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ABSTRACT

Reading allows for the construction of a new world within the mind as one centralises and processes the literature. Flipping from one page to the next the language and the typography guides and informs this spatial construction and directs us through this new world. It creates an intangible architecture of the mind.

In the physical realm however, we experience the real world directly and blatantly without the aid of texts and narratives. In this life the relationship between text and space is inverted. Here text and narrative do not inform the construction and tactile experience of space but rather act as a backdrop to everyday life. It seems to go unnoticed.

This dissertation aims to emphasise the importance of typography, text and narrative within not only our day-to-day functionings, but also in the architectural realm. It seeks an amalgamation of typography, museum and public space, and aspires to create a place where the seemingly unnoticed typeface can be showcased, propagated and made accessible.

KEYWORDS: Museum Space, Public Space, Typography, Threshold, The Surface, The Everyday.

EKSERP

Soos wat teks en literatuur geïnternaliseer word, word ‘n nuwe wêreld gekonstrueer in die geestesoog van die individu. Van die een bladsy na die volgende, gee die taal en tipografie aanleiding tot hierdie ruimtelike konstruksie en lei ons deur hierdie nuwe wêreld. Dit skep ast’ware ‘n ontasbare argitektuur in die geheue van die leser.

In ons fisiese omgewing, word die wêreld egter direk en blatant ervaar, sonder die hulp van teks en narratief. In hierdie milieu is die verhouding tussen teks en ruimte omgekeer. Hier lei teks en narratief nie die konstruksie en tasbare ervaring van ruimte nie, maar tree terug en dien as agtergrond vir die alledaagse lewe. Dit bly ongesien in die verbygaan.

Hierdie skripsie beoog om die belangrikheid van tipografie, teks en narratief binne ons alledaagse sowel as argitekonies wêreld te beklemtoon. Die dokument streef daarna om ‘n samesmelting van tipografie, museum en publieke ruimte te bewerkstellig, en beoog om ‘n omgewing te skep waar die oënskynlik ongesienie ‘letter’, ten toon gestel, gepropageer en toeganklik gemaak kan word.

SLEUTELWOORDE: Museum Ruimte, Publieke Ruimte, Tipografie, Drumpel, Die Oppervlak, Die Alledaags.
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