А. Иванова // Архитектон. - 2007. – № 17. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: http://archvuz.ru/magazine/Numbers/2007_1/cont.html.

2. Стойкова Д.А. Анализ взаимодействия архитектурной среды и человека / Д.А. Стойкова // Материалы VIII Всеукраинской студенческой научно-технической М34 конференции «Устойчивое развитие городов» (80-й студенческой научно-технической конференции ХНУМГ им. А.Н. Бекетова): в 4-х ч. / Ч.1 – Харьков: ХНУМГ им. А.Н. Бекетова, 2015. – 163с.

3. Трошкина Е.А. Особенности семантики в формировании образа представительной архитектуры Украины [Электронный ресурс]. URL: http://www.dissland.com/catalog_ukr/osobennosti_semantiki_v_formirovanii_obraza_predstavitelmznoj_arhitekturue_ukrainue.html

4. Шилин В. В. Архитектура и психология. Краткий конспект лекций. – Н.Новгород: Нижегород. гос. архит.-строит. ун.т, 2011. – 66 с.

5. Шубович С. А. Мифопоэтический феномен архитектурной среды: монография / С. А. Шубович; Харьк. нац. акад. гор. хоз-ва. – Х.: ХНАГХ, 2012. – 177 с.

6. Эко У. Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию. - СПб: ТОО ТК «Петрополис»,1998. - С.75.

7. Янковская Ю.С. Семиотические механизмы социально-психологической обусловленности архитектурного проектирования / Ю.С. Янковская – Архитектон: известия вузов. №1(6), 2004.

THE CONCEPT OF FRAME IN HISTORIC CONSTRUCTION CONTEXT

EUGENE SURZHAN, post-graduate student
O.M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv

Space frame is one of the most widely used building designs. Recent developments illustrate great economical advantage of implementing constructions of that type in projects. However, little research in revealing adjustable design prescriptions for Ukrainian construction industry has been pursued. The paper examines the conceptual variety of f*rame* designations in construction domain. The aim has been to give a brief insight into evolutionary history of the concept of *frame* in construction space.

The first prototype of a frame is considered a truss. *Truss* first was mentioned in ancient Egypt and according to Online Etymology Dictionary, meaning "framework for supporting a roof or bridge" [1] was first recorded in 1650.

A diversity of definitions of this facility in construction terminology proposes a wide range of its designations. For instance, according to Costanzo & Francesco, «In engineering, a truss is a structure that consists of two-force members only, where the members are organized so that the assemblage as a whole behaves as a single object» [2].

The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia gives the following definition of the notion in question: «Truss in architecture and engineering, a supporting structure or framework composed of beams, girders, or rods commonly of steel or wood lying in a single plane. (...) Trusses are used for large spans and heavy loads, especially, in bridges and roofs» [3].

In current meaning *truss* is a geometry sustainable system of bars to convert bending loads to a compression and tension. It can be plane and three-dimensional.

The further development of the facility was necessitated by the demand to build covers with a longer span. Thus, timber beams, connected in five or more triangles, were used by builders. Using mentioned above designs was spread in Greece, Rome Empire and Middle East.

New horizons were opened when engineers started to implement cast iron as a building material in trusses and in a construction in general (in the seventeenth century – England, France, Germany and Russia). It is necessary to emphasize the fact that cast iron possessed a number of poor qualities, in particular low tensile strength. Thus, it confined possibility to cover spans over 30m long.

In the eighteenth century technological discoveries fostered using iron for building needs. At the same time a new mechanical theory, describing the behavior of trusses under impact of external load appeared. Polonso was the author of this theory.