



Architects' Sketches

Dialogue and Design

Kendra Schank Smith



TU-80
S653

ARCHITECTS' SKETCHES

DIALOGUE AND DESIGN

KENDRA SCHANK SMITH



E2008001423



AMSTERDAM • BOSTON • HEIDELBERG • LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD
PARIS • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SINGAPORE • SYDNEY • TOKYO

Architectural Press is an imprint of Elsevier



Architectural Press is an imprint of Elsevier
Linacre House, Jordan Hill, Oxford OX2 8DP, UK
30 Corporate Drive, Suite 400, Burlington, MA 01803, USA

First published 2008

Copyright © 2008 Kendra Schank Smith. All rights reserved

The right of Kendra Schank Smith to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher

Permissions may be sought directly from Elsevier's Science & Technology Rights Department in Oxford, UK: phone (+44) (0) 1865 843830; fax (+44) (0) 1865 853333; email: permissions@elsevier.com. Alternatively you can submit your request online by visiting the Elsevier website at <http://elsevier.com/locate/permissions>, and selecting *Obtaining permission to use Elsevier material*

Notice

No responsibility is assumed by the publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this title is available from the Library of Congress

ISBN: 978-0-7506-8226-8

For information on all Architectural Press publications
visit our website at www.architecturalpress.com

Typeset by Charon Tec Ltd (A Macmillan Company), Chennai, India
www.charontec.com
Printed and bound in Slovenia

08 09 10 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Working together to grow
libraries in developing countries

www.elsevier.com | www.bookaid.org | www.sabre.org

ELSEVIER

BOOK AID
International

Sabre Foundation

ARCHITECTS' SKETCHES

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1.1 Triumphal Arch, Tripoli

© Stapleton Collection, UK/Bridgeman Art Library

Figure 1.2 Lorcan O’Herlihy; Idea sketch of unfolding light well in a structure

LOHA Lorcan O’Herlihy Architects

Figure 1.3 Steven Holl; Cactus Towers, Live Work Lofts

Courtesy Steven Holl

Figure 1.4 Antoine Predock; Staglieno Cemetery, Genova, Italy, 1988

Antoine Predock Architect PC

Figure 1.5 Morten Schmidt; Extension of the Royal Danish Library, Copenhagen

© schmidt hammer lassen

Figure 1.6 Merrill Elam; Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, University of California, Berkeley, North Elevation

Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects

Figure 1.7 Merrill Elam; Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, University of California, Berkeley, South Elevation

Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects

Figure 1.8 Merrill Elam; Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, University of California, Berkeley, West Elevation

Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects

Figure 1.9 Merrill Elam; Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, University of California, Berkeley, East Elevation

Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects

Figure 2.1 Michel de Klerk; Apartment Block 2, Spaarndammer-plantsoen, Amsterdam, 1914–16

Netherlands Architecture Institute

Figure 2.2 Eric A. Kahn; Urban Fabric: Mexico City (D.F.) 2003

Central Office of Architecture

Figure 2.3 Reima Pietilä; Dipoli Student Assembly Building, Ontaniemi, Espoo
Museum of Finnish Architecture

Figure 2.4 Francesco Borromini; Gateway for S. Carlo alle Quattro Fontane
Albertina Museum, Vienna, AZ Rom 159a

Figure 2.5 Jun Itami; Stone House 1982
(in *Drawings by Contemporary Japanese Architects*)
Jun Itami Architect A Research Institute

Figure 2.6 Floris Alkemade; Zeche Zollverein Masterplan, 2008, Office for Metropolitan Architecture
© OMA/Rem Koolhaas

Figure 2.7 Robert Venturi; House in Northern Delaware
Venturi Scott Brown and Associates, Inc.

Figure 2.8 Lorcan O’Herlihy; Idea sketch for Landmark Tower/U2 studio in Dublin, Ireland
LOH Lorcan O’Herlihy Architect

Figure 2.9 Yoshio Taniguchi; Seishun Shirakaba Art Museum 1982
(in *Drawings by Contemporary Japanese Architects*)

Figure 3.1 Pentti Karoeja; Westend Iuonnoskirja Day Nursery
Ark-house Architects

Figure 3.2 Antoine Predock; Royal Palace Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand, 2000
Antoine Predock Architect PC

Figure 3.3 Antoine Predock; Chenonceaux, France 1982
Antoine Predock Architect PC

Figure 3.4 Steven Holl; Knut Hamsun Museum
Courtesy Steven Holl

Figure 3.5 Renzo Piano; London Bridge Tower
Renzo Piano Building Workshop s.r.l.

Figure 3.6 Erich Mendelsohn; Library and Office Building for Salmon Schocken
MOMA 96.2000 © Art Resource

Figure 3.7 Michael Rotondi; idea-gram
RoTo Architects, Inc. Michael Rotondi

Figure 3.8 Michelangelo Buonarroti; Sketches of columns and faces
© British Museum, London, UK/ The Bridgeman Art Library

Figure 3.9 Reima Peitilä; Kaleva Church, Tampere
Museum of Finnish Architecture

Figure 3.10 Carlo Scarpa; Pianta dell'area di esposizione della statua di Cangrande; studi per il supporto della statua esquestre in un'ipotesi a colonne, n° inv. 31587 recto

Archivio Museo di Castelvecchio, Verona

Figure 3.11 Ieoh Ming Pei; East Wing of the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Pei Cobb Freed Partners

Figure 3.12 Mayumi Miyawaki; Sketch of Yokoo Residence, 1979

Drawings by Contemporary Japanese Architects

Figure 3.13 Cesar Pelli; Petronas Towers

Pelli Clarke Pelli Architects

Figure 3.14 Y. Tanguy, A. Breton, M. Duhamel, M. Morise; Exquisite Corpse, 1934

© Private Collection/Peter Willi/The Bridgeman Art Library

Figure 3.15 Sir Norman Foster; Norman Foster Concept Sketch

Foster + Partners

Figure 3.16 Robert Venturi; Gordon Wu Hall

Venturi Scott Brown and Associates, Inc.

Figure 4.1 Eric A. Kahn; Cathedrals: Notre Dame, Paris 2004

Central Office of Architecture

Figure 4.2 Gianlorenzo Bernini; A caricature of a Cardinal in bed, ART 321510

© Art Resource

Figure 4.3 Carlo Scarpa; Schizzi vari per un allestimento, n° inv. 32168 recto

Archivio Museo de Castelvecchio, Verona

Figure 4.4 Jørn Utzon; Bagsvaerd Community Church

Utzon Associates Architects

Figure 4.5 Leonardo da Vinci; Study of Heads, ALI 161559

© Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, Italy/Alinari/The Bridgeman Art Library

Figure 4.6 Santiago Calatrava, Human/Structure Sketches

Santiago Calatrava LLC

Figure 4.7 Rafael Viñoly; Van Andel Institute project sketch

Rafael Viñoly Architects, PC

Figure 4.8 Michael Rotondi; Architecture and Art Building at Prairie View A&M University

RoTo Architects, Inc., Michael Rotondi

Figure 4.9 Denise Scott Brown; Lewis Thomas Laboratory, Princeton University

Venturi, Scott Brown Architects, Inc.

Figure 4.10 Morten Schmidt; Aarhus Museum of Modern Art, ARoS

© schmidt hammer lassen

Figure 4.11 Santiago Calatrava; Planetarium at the Valencia Science Centre

Santiago Calatrava LLC

Figure 4.12 Helmut Jahn; 362 West Street Building, Durban, South Africa

Murphy/Jahn

Figure 4.13 Erich Mendelsohn; Hadassah University Medical Center Mount, Scopus, Jerusalem

MOMA 95.2000 © Art Resource

Figure 4.14 Morten Schmidt; Aarhus Museum of Modern Art, ARoS

© schmidt hammer lassen

Figure 4.15 Michael Rotondi; Architecture and Art Building at Prairie View A&M University

RoTo Architects, Inc., Michael Rotondi

Figure 4.16 Santiago Calatrava; Human/Structure sketches

Santiago Calatrava LLC

Figure 4.17 Frank Fort; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 90

Chicago Tribune

Figure 4.18 Milnar, Chapman and Markes; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 54

Chicago Tribune

Figure 4.19 William Berg; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 121

Chicago Tribune

Figure 4.20 Adolf Loos; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 196

Chicago Tribune

Figure 4.21 Mathew L. Freeman; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 162

Chicago Tribune

Figure 4.22 Bliss and Faville; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 104

Chicago Tribune

Figure 4.23 Saverio Dioguardi; Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, Entry 248

Chicago Tribune

Figure 5.1 Perino del Vaga (Pietro Buonaccorsi); Design for a mural decoration with grotesques for the Cagliostro of the Castel Sant' Angelo in Rome, c. 1544

© Musee Conde, Chantilly, France/Giraudon/The Bridgeman Art Library

Figure 5.2 Leonardo da Vinci; Seven Studies of Grotesque Faces

© Galleria dell' Accademia, Venice, Italy/ The Bridgeman Art Library

Figure 5.3 Giovanni Battista Piranesi; *Carceri*, Plate III

RIBA Library Photographs Collection (RIBA 10178)

Figure 5.4 Giovanni Battista Piranesi; *Carceri*, Plate IX

RIBA Library Photographs Collection (RIBA 10184)

Figure 5.5 Giovanni Battista Piranesi; *Carceri*, Plate XII

RIBA Library Photographs Collection (RIBA 10187)

Figure 5.6 Giovanni Battista Piranesi; *Carceri*, Plate VII

RIBA Library Photographs Collection (RIBA 10182)

Figure 5.7 Giovanni Battista Piranesi; *Carceri*, Plate XIII

RIBA Library Photographs Collection (RIBA 10188)

Figure 6.1 Steven Holl; Section of Trapped Shadows, Knut Hamsun project

Courtesy Steven Holl

Figure 6.2 Mark Foster Gage; Wallpaper

Gage/Clemenceau Architects

Figure 6.3 Mark Foster Gage; Very Large Interior apocalyptic

Gage/Clemenceau Architects

Figure 6.4 Mark Foster Gage; Final Blue copy

Gage/Clemenceau Architects

Figure 6.5 Julio Bermudez, Bennett Neiman, Tim Castillo; Digital Analog Studio

Julio Bermudez, University of Utah, Bennett Neiman, Texas Tech University, Tim Castillo, University of New Mexico. Student project; Team 04 (13 d-model 2) Jeongkeun Yoon, Yalin Uluaydin, Jeffrey Schneider

Figure 6.6 Julio Bermudez, Bennett Neiman, Tim Castillo; Digital Analog Studio

Julio Bermudez, University of Utah, Bennett Neiman, Texas Tech University, Tim Castillo, University of New Mexico. Student project; Team 05 (12 a-model 3) Andrew Berry, Stephen Hunter, Tess Rigel

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Stefanie Leontiadis, former graduate assistant at the University of Hartford, for her help with the initial research of images. I would also like to recognize Dmitry Kulikov of the University of Hartford and Erald Kokalari of Ryerson University for their assistance with digital reproduction at various stages of the project. My appreciation goes to Caitlin Bailey who edited much of the text and provided helpful insight.

I would like to thank the University of Hartford for assistance with a research grant and Ryerson University with development funds to help purchase illustrations.

I truly appreciate the generosity of the architects whose sketches are illustrated here. Their assistance, and enthusiasm for the project, was critical to the realization of this book.

I also would like to thank my family, and especially my husband Albert C. Smith, whose support means so much to me.

CONTENTS

<i>List of illustrations</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
CHAPTER 1 Introduction and the sketch	1
Architectural sketches and a comparison to dialogue	2
Methodology	7
The nature of sketches	11
Visual perception as it pertains to architectural sketches	14
How architects use sketches	18
Bibliography	24
CHAPTER 2 Play, quickness and <i>Festina Lente</i>	26
Illusion and allusion	27
A knowledge gained	32
Play at work	33
Quickness and <i>Festina Lente</i>	35
Bibliography	42
CHAPTER 3 Memory, imagination and fantasy	43
Memory	43
Imagination	57
Fantasy	64
Bibliography	70
CHAPTER 4 Caricature as a mode of transformation	72
History of caricature	73
Definition of caricature	75
Caricature evident in architectural sketches	78
Bibliography	101
CHAPTER 5 The grotesque sketch	103
History of the grotesque	104

	Grotesque sketches	108
	Bibliography	121
CHAPTER 6	Observation/compendium and <i>likeness</i>	123
	Digital sketches	127
	<i>Likeness</i> and the marginal	130
	Conclusion	133
	Bibliography	133
	<i>Index</i>	135

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND THE SKETCH

Figure 1.1 depicts an architect sketching what he observes, which represents one way that architects think with media and use sketches for dialogue. This architect, placed in front of a dynamic and historic construction, may be recording the building's proportions, details, or its placement in context. He may be drawing to try to understand its scale, materiality, or how it compares with



FIGURE 1.1 Triumphal Arch, Tripoli; Plate 4 (engraved by George Harley (1791–1871) 1821 (litho) from *A Narrative of Travels in Northern Africa* by Lyon, Captain George Francis (1795–1832) (after).

other buildings throughout history. He may be trying to replicate how it looks as a way to bring a souvenir home or to preserve its complexities, which may be hard to imprint on his memory without visual stimulus. The architect, possibly on a *Grand Tour*, comprehends more through the action of sketching than mere observation. Forced to study as he imitates, this architect may understand more about the building's construction or intention. Drawing from observation is one dimension of how architects may use sketches as dialogue.

Architects depend upon sketches throughout the process of design as a medium for dialogue. They are the physical manifestation of their thinking and are used in various ways from the inception of the project to final detailing and evaluation. As instruments of a process, they reveal an intimate conversation that is coupled with desire for the future building (Piotrowski and Robinson, 2001). Intention and meaning evident in the use of architectural sketches may be explored by comparing them to theories of play, memory, imagination, and fantasy. A further method of examining the propositions inherent in sketches is to compare them to characteristics of caricature and the grotesque to find less obvious qualities of conscious, or subconscious, intention. Where architects depend upon sketches as the medium for the creative process used to conceive architecture, they also use sketches in all aspects of the design process with individual expression. This examination suggests an interpretation of architects' relationships with the transitory and immediate images they utilize for design.

Because architectural sketches are part of a thinking process and seldom an end product, they play an important role in the process of architectural design. Even though architectural sketches are uniquely personal, there are several general functions which are common to them. Sketches may facilitate discovery and the first inspirations for conceptual beginnings, they can be part of the communication between parties involved in the process, or they are often a means to record mental impressions. Sketches can be employed to evaluate decisions and suggest refinement; they are used as diagrams to analyze a difficult thought, and they help architects to visualize and thus understand complex configurations. As evidenced by cave paintings and images continuously created through history, humans also have an innate desire to represent what they see and what they imagine (Gombrich, 1985).

ARCHITECTURAL SKETCHES AND A COMPARISON TO DIALOGUE

Architects require a visual forum to construe the information necessary for the conception and building of complex structures. This process necessitates a dialogue – a free exchange of thoughts and opinions – between architects and themselves, their clients, the contractors and their colleagues. The discourse implies a two-way interaction, which creates a learning environment, one where the interaction and reasoning facilitates the entire process of design. This dialogue, as a theme throughout this book, implies the fluid and evolving 'give and take' of discussion. It reinforces the thesis, antithesis and synthesis of a design spiral, along with the 'action and reaction' promoting intelligibility (Broadbent, 1973).

With the varied uses of sketches for inspiration and design thinking, communication, recording, evaluation and testing, analysis, visualization and understanding, together with a passion to create images, architects depend upon a representational medium to facilitate the dialogue of these functions. Primarily visual rather than verbal or written, design requires a projection for this conversation. These visual tools help architects communicate with colleagues or engage a personal discussion with their images.

Fraser and Henmi, in their book *Envisioning Architecture*, recognize that drawings, like sketches, have the potential to multiply thought and create a chain of associations that lead to new ways

of seeing and understanding. Here it is evident that the acts of visual dialogue enrich the entire process:

Just as an author inserts his or her conceptual presence into a drawing through a mode of seeing, interpreting, and changing a scene, drawing tools impose a material influence. Drawing thus intervenes between an author and their ideas being considered, becoming in effect a third presence. In this sense, drawing is not a transparent translation of thought into form, but rather a medium which influences thought just as thought influences drawing. (Fraser & Henmi, 1994: viii)

Dialogue, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, stems from the Greek to ‘speak alternately,’ and is a verbal interchange or thought between two or more persons. It describes an interaction and implies question and answer. Similar to discourse, it may be accompanied by an act of understanding by which it passes from premises to consequences and includes the faculty of reasoning. This free exchange of thoughts and opinions creates the close acquaintance, or intimacy, of sentiments or observations, opinions and ideas. An intelligibility results from the give and take, and trial and error, profoundly evidenced in the acquisition of knowledge. For architects, when designing, this communication requires a visual component – images that through their power to convince, seduce, compel, argue, and provide insight, fertilize and solidify the infinite number of decisions necessary for a building to be built as it was conceived.

Intention gleaned from images has been demonstrated by the extensive research of iconology and aesthetics. If dialogue, as an analogy for the design process, evokes the relationship between designers themselves and their repertoire of constituents, then sketches become a participant in this acquisition of understanding. Designers engage in conversation on many levels; some of this dialogue is initiated with the intricate questioning and interpretation of a client’s needs and desires. In an abstract relationship, designers need to converse with the boundaries of their design, such as codes, site, and functions of the intended outcome. Additional boundaries of dialogue may include the people who support the process such as contractors, consultants, community groups and zoning boards. This conversation includes the issues of design that affect the designers’ decisions, such as the history of architecture, current trends or styles, the conceptual strategies imposed on the project, and the designers’ whole being (made up of education, sensibilities, experiences, memories, and propensity for imagination).

Architectural drawing, as Edward Robbins writes, has a social dimension. It unites its physical manifestation to the architect, who makes cultural artifacts and acts as a social practitioner (Robbins, 1994). Sketches, by comparison, are in most cases personal notes, references, and analysis. Although used for communication with clients and other people in the building process, much of architects’ personal communication in the form of sketches is inherently too vague and unformed to be effective communication to others. When it does occur, this communication may be an ephemeral search for ideas amongst a design team. Beyond the public domain of the drawings being used for communication of construction directives and presentation, sketches represent architects’ dialogue, employing a physical manipulation of media in a manifestation of immediate impressions. Directly from the hand, without intermediaries, sketches can be a personal dialogue or a physical remnant of a conversation that depends upon imagery. Thus, the production of a sketch constitutes an action and reaction that provides architects with the interaction necessary to think through the complex process of anticipating a building and nurturing it to final completion.

Dialogue implies the presentation of images, written words or sound used to influence others. How we interpret this stimulus depends on many factors, as visual communication involves perception and interpretation, and is laced with cultural and psychological dimensions. Since any projection of communication in culture depends upon signs, part of this discussion concerns the signifier and that which is signified (Culler, 1986; Buchler, 1955; Eco, 1976; Walker and Chaplin, 1977). Writing on semiotics speculates a relationship between what made the image and the image itself. In contemporary society, the mass communication of media is simultaneously received through

different means; we can no longer differentiate and control the media, and thus it becomes omnipresent and loses a hierarchy of importance (Kearney, 1988). Society cannot ignore the media's influence, and everything seen and heard is somehow translated, as W.J.T. Mitchell writes, 'this interaction is unavoidable,' and when speaking about 'the innocent eye' he states:

When this metaphor becomes literalized, when we try to postulate a foundational experience of 'pure' vision, a merely mechanical process uncontaminated by imagination, purpose, or desire, we invariably discover one of the few maxims on which Gombrich and Nelson agree: 'the innocent eye is blind.' The capacity for a purely physical vision that is supposed to be forever inaccessible to the blind turns out to be itself a kind of blindness. (Mitchell, 1986: 118)

Comparatively, theorists seek to interpret sketches and, not surprisingly, these sketches confound even the architects who make them. As a way to begin this method of translation, it is important to turn to several philosophers who write about some basic theories of visual communication, intention and interpretation. Once established that all images demand interpretation, it is possible to accept hermeneutics as a method to extrapolate meaning from images. But this meaning may be indeterminate and it is important to recognize, as Saussure states, that '...signs do not refer to objects in any fixed way' (Kearney, 1988: 269; Saussure, 1986). If, as Barthes writes, the authority of the author is diminished, then readers may interpret in any way they please. This opportunity opens interpretation to fragmentation (Barthes, 1988; Kearney, 1988). But by presenting the notion of 'The Third Meaning', the reader, as observer of the image, can find an interpretation beyond simple signs and find an 'obtuse' signifier in the '...power of certain [images] to carry a third level of impact (*significance*) beyond the conventional levels of informational *message* or symbolic *reference*' (Kearney, 1988: 278). Postmodern philosophers write about elusive interpretation and find that in a parodic circle '[t]here is no possibility of a single founding reference' (Kearney, 1988: 252).

With this constant 'mirroring' of reflexivity comes the problem of definitive meaning. The instability opens opportunities for the architect to act as an interpreter and operate between the parts and the whole (Gadamer, 1989). Humans can no longer regulate mass media at the source but, as Eco suggests, concentrate on 'the point of reception' (Kearney, 1988; Eco 1976). 'By affirming the right of each media recipient to give his own meaning to the images and sounds which surround him, are we not in fact leaving the basic system of media consumerism intact?' (Kearney, 1988: 382). This communication might be one-way, but through interpretation or acceptance into our psyche, we are partners in this conversation. This relationship may not be concerned with the definitive interpretation, but instead with utilizing possibilities found through understanding. It is important to recognize the various perspectives viewed in the cultural artifact (Gadamer, 1989). With this inspection the meaning of the 'text' can be extrapolated from its context.

The same may be true of architects' images. They carry potential meaning that can be accepted, rejected, countered, expanded or mutated depending, of course, on the reaction evoked in the human. Sketches and drawings are modes of architectural representation, as they may represent a mental impression of a visual perception of a setting as it is observed. The representation often gives the ability to see beyond appearances to a deeper meaning. The act of drawing facilitates interpretation; this understanding is expressed by Richard Wollheim when he writes 'to see a drawing as a representation of something is no longer to take it, or to be disposed to take it, for that thing: it is rather to understand that thing by it' (Wollheim, 1974: 24). Architects draw to see and subsequently understand, whether it is an observation of perceptual stimulus or from a mental impression conjured up by imagination. Carlo Scarpa expresses this concept well: 'I want to see things, that's all I really trust. I want to see, and that's why I draw. I can see an image only if I draw it' (Dal Co and Mazzariol, 1984: 242).

Donald Schön writes that much of what defines the 'reflective practitioner' is a designer having a conversation with the situation. He reinforces the relationship of designers to the way they

visualize when he writes ‘...the graphic world of the sketchpad is the medium of reflection-in-action. ...Because the drawing reveals qualities and relations unimagined beforehand, moves can function as experiments’ (Schön, 1983: 157). Schön recognizes how the action of sketching is part of eliciting a certain problem solving activity, and that the translation and application of those images are vital steps in bringing forth a design. ‘The act of drawing can be rapid and spontaneous, but the residual traces are stable. The designer can examine them at leisure’ (Schön, 1983: 157). As in any conversation, the dialogue with an image is not something that can be predetermined – it is a reaction to each image as it emerges on the page.

Fraser and Henmi suggest that a drawing has two lives: a dialogue with the architect at the time of the actual action of drawing and an afterlife, during which others view and interact with it. ‘The influence of drawing then exists independently, acquiring its own voice and its own history through many acts of viewing and interpreting’ (Fraser and Henmi, 1994: viii). Architects may be looking for something different each time they sit down to draw, and may discover something other than expected at each sitting. The methods and techniques, although unique to each architect, may also vary depending on the intended outcome and, in a situation of this variety, interpretation may even differ depending upon the time of day or mood of the designer.

A sketch may have many functions and how they communicate to their creator may be vague and allusive. Donald Schön writes about how architects revel in the ambiguous. When drawing, an architect finds himself immersed in ‘...judgments of quality for which he cannot state adequate criteria, and he displays skills for which he cannot state the rules and procedures. ...It is this entire process of reflection-in-action which is central to the ‘art’ by which practitioners sometimes deal well with situations of uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict’ (Schön, 1983: 50).

All images convey something, whether they are ideas, impressions, or emotions, and these communications range from the concrete to the abstract. Bernard Tschumi writes that all architecture represents something – the king, or ideas of God (Tschumi, 1994). These each imply the notion of the signified and the signifier, and of course the interpreters who utilize the information. Conversations are always subject to misinterpretation, inadequacy, implied terms, private jokes, intonation or allusion. They are often too brief, too elaborate, too cryptic, too flowery, too dense, too obtuse, or too pointed in their language, but each event of communication evokes some emotional response, either subtle or overt. Dialogue is woven with the constant interpretation between what has been said and an appropriate response.

Juan Pablo Bonta expresses the indirect learning and added dimension of communication that emerges from an image viewed as an indicator. ‘An *indicator* is a directly perceivable event by means of which it is possible to learn something about other events which are not perceivable directly.’ The ‘...queue, ambulance and notice are *indicators* and the occurrence of the accident in their *meaning*’ (Bonta, 1979: 26). Each interaction requires a rethinking and a repositioning since dialogue must be a continual interpretation by the human to understand and react, whether actively or passively:

The picture and the actor's fantasy-imaginary are not devices to be borrowed from the real world in order to signify prosaic things which are absent. For the imaginary is much nearer to, and much farther away from, the actual – nearer because it is in my body as a diagram of the life of the actual...farther away from the actual because the painting is an analogue or likeness only according to the body; because it does not present the mind with an occasion to rethink the constitutive relations of things; because, rather...it offers to vision its inward tapestries, the imaginary texture of the real. (Kearney, 1988: 116)

Much dialogue vacillates between the past, present and future: the past that an architect has experienced and the future anticipation of a structure. This adds to the ambiguous nature of the medium and also multiples the effort in the translation.