

# On why we should consider that the interior perspective render is art, after all: a review of literature concerning the development of perspective representations of interior spaces from the Italian Renaissance to the digital age

Louie T. Navarro  
Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Gerhard Bruyns  
Hong Kong Polytechnic University

## **Abstract**

*In order to establish how the interior perspective render can secure for interior design the status of a legitimate art form, this review of literature will be looking into the history of representing three-dimensional interior spaces from the varied perspectives, or better yet, the evolutionary perspective of the practice of interior spatial representation itself: from painters to architects to decorators and eventually, interior designers beginning from the time interior space was first depicted, all the way to the current iteration of the interior perspective render created with the use of computer technology.*

*Now if this ‘elevation’ may seem antithetical given the frame of reclamation most especially when one considers that this is suggestive of a return to autonomy—that divorce of form and function—that has been repeatedly levied against art in order to diminish its significance, this article will forward the necessity of such a positioning as we are catapulted into the digital age.*

*Ambitiously, by forwarding this render as the consummate ‘end’ that encompasses the historical, theoretical, and practical facets of the practice of interior design, this review will argue how claims to its value as a work of art can be indicative of the profession’s role in reimagining spaces in a future poised for a literal iteration of the notion of a space transcending spatiality. At the most basic, this review will look into how such an elevation can secure the continuity of a practice that with its very physical, tangible quality is challenged by the inescapable reality of virtuality.*

### **Shared practices or Representations as once shared by practices**

Focused on the transmission<sup>1</sup> of the design idea, graphical representations of the interior have their histories embedded within practices that have in turn been codified during the Italian Renaissance<sup>2</sup>. These drawing-types' influence on the practice of architecture—and of course, interior design<sup>3</sup>—cannot be denied: six centuries later, not much has changed in the way they are employed today.

We can arrive at so many definitions of what these drawings themselves in turn represent, but two definitions should suffice for this endeavour. The first is from Lotz' "The Rendering of the Interior in Architectural Drawings of the Renaissance"<sup>4</sup> wherein the author forwarded a definition in the 'narrowest' sense in that these drawings "serve in the planning, the execution, or the illustration of the building project" (4). The second is from Brothers' "What Drawings Did in Renaissance Italy"<sup>5</sup>: "Drawings functioned as a form of communication with patrons, builders, and members of the workshop" (108). These definitions are not dissimilar in that they describe these drawings as as a means to an end that in turn make use of specific techniques depending on the audience they wish to engage: (1) other architects (in *the planning* together with the *members of the workshop*); (2) the clients (in *the illustration of the building project* for the benefit of the *patron*); and (3) the contractors (in *the execution* by the *builders*).

For this review, we will concern ourselves with the last two types beginning with the drawings that are meant primarily to communicate with contractors: orthographic representations. Institutionalised by way of Raphael's letters to Pope Leo X of 1519<sup>6</sup> that contained a proposal for a set of drawings consisting of the 'triumvirate' of plan, elevation (exterior), and the section (interior), this set paved the way for preciseness during the course of building in the absence of the architect. Individually, these drawings are pieces to a "puzzle"<sup>7</sup> that is the object they depict.

Other drawings such as axonometric, multiview, and specific to the interior, the laid-out interior/developed surface interior<sup>8</sup> are all attempts at combining this triumvirate of orthographically-projected drawings. What is important to note here is the preciseness in which these conventions are carried-out in order to retain all pertinent information. This is most true in the case of axonometric drawing that unlike the others, the principal plane or axis of an object is not parallel to the projection plane. With this technique, in an attempt to depict a three-dimensional object on a two-dimensional on a two-dimensional, flat surface the scale for both near and distant features remain the same. An easier way to define what axonometric projection is is to say what it is not: perspective projection.

This is the second mode of graphical representation that concerns us here and is considered as one of the landmark achievements of the Renaissance as “the great opener of western eyes”<sup>9</sup> <sup>10</sup>.

Considering how many architects of the Renaissance were also artists (painters, sculptors, etc.) or were artists first before becoming architects<sup>11</sup>, the histories of representations in architecture and painting are inevitably intertwined. Inevitable in a sense that drawing materials and implements, and more importantly, drawing techniques were shared amongst these so-called Renaissance men<sup>12</sup>.

Alas, such an ideal blurring of practices never lasted. Perhaps it didn’t help that painters were considered to belong to a higher order than architects at the time.

As Lotz succinctly noted: the reason why Alberti would choose to write about perspective drawing in his treatise *On Painting* instead of the *Ten Books on Architecture* (*On the Art of Building in Ten Books*) is that “the architect merely gives substance to the inventions of the painter. Consequently, architecture is an art of lower rank, painting one of higher” (14).

### **Architectural truth or Representations in the age of the specialisation of practices**

This divide between architects and painters had nothing to do with the ways and means of representation per se but in its perception instead as it relates to *truth*.

The problem lies in perspective drawings’ inability to convey useful information in its distorted, “untruthful”<sup>13</sup> depiction of space because of foreshortening and overlaps—although ‘truthfulness’ is relative here. Because on the other hand, perspective drawing was championed precisely because it showed the viewer a ‘correct’ drawing of a three-dimensional world on a two-dimensional plane—on how it ‘truthfully’ represented what we see<sup>14</sup>.

But this perceptual ‘truthfulness’ is of no use to a trade that necessitates precise measurements to facilitate actual construction in the absence of the architect<sup>15</sup>. As Evans would contrast orthographic drawings with perspective drawings in “Architectural Projection”<sup>16</sup>: “The advantage of orthographic projection is that it preserves more of the shape and size of what is drawn than perspective does. It is easier to make things from than to see things with” (21). A treatise on how orthographic projection became the preferred medium of the architectural profession, Evans would conclude that: “As painting after the Renaissance was overwhelmingly perspectival, so architecture after the Renaissance was overwhelmingly orthographic” (25).

Although perspective drawings were never completely shunned in practice<sup>17</sup>, it became, to use Lotz' term, an architectural 'expedient' specifically used for the appreciation of clients who cannot make sense of orthographic drawings. Flowing from this is the idea that perspective drawings were easier to sell.

But this did not change the fact that the perceptual 'truthfulness' that the Renaissance painters and scholars after them so championed was reduced to an 'expedient' in the practice of architecture: "a means of attaining an end, especially one that is convenient but possibly improper or immoral"<sup>18</sup> in its 'untruthfulness'.

By relegating perspective drawing to the domain of painting, it effectively positioned architecture—by way of its primary means of communication, i.e., orthographic drawings—on a higher moral plane of truth.

All this is even of more interest given that orthographic projection was initially considered as a mere preparatory step in the drawing of perspective—"relegated to the status of a technical manner: technical drawing"<sup>19</sup>—before it transformed into "the inviolate medium of architectural thinking"<sup>20</sup>.

In the same essay by Lotz—it was a treatise entitled the "Rendering of the *Interior* [emphasis mine] in Architectural Drawings" after all—he would identify the first perspective drawing of an interior that faithfully subscribed to Alberti's prescriptions in *On Painting*: with a central vanishing point that primarily served as a setting for human figures.

By none other than a painter, Pisanello, it is a *dipintura*—Alberti's term for interior perspectives—of a space with barrel vaulting that is more of a shell in its frame construction.

The way it was drawn is still considered a rudimentary technique of representing three-dimensional space on a two-dimensional surface for any interior design student today.

**Ideal representations or Representations that have become interior design-specific**

Dated 1776, the painting entitled Room in the Prinz-Max-Palais in Dresden has been described by Mario Praz in *An Illustrated History of Interior Decoration: from Pompeii to Art Nouveau*<sup>21</sup> as an "example of an interior painted for its own sake without people: it is one of the first, if not the first, of a genre which was to have an enormous success in the course of the 19th century" (154).

In similar fashion but of limited scope, Charlotte Gere's *Nineteenth Century Interiors: An Album of Watercolors*<sup>22</sup> also focused on this genre of portraiture the subject of which is the interior space: "The depiction of rooms for their own sake, rather than as background to a narrative, anecdotal, or portrait painting, germinated, reached its fullest flowering, and died within the space of one century" (14). Loosely, they can be referred to as interior-portraits owing to the fact that they were made after the construction of the interior.

Although at the onset, these interior-portraits can be argued to have no relation to what concerns us here (i.e., graphical representations), it must be highlighted that the provenance of such ideal representations—"for their own sake"—was identified by Gere to be a corollary of the first use of the term 'interior decoration' in print with the release of the instalment of illustrations by Charles Percier and Pierre Fontaine in 1801 as part of the publication *Receuil de Decorations Interieures*: "That this interest in interior decoration had a direct bearing on the taste for interior views is evidenced by the fact that so many of them show rooms that must just have been decorated and newly arranged" (13).

Gere would also note of other significant publication that contributed to this new profession's popularity: Thomas Hope's *Household Furniture and Interior Decoration* published 1807 and George Smith's *A Collection of Designs for Household Furniture and Interior Decoration* published 1808 and "Within less than a decade the concept of an independent art of 'interior decoration' was established" (13).

By the mid-19th century, the publication in 1868 of Charles Eastlake's *Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, Upholstery, and Other Details*<sup>23</sup> represented an important marker in the history of the specialised practice of interior decoration. Eastlake would position himself against the tide of practitioners working on domestic interiors such as architects<sup>24</sup> and most especially, upholsterers and curtain-makers, and pronounced that "Indeed, it was the practical evidence that a healthy and genuine taste was altogether wanting" (74).

There is one more work that today is considered part of the triumvirate of publications alongside that of Praz's and Gere's that focused on the historical development of the interior by way of its representation: Peter Thornton's *Authentic Décor: The Domestic Interior, 1620-1920*<sup>25</sup>.

Beyond the criticism levied against these publications<sup>26</sup>, what is of interest for us here is the year Thornton's survey stopped: 1920. Involving architects and painters once again,

this decade will witness a reunion of practices separated four centuries prior. This time, these practices will rally against perspective drawing.

In the wake of this, the domestic interior will be witness to the demise of the interior decorator.

There are two things worth emphasising at this juncture. The first point is the recognition of the lasting influence of the medium of watercolor and of course, perspective drawing in the professional practice of interior design. Indirectly, these publications by Praz, Thornton, and Gere reinforced the preeminence of a representational technique that have become particular to the practice of interior decoration all the way through the early part of the 20th century: the interior perspective drawing rendered in watercolor. This can be read as the hijacking of a medium that the profession can call its own. Effectively outliving the practice as it has been known as interior decoration, this brings us to the second point: the plight of the professional interior decorator can be similarly argued to have *germinated, reached its fullest flowering, and died within the space of one century.*

### **Scientific recourse or Representations as a site of the reinforcement of architecture's dominance**

Firmly believing the need to do away with perspective drawing that is restrictive and of course, anthropocentric, El Lissitzky's "A. and Pangeometry"<sup>27</sup> published in 1925 championed axonometric drawing as an alternative. This would be preceded two years prior by the De Stijl exhibition at the L'Effort Moderne gallery in Paris, France: a year that had Yve-Alain Bois in "Metamorphosis of Axonometry" proclaiming as the year of the "modern revival of axonometry" (42).

Modernist painters as spearheaded by the Impressionist and Cubist<sup>28 29</sup> and eventually, architects<sup>30</sup>, were contesting the fixity, finiteness of the conventions of perspective as reduced to that single vantage point—as a singular truth<sup>31</sup>—that had ultimately limited our visual faculty<sup>32</sup>.

Additionally, Robert Bruegmann in "The Pencil and the Electronic Sketchboard: Architectural Representation and the Computer"<sup>33</sup>, a work that will trace the transition of the architectural drawing from 'pencil to computer,' noted how Modernist architects were further driven by "their enthusiasm for removing all traces of the subjective and personal" (142).

No longer an issue of the 'truthful' orthographic drawings versus the 'untruthful' perspective drawings of the Renaissance, the issue by the turn of the 20th century ran in

a more or less parallel fashion: objectivity versus subjectivity, the structural versus the ornamental, the scientific versus the aesthetic.

Bruegmann forwarded this to be a battle of graphical representations involving class: the masses (scientific) versus the elites (aesthetic) by highlighting the architectural convention of representations at the turn of the century: “watercolor washes and other ‘pictorial’ effects that revealed the hand of the architect were banished in favor of precise, hard-line drawings in ink on flat white paper with, occasionally, flat color, usually in primary hues” (142).

As early as the mid-twentieth century, this shift was reflected in the popularity of employing the more ‘scientific’ means of representation (orthographic drawings) versus interior perspective renders in watercolor that privileged the material elements of the interior (specifically colors, textures, and patterns) in one of the renowned schools for interior design.

A study that looked into the history of a school that was known for its ‘good taste’, Joanna Merwood-Salisbury in “Interior Design as Environmental Design: The Parsons Program in the 1960s”<sup>34</sup> would expound how, driven by social awareness and engagement, the shift from ‘aesthetic to scientific’ in the school’s curriculum—as an example, the replacement of the course “Drawing and Painting” with “Graphic Communications”—was part of the interdisciplinary approach that had complete disregard for the distinction across spatial disciplines (architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, etc.) across post-war America.

This change was “based on modernist ideas about the improvement of physical well-being for all and the betterment of social relations, an approach in which the concept of taste appeared to have no place” (119).

Given the history of the said school’s curriculum founded on the practice of interior decoration—it was the title of the program after all when it was established in 1904<sup>35</sup>—that focused on the ‘updating’ of historic, French period interiors<sup>36</sup>, this meant that like the upholsterer’s and curtain maker’s in England who were accused of lacking taste a century prior, the interior decorator was likewise, to put it mildly, demoted, but this time for privileging taste.

Although there is this one curious comment made by Lissitzky that appeared as a footnote to his 1925 text. After proclaiming Mondrian’s ‘solution’ to representation with a

return to flatness, the author observed that: “When the De Stijl Artists [artists] transpose the Mondrian principle to the three planes of space, they become interior decorators”.

On the one hand, this can be read much like another demotion, on the other, it can be considered as an endorsement of ‘decorators’ as artists.

**Finally, beauty or *The value of the interior perspective render in the future practice of interior design***

Mark Wigley in *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida’s Haunt*<sup>37</sup> reclaimed architecture from the violence that philosophy has exacted against it by bringing to fore the architectonic configuration of philosophy. For the author, architecture is that structure that gave philosophy its ground in the same way that Heidegger’s temple unconcealed the ground on which it stood. Here the case for the dominance of architecture is established: that it can never be a mere ornament to philosophy, a mere cosmetic addition—this status is reserved for interior design.

In the process of exposing the fissures within the architecture that is philosophy, Wigley had (inadvertently?) enacted the very same violence he compellingly charged philosophy of employing in its subordination of architecture.

We have so far traced the systemic violence enacted between practices grounded in their more or less shared representational processes: painters versus architects; architects versus painters; interior decorators (who derived their practice of representation from painters) versus architects, upholsterers, and curtain-makers (who lacked taste); Modernist architects and painters versus perspective drawing (indirectly, all practitioners who utilise this may they be architects, painter, etc. themselves); interior designers versus interior decorators (who privileged taste); painters versus/for decorators (Lissitzky); and architects versus interior designers (structure versus ornament) or alternatively, architects for interior designers within the frame of this endeavour (ornament/interior design as art).

Given the context of reclaiming the practice, we can very well do what Wigley has done, i.e., disprove such a positioning, but instead, we are taking the route of acquiescence and look at how such a conferral can actually be beneficial to interior design. This is why this review was grounded in the presupposition that if interior design is art, then its processes—from the conception of the design idea all the way to its articulation that culminates in the interior perspective render—must then hold the key to its own reclamation.

Such an endeavour must be considered ever more relevant in this day and age where the practice sees itself vacillating between autonomy that necessitates the isolation of its

stakeholders or subsumption under the rubric of the blurring of exterior and interior environments that necessitates a certain flexibility of its stakeholders. It can certainly be argued that nothing is wrong with one or the other, but so long as history repeats itself, a practice uncertain of its stand, unsure of what it can bring to the table dominated by discourses of other practices, interior spatial practices will forever be subjected to a certain... disparagement: neither structurally important nor aesthetically vaunted.

As Kent Kleinman in "Taste, After All"<sup>38</sup> would comment on why indeed, there is still that question of taste in the practice of interior design today:

The field's episodic and earnest attempts to selectively distance itself from its own history—to posit a state of affairs 'after taste'<sup>39</sup>—are in response to charges of subjectivism, elitism, and classicism that cling to the history of eighteenth-century enlightenment itself; who, after all, but wealthy white English gentlemen or German philosophers had the time and comfort to contemplate with utter disinterest objects of the beauty in the world? (39)

It is a given that the outcomes (i.e., interior-designed spaces) can never be considered as works of art in this sense of being 'looked at' for the sole reason of its occupancy, but delving into the processes of interior-designing itself (specifically: representation) can afford us a certain ground from which to reconsider how such an act of 'looking at' is possible.

Once we consider how representations of interior-designed spaces as the terminal representation in the practice continue to present itself as an aspirational ideal—an act borne *and* sustained in liminality, in-between planning expressed as orthography and actual construction—we arrive at a definition of a work of art.

Although referring to the dangers of the positioning of architecture closer to the visual arts, Robin Evans' commentary in "Translations from Drawing to Building"<sup>40</sup> is nonetheless applicable in the case of interior design: "...we would be relinquishing claim to architecture that now flourishes within the political, economic and social order... that in giving up grandiose pretensions to represent and define the social world in both its imaginative and active aspects architecture may, by contradiction and concentration, constitute anew?" (157)

## **Epilogue: Post-truth spaces**

As Michael Baxandall noted in *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*<sup>41</sup>: “Much of what we call ‘taste’ lies in this, the conformity between discriminations demanded by a painting and skills of discrimination possessed by the beholder” (34).

Baxandall's seminal publication would argue that the production of a work of art is contingent on the society where it was produced and our understanding of the same should be informed by the specificity of such a milieu<sup>42</sup>. This is embodied in the notion of the ‘period eye.’ Simply, it is a mode of looking defined by what an individual ‘brings-in’—innate, learned, and experienced—in the interpretation of that which what one looks at. But in as much as it demands of the ‘beholder’ certain discriminatory skills, it also demands of the artists the same set of skills in order to produce a work of art.

Although Baxandall's argument for a specific Quattrocento cognitive style vis-à-vis a Quattrocento pictorial style is still very relevant, the question today is: with the preponderance of internet use and corollary exposure to information (regardless of say, veracity), how is ‘discrimination’ evolved? Also of computer technology: has it then pushed our discriminatory eye? Has it also, in turn, pushed the processes behind works of art? And specific to this endeavour, what of the practice of interior design?

The idea of immaculate interior spaces speaks of the fashion in interior design then (the interior-portraits of the 19th century) but is still very much alive today: most especially with the prevalence of digital representations that for a time “represented in many ways the fulfilment of the modernist dreams of the 1920s of a rational, economical architecture”<sup>43</sup>. In light of the fact that in the 200 years or so that have passed since the ‘beginnings’ of the profession as personified by the interior decorator, could it be that this ‘fashion’—as close as it is, by definition, tied to the currency of the new—may, instead of ‘running out of fashion,’ actually portend the future of interior design?

Further, unlike a study of a buried civilisation, drawing inferences from artefacts, we are looking at a contemporaneous phenomenon. Happening as we speak or better yet, *Instagrammable*.

As these drawings are continually projected in the virtual space of the internet, shared in various social networking platforms where the reception of ideas (by clients, potential or otherwise) makes the ‘real’ secondary, can we consider such sophisticated representations as not only crucial for the said reception of the design idea but may ultimately be changing the very idea of space itself?

Going beyond their use-value as tools necessary in the selling of interior spaces, the value of the interior perspective render must be considered important now more than ever.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Here, we take from Evans' essay "Translations from Drawing to Building" where in his introduction he likened the drawing to a vehicle.

Robin Evans, "Translations from Drawing to Building," in *Translations From Drawing to Building and Other Essays* (London: Architectural Association Publications, 1997), 153-193.

<sup>2</sup> Eve Blau and Edward Kaufman, Introduction, in Eve Blau, Edward Kaufman, Robin Evans, and Centre Canadien d'architecture (eds.), *Architecture and its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation: Works from the Collection of the Canadian Centre for Architecture* (Montreal: Cambridge, MA: Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture; Distributed by the MIT Press, 1989), 13-15; Brothers; Robin Evans, *The Projective Cast: Architecture and its Three Geometries* (Cambridge, MA.; London: MIT Press, 1995); Lotz.

<sup>3</sup> Although as argued by Amy Campos and Deborah Schneiderman in their introduction for the compiler *Interiors Beyond Architecture* (2018), the field of interior design can be considered to go beyond being a just a "subset" (xv) of architecture, this Review of literature will not concern itself with reclaiming the practice of interior design by going this route. In fact, this endeavour will go in the opposite direction of such an argument as will be forwarded in the subsection 'Finally, beauty or The value of the interior perspective render in the future practice of interior design.'

<sup>4</sup> Wolfgang Lotz, "The Rendering of the Interior in Architectural Drawings of the Renaissance," in *Studies in Italian Renaissance Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977), 1-65.

<sup>5</sup> Cammy Brothers, "What Drawings Did In Renaissance Italy," *The Companions to the History of Architecture*, 1:4 (2017), 104-135.

<sup>6</sup> Yve-Alain Bois, "Metamorphosis of Axonometry," *Daidalos*, 1 (1981), 41-58; Evans, *The Projective*; Lotz.

<sup>7</sup> Blau and Edward, 13.

<sup>8</sup> See the definitive scholarships on the representation of interior spaces of Laura Jacobus in "On 'Whether a Man Could See before Him and behind Him Both at Once': The Role of Drawing in the Design of Interior Space in England c. 1600-1800" and Robin Evans in "The Developed Surface: An Enquiry into the Brief Life of an Eighteenth-Century Drawing Technique".

<sup>9</sup> Robin Evans, "Architectural Projection," in *Architecture and its Image*, 18-35; 24.

<sup>10</sup> See Philipp H. Lepenies' *Art, Politics, and Development: How Linear Perspective Shaped Policies in the Western World* (2014) on how this means of representation had far-ranging influence that went beyond the domain of the art world—to name but just one of the many scholarly works that dealt with the preeminence of perspective drawing.

<sup>11</sup> Brothers; Lotz.

<sup>12</sup> Brothers.

<sup>13</sup> Lotz, 4.

<sup>14</sup> Elkins, *The Poetics of Perspective*; Laura Jacobus, "On 'Whether a Man Could See,'" *Architectural History*, 31 (1988), 148-165.

<sup>15</sup> Brothers; Lotz.

<sup>16</sup> Evans, "Architectural".

<sup>17</sup> Bois; Brothers; Lotz.

<sup>18</sup> *Oxford Dictionaries*, s.v. "expedient," accessed May 24, 2018.

<sup>19</sup> Evans, "Architectural," 24.

- 20 Evans, "Architectural," 33.
- 21 Mario Praz, *An Illustrated History of Interior Decoration: from Pompeii to Art Nouveau* (Milan: Longanesi & C., 1981).
- 22 Charlotte Gere, *Nineteenth Century Interiors: An Album of Watercolors* (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1992).
- 23 Charles Eastlake, *Hints on Household Taste: The Classic Handbook of Victorian Interior Decoration* (New York: Dover Publications, 1986).
- 24 For Thornton, this divide amongst practitioners working on the domestic interior, specifically between the architects and upholsterers, began in the late 17th century and "ragged right through the nineteenth century" (1984, 10).
- 25 Peter Thornton, *Authentic Décor: The Domestic Interior, 1620-1920* (New York: Viking, 1984).
- 26 Editors Mark Taylor and Julieanna Preston in their introduction to *Intimus: Interior Design Theory Reader* (2006) would cast doubts on these publications as they "perpetuate the style-manual documentation of furnishings and accessories... [that] contributed to the suppression and relegation of the decorative to a lesser understood architectural activity" (11).
- 27 El Lissitzky, "A. and Pangeometry" (1925), <https://thedetachedgaze.com/2014/03/15/105/>.
- 28 Indeed as Elkins would note: "Contemporary art has largely abandoned it, or more precisely, the founding of modernism was bound up with a rejection of perspective, a rejection that has itself been abandoned in postmodern developments" (1994, 3).
- 29 Lissitzky.
- 30 Bois.
- 31 Panofsky cf. Lissitzky's visual pyramid.
- 32 Bois; Lissitzky.
- 33 Robert Bruegmann, "The Pencil and the Electronic Sketchboard: Architectural Representation and the Computer," in *Architecture and its Image*, 138-155.
- 34 Joanna Merwood-Salisbury, "Interior Design as Environmental Design: The Parsons Program in the 1960s," in Kent Kleinman, Joanna Merwood-Salisbury, and Lois Weintal (eds.), *After Taste: Expanded Practice in Interior Design* (1st ed.) (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2012), 110-129.
- 35 "History," The New School, Parsons, accessed January 11, 2018 <http://www.newschool.edu/parsons/history/>
- 36 Merwood-Salisbury.
- 37 Mark Wigley, *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt* (Cambridge, London: MIT Press, 1993).
- 38 Kent Kleinman, "Taste, After All," in *After Taste*, 28-41.
- 39 Referring to the book *After Taste: Expanded Practice in Interior Design* which the author co-edited and where this essay appeared. In turn, this references Elsie de Wolfe's autobiography entitled *After Taste* published in 1935.
- 40 Evans, "Translations".
- 41 Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

<sup>42</sup> Further, Baxandall's description of the transactions between artists and 'clients' of the Renaissance mirror the transactions interior designers today deal with on a daily basis, in particular, "the customer's participation in it [in this case, designing]" (1972, 3).

<sup>43</sup> Bruegmann, 147.