

When architecture wanted to be drawing

Teresa Larumbe

Mariano G. Presencio

Though architectural drawing has always been considered a subsidiary element of the construction of buildings, there have been moments throughout its history where this “tacit agreement”, as Hélène Lipstadt called it, has been questioned, disturbing in its wake the fragile equilibrium between architecture and drawing, even reaching the point of confusing the ideal scenario and the material object, the conception and realization, and the representation and the represented reality¹.

One of the most recent episodes of this phenomenon took place during the seventies and eighties, in the middle of a deep crisis caused by a liberalization of the professional exercise of architecture. This liberalization had been caused by the productive and economic context, which had reduced the role of the architect to that of a mere technocrat. Against it arose a reaction from within the architectural culture, which aimed to restore the artistic and cultural prestige of the profession and the work of the architect. This would trigger a review of the foundations of the discipline and of the architectural practice that would then lead the protagonists of that period towards an Albertian definition of the drawing, where they would not only rediscover the space where architecture is built, but also the materials and the aim of the architect’s work.

In their efforts to reoutline such a specifically architectonic discipline, which is led and guided through drawing - and because they were very confident in being able to influence the definition of the image of architecture and the shaping of the city through their designs - architects would pause in this intermediate stage of creation, and would pour their desires and aspirations on to the paper, giving rise to some drawings that would by far exceed any purely professional intention, they would become autonomous objects, with an artistic value within them. These drawings would seem to safeguard a more genuine and purer architectural reality than the built reality that the economic and industrial system of the moment allowed.

Spanish architects, rooted in a strong constructive tradition, would however never lose sight of the final purpose of the architectural drawing: the material construction of the project. Others, such as Leon Krier, would refuse to build in order to avoid taking part in a perverse industrial system, or Massimo Scolari or John Hejduk, would design impossible constructions. In

contrast with the architectural discourse present in the designs and the *new sensibility* that specialized journals had contributed to spreading, in Spain the aim would be to overcome the limits of the graphic medium, in order to tackle the encounter between the promises what were contained in paper and the physical reality.

Therefore, throughout the eighties, Spanish architectural culture would see the emergence of a set of projects that were very different to those architectures that had defined the image of Spanish suburbs during the fifties and sixties. A new architecture, in which Oriol Bohigas could see a dependency on the means of production, which were no longer only the instruments of capital, or the construction industry, but its techniques for representation:

“The abundant crop of architectural drawings appeared in recent years states the intention of testifying a kind of critical usefulness no longer representable by real architecture. This critical approach can be considered as a consequence of a general disappointment in the achievements of modern architecture in the formation of the modern city or of a more-or-less conscious resistance to the standardization and anonymity of architecture. (...)”

Perhaps we should talk in terms of “architectonic painting” with cultural models based on the Renaissance tradition and the tradition of various -isms, keeping it distinct, however, from the hallucinatory derivations of “drawings of architecture”. Then, once the phenomenon is seen as belonging within the specific field of painting, might we not hypothesize the existence of simple and straightforward influence of it on architecture, with no confusion of boundaries between respective fields? And might we not interpret a certain type of architecture now beginning to be built as a new “pictorial architecture”?”²

In this article, published in *Domus* in 1980, Bohigas referred to an idea of architecture that had already appeared during the Baroque period. It was an idea of an architecture whose origins and *raison d’être* were to be founded in the new consideration that drawing had acquired throughout Renaissance, becoming the place where different artistic disciplines emerged from and fused together. From this “intimate relationship” between drawing and architecture (and, through it, between architecture and other arts), a painterly architecture would arise, the experience of which didn’t depend on tangible features or palpable shapes, as defined by Wölfflin in the early XX century, but on the visual impression that the artistic arrangement of its elements created in the viewer, since “the painterly style”, Wölfflin had wrote, “does not shape the things in themselves but represents the world as a seen world, namely, as it actually appears to the eye”³.

Therefore, when Bohigas referred to the architecture of that time as “pictorial”, he was suggesting an interpretation of it as a *visual event*, that had appropriated some of the traits and tasks that were characteristic

of the graphic medium, namely: to evoke, to suggest, to represent. Since drawing, as well as painting, tried to “conjure up by forms, lines, shades, or colours those mysterious phantoms of visual reality we call *pictures*”, according to Gombrich⁴; it follows that a painterly architecture, according to Wölfflin, would be an architecture that entrusts its elements with the task of evoking a reality that it is not in itself. Thus, it would be an architecture that was meant to be seen⁵, that displayed itself to a viewer that should then learn to “ignore the merely tangible character of the architectural forms” and instead devote himself to “the visual spectacle, where semblance is interwoven with semblance.”⁶

This viewer portrayed by Wölfflin is embodied in the figure of Antón Capitel during his visit to the project that Rafael Moneo built in Mérida, the first of the three examples that answer the question presented by Bohigas. In the article “Notes on the composition of the Museum of Roman Art”⁷, Capitel explains that when he stood in front of the main gallery of the museum, and contemplated it from a certain angle, his thoughts led on to an admiration of the interior spaciality of some of the buildings of the Roman Empire, in particular, the vaulted space of its basilicas (F. 01). However, when he entered further into the space, and he walked through it, the image of the basilica that Capitel had previously perceived vanished, and in its place, the spectator could only reach out to some brick walls pierced by an arch and arranged in a parallel way, as if they were the side wings of a stage.

Distancing himself from this tactile experience of architecture, Moneo’s aim was not to model the space. All the contrary, he played around with the tectonic elements, arranging them in a scenographic way, so that the overlapping of forms suggested “an image of a wide space similar to the roman vaulted spaces”⁸ to the viewer:

“the simple evocation that is made of the roman space, is not achieved by actually modelling a roman space, not even schematically, but he makes it appear, as an illusion, as a stage. The great basilica only exists in appearance, by means of that illusion created by the walls pierced by equal arches. The structure is like a dockyard, but the suggestion, the illusion, is closer to the vaulted space, to the substantial roman spaces. The perceived space is here virtual, because, even if it were a single primary mural order basilica, it would have its walls arranged in the opposite direction, in a longitudinal way.”⁹

The basilica “does not exist in reality”, Capitel insists¹⁰: it can only exist in the mind of the viewer who, thanks to his capacity of projection, connects the impressions he perceives though the eye with the memories stored in his mind, and by doing so, identifies and reorganizes the image of a basilica in the object perceived. The spectator can therefore see the roman space, but cannot touch it, since the basilica that the eye perceives disappears as soon as the spectator tries to approach it and apprehend it with his hands. In the Museum of Mérida, “the corporeal

reality is replaced by optical appearance”¹¹, and, much like Wölfflin wrote in reference to the painterly architecture, “the tangible” is combined “with the allure of the intangible”¹².

It is an architecture constructed on the same illusions of the drawing that conceived it. It is not possible to understand this mirage without understanding the drawing of perspective, which Moneo had entrusted with the conception of the building from its early beginning (F. 02), where we can glimpse the decisive role played by optics both in the design process and the author’s pictorial aims, since “whenever we are dealing with *vistas*”, as Wölfflin would say, “we will always be on painterly ground”¹³. The perspective drawing is not created later on, as a presentational drawing subsequent to conception, but it is there from the very conception of the architectural idea, in the words of its creator, “the first construction” of the project, “becoming a concrete and reality”¹⁴ (F. 03). Hence we can interpret the museum of Mérida as an architecture that has faced the challenge of building an image of perspective; cristalizing a visual impression into architecture, a brief and a sensitive appearance, an illusion. It is a work, that, ultimately, presents us with the same questions that Juan Antonio Ramirez stated about the architects of perspective of the 18th century: “what does such translation from painting into practice mean? Does not it suggest a tectonic feasibility of the optic dream to the client?”¹⁵

The conquest of illusion would also guide some of the projects created by Bofill in France in the early eighties. In them we can see, with greater evidence than in Moneo’s building, how their forms rely on the strategies of drawing to achieve this illusion. In *Le Viaduct, Les arcades du Lac* o *Les Temples du Lac*, in Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines; the Spaces of Abraxas, in Marné la Vallée, or La Place du Nombre d’Or, in Montpellier, Bofill turns his gaze to the architecture of humanism (the tradition by which architects of the late 20th century would see the incarnation of a specifically architectonical culture), in order to claim back the artistic condition of the architectonic fact¹⁶ and their profession, against the subordination of professionalism to the mechanisms of capitalism, which had destroyed suburbs of the cities with generic and anodine architecture.

It can be sensed in the first sketches of his projects, where Bofill tried to restore the role of the architect as the creator of the form and the image of the city (F. 04, F. 05). Bofill would invert the logic of functionalism by starting his projects by drawing the urban scene he wanted to achieve, and “integrating the programme” in the second stage of the creation¹⁷. By making the pencil strokes his object and the very material of his work, the architect would try to suggest the appearance of classic shapes, until he managed to capture the image that he wanted to communicate on paper, that the viewer could then recognize thanks to visual perception. Those sketches were made by unconnected lines; open outlines spread

throughout the paper; “wild lines as they are broken, dispersed, and multiplied”¹⁸ that Wölfflin would have linked with a drawing that had rejected the tactile sense of form, “they merely give the optical appearance of the thing”¹⁹. A feature that would reveal the primacy of the images that the painterly arrangement of lines could suggest to the viewer over the tectonic condition of form. They are impressions that portray the world as something that is seen, something that “issues from the eye alone and appeals only to the eye.”²⁰ We stand on the ground of impressionism, Wölfflin would say.

When pouring out the drawing into the three-dimensional reality, the outlines would be used, not as the contours of the different constructive elements, but rather as the guidelines that were to govern, articulate and structure the overlapping of such elements. Those strokes that had managed to deceive the viewer’s eye on paper, making them believe that he was perceiving the real model, would dictate the arrangement of the elements that composed the material building. Such materials, therefore, would not only be arranged according to the constructive logic or the imperatives of gravity, but they would be subject to the mechanisms of drawing to achieve the illusion, trying to reproduce the image that was contained in the drawing.

The architect would make use of the painterly arrangement of the building elements in order to create - in the viewer - the illusion of contemplating a specimen of classical architecture at a glance. However, whenever the viewer proceed to analyze each single element, his eye would not recognize any detail of the classical tradition; in *Les arcades du Lac*, the columns would be turned into brick walls, the entablature turned into windows (F.06 y F.07); in *Les espaces d’Abraxas*, the orders become stair cases and the capitals evolve into balconies (F.08 y F.09), something that also happens with the cornice of the *Place du nombre d’Or* or *Les Arcades du Lac* (F.10, F.11, F.12). When they are analyzed individually, such elements are deprived from their meaning; the illusion that an overall view made possible vanishes; leaving no trace of classical architecture. It is an architecture that was once interpreted by the critique as the tempering of architectonical language, but it is not a linguistic experiment, instead it is a visual trick. Taking the painterly arrangement of shapes, Bofill became a real illusionist, he managed to mislead the viewer, making him believe that he was looking at the image of a reality that he did not actually see. He managed to make architecture mean something that it is not in itself. He made architecture “express”, as Bofill would write, “what it does not say”²¹.

The architect manages therefore to bring such “theatre of figuration” to life, according to the definition of drawing stated by Jacques Guillaume²², forcing the viewer to put into practice his capacity of projection, in order to recognize the motif that has been aluded and to reconstruct the forms intellectually. Such reconstruction was intentionally pursued by Bofill²³, and, as with Moneo’s Museum

of Roman Art, it betrayed the theatrical and scenographic condition of architecture, as Tafuri would write:

*“The theatrical and the scenographic... allow the architect to underline the thoughtful nature, deeply critical, of his investigation. Provoking in the observer a distant attitude, they prevent him to be involved in the architectonic representation (...), rather, they introduce in him a critical attention, a need to intellectually reconstruct the creative process of the form.”*²⁴

Such theatricality would be pursued by Bofill intentionally with a polemical and critical goal²⁵. As Tafuri explains:

*“The involvement in a stage development, due to its intrinsic character, always forces the adoption of a certain degree of exile or distancing, that favours an ironic or playful attitude. Having said that, to translate a theatrical or scenographic condition into architecture allows for acting skillfully among a sharp criticism and a bitter skepticism, and it provides space for whoever wants to save the soul, by means of the fireworks of an intelligence which is alienated from a world of purposes, to hide his tragical dissapointment behind a comical mask.”*²⁶

The dissapointment that, ultimately, Bofill’s architecture would not manage to conceal, but would rather state in a straightforward, evident, and even strident way, was the impossibility of rejecting the rules of the game that the new capitalist society imposed on architecture²⁷. A fact that would automatically imply the rejection of any attempt to restore such architecture, specifically architectonic, that had been caught in his drawings. Bofill’s work pointed out that the “work of the architect”, represented by the classical tradition, could only be bought to life as a scenography, as a phantasmagoria, as an illusion, as an appearance. An appearance, John Berger would say, that was nothing but the “construction that arises from the waste of everything that has previously disappeared”²⁸.

Whereas Bofill’s painterly architecture, as well as Moneo’s “basilica”, presented an unrealism that did not affect the realistic substance of its components, other projects would emerge that would sacrifice the material condition of architecture to entrust the representation to the fragile wall frescos and ephemeral decoration. There are numerous examples, such as the ones found in the Church of Hospitalet or in the Villa Cecilia Garden, by Elías Torres and José Antonio Martínez Lapeña; the Chamber of Commerce of Seville, by Antonio González Cordón; the villas by Óscar Tusquets; the main Theatre of Zamora, the Campoamor Theatre of Oviedo or the Rojas Theatre of Toledo, among others; the interiors from the Movida in Madrid, by Guillermo Pérez Villalta; the night clubs in Barcelona; and many other works that would discover a “virtual and limitless ground” within architecture, as a “pictorial stand under new cases that have been barely explored”²⁹, as described in *Diseño Interior* magazine in 1991.

The plaster facing that would cover the walls of said buildings gave away a tectonic indifference, and it allowed the transformation of the façade into a great blank space where architecture could be redrawn, favouring the combination of figurative spaces of a different nature. Some architects turned their surfaces into a canvas into which they could pour the content of the drawing, in a straightforward and literal way, trying carefully not to alter the shapes that had been drawn on paper, nor to lose the allusive capacity, the visual effects and the artistic qualities achieved by the drawing along the way. This fact was favoured by what Robin Evans would define as the “easy traslation of the drawing”, that is, a homologous relationship between the surface of the representation and the surface of the building³⁰. Thus, a transfer was made from the painterly to the tectonic, and the features of the graphic representation would spread to the building, conquering it in some cases. The painting that was applied over the building would assume the content of the project, becoming the main theme of the architectural work.

One of those buildings was the project that Javier Vellés created for the baroque chapel of San Isidro in Madrid. The project was meant to continue the restoration process of the chapel that, after its destruction in 1936, had started in 1970 by the reconstruction of the spire, the cupola, the small tower and the dome, followed by the reconstruction of the white plaster decoration of the tambour, the ring, the pendentives and the arches. Thus, when the chapel came into the hands of Vellés, its upper part had been partially reconstructed but its interior was still ruined³¹.

Free of any historicist intentions, the new architectonic thought had renewed the interest of architects in restoration projects. Thanks to the opportunity they gave the architect to approach the material in ruins - a metaphor concerning the state of the discipline - and the opportunity to go back to being in contact with the built reality, free from any ideological mediation that would stain the innocence of the eye, they were able to study the materials that formed the *architectonic science*, as Rossi had claimed. The very nature of the assignment pushed Vellés to approach architecture through his senses: his touch, his sight. “Because history, when it is physically examined”, Capitel would say, “allows us to understand architecture in a less simple way, whereas restoration pushes oneself to get closer to craft and to material labour. Vellés managed in that way to touch physical things with his own hands, and to acquire direct knowledge from the materials, the techniques and the handcraft.”³²

In order to study the architecture he had to equip himself with the graphic instruments, the specific tools of the architect, “an extraordinary instrument to understand reality; a way of seeing and showing the world to others”³³, as Vellés had already done when he restored the walls of Tabarca’s island, in 1980³⁴. On the other hand, when confronted with such raw, embodied, physical and

concrete architecture, modern architectural theories, like functionalism and organicism, as well as their more sophisticated versions such as technologists and cibernetic experiments, prove to be ineffective. It was necessary to build on the lessons of tradition, and to turn back towards the specific *corpus* that had been gathered in former treatises. Drawing and knowledge of history met and became linked in these works of restoration. Two competences that, as Lipstad would describe, had allowed a reformulation of the architectural practice during Renaissance, by “closing the gap between architects and other artists” on the one hand, and “widening the one between them and rival builders”³⁵ on the other. Two skills that would serve Vellés to carry out such specifically architectonic work, guided and controlled from the graphic podium.

The ritual of approaching architecture would be carried out with scientific enthusiasm and accuracy (F.13. y F.14.). Following Leonardo’s method, who, according to Antonio López, would approach and see how an object was made before painting it, Vellés would also approach architecture to see how it was built first. With the help of a grid made by thread and play dough, he would get to understand its shapes and dimensions in order to translate them into paper afterwards³⁶. On paper, architectural reality would then be split and its anatomy would be analyzed thoroughly, revealing the geometrical reason of its configuration, the way it is set up, assembled and composed. The axonometric drawing of the capital would disclose the contemporaneity of the view of the draughtman (F.15.), since the piece is shred, and its elements are split from the main body, something which would be inconceivable in classical architecture, where the capital was made from just one block of stone.

The rigour of the drawing would not be diminished when using graphic techniques to build the architecture on paper; either wash, watercolours, or Chinese ink were used (F.16.). While he was erecting the architecture on paper, Vellés would try to underline its greatest outward appearance and epithelial attributes, those qualities that would try to seduce the senses, yielding a drawing that would display its own artistic value, a “technical and artistic” drawing, as its creator would say, that would allow him to convince the client, conquering him through the eyes, through the visual delight of the drawing.

Vellés would transform the practice to get to know and understand the physical reality, and as a result he would obtain a “portrait of history that, paradoxically, has disappeared”³⁷. As a portrait, it was a reality reenacted, an analogue reality, a reality with a better, more complete and a more perfect one than the physical reality that he had taken as a model. “An architectonic and figurative reality” Capitel would say, “capable of physically capturing the image of history that no longer exists.”³⁸ A reality that would be mistaken for its own image.

Once the architecture was captured on paper, once it was frozen at its most ideal version,

it would then be the time to overcome the confines of the graphic medium and to move on to physical reality. Vellés decided to adopt a scenographic solution, entrusting the painting -the characteristic raw material of the graphic domain- his desire to achieve the architectonic ideal that had been caught on the sheet of paper. An undertaking that would be carried out through strokes of painting that would manage to imitate the “colour, the veining and the cutting”³⁹ of the drawing over the plaster surfaces which had become the canvas. (F.17)

In order to complete this task, Vellés would make use of the optical tricks used by painters to deceive the eye and to create the illusion of depth, as he had previously done within the drawing. According to the pictorial codes, the closest elements to the spectator (such as the bases of the orders, their shafts, their capitals and the entablature that crowned them) would be highly detailed, in order to achieve a convincing appearance. However, as the motifs distanced from the viewer’s point of view, standing “far away enough not to see their real matter”, the elements would be barely sketched, leaving the rest to the intuition of the projective capacity of the viewer, according to the Gestalt principle of continuity, as pointed out by Consuelo Martorell:

“Thus, the decoration of the part above the entablature (arches and tympanum, pendentives, ring and tambour) was washpainted, it received a pictorial treatment, simplified and dramatic, without painting it too much or imitating almost nothing of it. Red and Black were used to paint the marble in the architectural backgrounds, yellow for the golden capitals, craters, scrolls and shields, and greens, pinks, violets and oranges for the flowers, garlands and fruits.”⁴⁰

In that manner, Vellés managed to deny reality via the painting. The creation of an image prevailed over the tectonic condition of form, illusion took precedence over material reality, obtaining a metamorphosis of architecture into drawing. The tectonic structure would become the stand of the drawing, achieving “a perfect imitation of what we see, but we do not touch”⁴¹, and making the viewer see a reality that did not exist. Making use of that “visual discipline that the baroque artists already practiced”⁴², Vellés would create a pure illusionist surface from the walls of the chapel, a real *trompe l’oeil*. An artistic resource that - as Miriam Milman pointed out - had emerged at different moments in history to signify the desire of life in a different environment. An illusionist trick with which the author tried to engage the viewer, making him escape a reality that he was forced to accept, in order to bring him into an ideal world, one of fiction. It was a resource, ultimately, that the artist would use to materialize a protest, a rejection:

“Emerging in the most diverse interiors, today’s trompe l’oeil responds to the need to reintroduce a painterly and plastic element into the architectural universe, but also to materialize a protest, a phenomenon of rejection. As has often happened in the past, it pretends to abolish the existing structures

and to allow the evasion of the gaze towards a world that, today, has the same verosimilitude a dream has. Strongly imbued with the surrealist experience, it questions the ambiguity of reality, exacerbating its detail (...). The trompe l'oeil sometimes represents the great architectures of Antiquity, but also the romantic ruins of a closer time. The evoked landscapes are rarely the image of the external city, but evoke further landscapes, always sunny. Nostalgic, ironic, sometimes picturesque or sly (...), nowadays the trompe l'oeil mainly signifies a desire to live in a different environment. More spectacular expressions of this desire, the painted facades have become a complex phenomenon, both in the artistic and urbanistic dimension and in their social meaning.²⁸³

In the chapel of San Isidro, the imaginary environment that Vellés, through the illusionist use of painting, tried to evoke, was not a natural reality, as with Mannerist architecture; nor was it a transcendent reality, true, permanent and eternal, as represented in the baroque cupolas of the Counter-reformation. It was rather a specifically architectonic reality, whose existence, in the productive context in the late 20th century, could be only feasible within the boundaries of paper, whereas the physical reality should just settle for building “a reproduction, an accurate evocation of it”, as Capitel would say, “in his fascination for the absolute discovery of a veiled reality -in his pursuit of an accuracy which is able to know about even the most detailed questions of the model- the artist can apprehend it in the drawing, but he cannot, with reality, reach nothing more than another (the most perfect) of its representations.”²⁴⁴

Therefore, in the chapel of San Isidro, the architect tried to transform the built reality into an object as similar as possible to the architecture that was captured in the drawing. In that way, the physical reality was defined as a representation of the real architecture that inhabited the drawing. A fact that pointed out a reversal in the directionality of the classical mimesis; it was not the drawing that imitated reality, but the building that would have to resemble the drawing, as Enric Soria would also state:

“Drawing itself, the drawing, is already the project. Drawing is not only a tool, but it is already the very material, and the object of the work, it is the design. (...) Therefore, the drawing is like the prototype of an idea, from which, through mechanical mediums or whatever, the idea is translated into reality, it is built. (...) You can only foresee the drawing and the floor’s surface colour by drawing it, painting it. In that sense, we often say: if the drawing of the Project is satisfying, the only thing you should achieve is that the building resembles the drawing you have already developed as much as possible, isn’t it?”²⁴⁵

These words pointed out a reversal of the existing codes of understanding. A subversion that Óscar Tusquets had already played with in 1975, when, after having contemplated Dalí’s painting “Mae West Face which may be used as a Surrealist Apartment”, suggested that the artist should make his dream come true and represented the painting in one

of the galleries of the new museum he was building in Figueres, giving way to a project that played with the paradox of building a representation of another artistic reality, more original and authentic, that was, equally, a representation (F.18., F.19. y F.20.).

And it is in this reversal of the relationship between reality and representation where these architectures would achieve their most critical success, proving that “the method of surrealism as a process of subversion of the existing codes” was “the only way to act within a stabilized society, developed, and hardly attackable in its modernisation process”²⁴⁶, as Ignasi Solà-Morales would write. Only by imitating with physical reality, the reality that was captured in their designs, the architects would be able to carry out their work rationally within that irrational context they had to live, as Lluís Clotet stated²⁴⁷. A surrealist subversion of the existing codes to understand reality that would arise, as it had been stated by André Breton, *from a consciousness ever clearer, and the same time, more passionate, of the sensible world.*²⁴⁸

1. Hélène Lipstadt, “Architectural Publications, competitions and exhibitions”, Architecture and its image (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1989).

2. Oriol Bohigas, “Pictorial Architecture”, Domus, n. 603 (February 1980): 7-11.

3. “It has rightly been said that the effect of a well-proportioned space will inevitably be perceived even if one is led through it blindfolded. Since space is something corporeal, it follows that it can only be sensed with corporeal organs. This spatial effect is intrinsic to all architecture. However, if a painterly stimulus is added, then that is something purely optical, pictorial, and therefore no longer accessible to even the most general kind of tactile feeling. The view through a succession of spaces is painterly not on account of the architectonic quality of the individual spaces but on account of the image, the optical image received by the viewer. Each overlap contributes to the effect of this image, which is the product of overlapped and overlapping forms: an individual form in itself can be touched, but an image arising from a succession of forms can only be seen.” Heinrich Wölfflin, Principles of art history. The problems of the Development of Style in Early Modern Art, (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute Publications Program, 2015), 144.

4. Ernst Gombrich, Art and Illusion (London: Phaidon Press, 2008)

5. Wölfflin, Principles of art history, 86.

6. Wölfflin, Principles of art history, 149-150

7. Antón Capitel, “Notas sobre la composición del museo de Arte Romano”, Arquitectura, n. 248 (Mayo-Junio 1984): 46-47.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. Antón Capitel, “Arquitectura española: 1939-1992”, “Arquitectura española del siglo XX”, Summa Artis Vol. 40 (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1995), 550.

11. Ibid. p. 147

12. Ibid. p. 322

13. Ibid. p. 145

14. Rafael Moneo, Juan Antonio Cortés, Comentarios sobre dibujos de 20 arquitectos actuales (Barcelona: ETSAB, 1978), 2.

15. Juan Antonio Ramírez, Prólogo al libro de Jorge Sáinz, El dibujo de arquitectura, teoría e historia de un lenguaje gráfico (Barce-lona, Ed. Reverté, 2005), 10.

16. “When I started to build in France, my main worry was to prove that the function and the draconian budgets did not impose any aesthetic. It would be possible to host people, and offer them a comfortable bathroom, two or three bedrooms and a sitting room while doing a proper architect’s work.” Ricardo Bofill, Espacio y Vida (Barcelona: Tusquets Editoriales, 1990), 69.

17. Ibid., 69.

18. Wölfflin, Principles of art history, 111.

19. Ibid., 103.

20. Ibid., 103.

21. Bofill, Espacio y vida, 190.

22. Jacques Guillerme, La figurazione in architettura. Traducción de Laura Agnesi (Milano: Franco Angeli Editore, 1982), 13.

23. “The eye here perceives a triangle, there the cylinder of an order or even a trapezium. The figure is identified.” Bofill, Espacio y Vida, 190.

24. Manfredo Tafuri, Retórica y experimentalismo. Ensayos sobre la arquitectura de los siglos XVI y XVII (Sevilla: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1978), 84-85.

25. “In my case, archetypes, regardless their own value, are invested with a polemic mission, a expressive one. For instance, the theatre.” Bofill, Espacio y vida, 173.

26. Tafuri, Retórica y experimentalismo, 23.

27. “we are not mere cabinet curiosities, but actors within our full rights in the economic game. It is no longer possible to practice architecture on the margins, as an addition, but we must be the very core of the economic fight.” Bofill, Espacio y vida, 92

28. John Berger, Sobre el dibujo. (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 2011), 52.

29. Jose María Faerna, “Arquitectura y pintura. En búsqueda de la unidad perdida”, Diseño Interior, n. 3 (Abril 1991): 44-57

30. Robin Evans, Translations from drawing to building and other essays (Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1997), 152-193

31. Consuelo Martorell, “La capilla de San Isidro en Madrid”, Diseño Interior, n. 6 (Julio/Agosto 1991): 96.

32. Antón Capitel, “Un retrato de la historia. La reconstrucción del interior de la capilla de San Isidro en Madrid”, Diseño Interior, n. 6 (Julio/Agosto 1991): 100.

33. Ibid.

34. Vellés describes the ritual of preparing the graphic tools to approach the analysis of architecture in Tabarca Island, in Alicante: “It seemed necessary to understand the walls there, in the island itself, to contemplate them calmly, to draw them, to touch them, to photograph them, to observe the ravages of the sea in the masonry, to live with them and to take care of them. (...) We loaded the car with boards, flexes, paralax, drawing instruments, papel rolls, folders, books, maps and nautical charts, cameras, a 100 meter tape, a diving equipment, a sight and an optical level made of bronze, with its robust Wood tripod borrowed from José Toran, the popular engineer.” Javier Vellés, Javier Vellés (Madrid: Fundación Argentaria, 1995), 26

35. Lipstadt, Architectural Publications, competitions and exhibitions, 129.

36. Javier Vellés, Entrevista personal con el autor, Toledo, 1st August 2017.

37. Capitel, Un retrato de la historia, 100.

38. Ibid.

39. Ibid.

40. Martorell, La capilla de San Isidro en Madrid, 98

41. Ibid.

42. Capitel, Un retrato de la historia, 100.

43. Miriam Milman, Histoire et actualité du trompe d’oeil architectural, en Images et Imaginaires d’architecture, ed. Jean Dethier (Paris: Éditions du Centre Georges Pompidou, 1992), 91-92. (Mi traducción)

44. Capitel, Un retrato de la historia, 100.

45. Enric Soria, “Una Conversación sobre dibujo en la Escuela de Arquitectura”, Dibujos (Barcelona: Escola Técnica Supe-rior d’Arquitectura de Barcelona, 1991), 22

46. Ignasi Solà-Morales Rubió, Eclecticism and vanguardia (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1980), 204

47. Lluís Clotet, “A Barcelone pour une architecture de l’évocation”, Werk-Archithese Vol. 66, n. 25-36 (1979): 23-24

48. André Breton, Les pas perdus (Paris: Éditions de la nouvelle revue Française, 1924)

Painterly architecture Representation Scenography Postmodernism Surrealism