

The Origin of Drawing: event, embodiment and desire in architectural drawing

JUSTINE CLARK

Assistant Editor of *Architecture Australia*

The mythical origin of painting, as told by Pliny the Elder, is discussed in many contemporary essays that seek to theorise architectural drawing. Pliny's tale locates these origins in the actions of Diboutades, a Corinthian maid who traced the shadow of her departing lover on a wall. This myth does not overtly concern architecture, but it does figure drawing as both a motivated event and a procedure: an activity in the world. The introduction of this myth to architectural discourse over the last fifteen years indexes a growing interest in drawing and projection, but it also, perhaps unwittingly, introduces other issues. The myth and its allegorical history open up possibilities of exploring architectural drawing as an embodied activity. Such readings are mostly absent from the texts that refer to the myth. This paper speculates on what might be at stake in the architectural deployment of this myth, and on how it presents an opportunity to unpack and unfold issues of gender and desire in relation to architecture's representational practices. Following Elizabeth Grosz, the paper suggests that attending to processes and practices of production might be a useful way to engage questions of gender beyond the particular sex of the maker – whether they are drawer, architect or reader.

~

This paper addresses the presence of a number of representations of the mythical origins of painting within architectural discourse. It looks at the effects of adding these painterly, allegorical images to the body of writing on architectural drawing, and it takes their presence as an opportunity to make further excursions beyond architecture – excursions that are used to develop speculative readings of architectural drawing as an embodied practice. The paper does not aim for a particular coherent reading of these images and their possibilities; instead, it makes a series of supplementary explorations that might feed back into the way we consider drawing, architecture and subjectivity.

The mythical origin of painting, as outlined by Pliny the Elder, tells the story of Diboutades, a Corinthian maid who traces the shadow of her lover, soon to depart for war, on a wall. The myth became a popular theme for European paintings from the 1770s until the 1820s. This popularity coincided with interest in allegories of feminine virtue, and with the development of “automatic portrait technologies” such as the silhouette machine.¹ In the 1980s and 1990s interest in the myth – especially the painted versions of it – revived again, and it was deployed in a number of essays that sought to theorise the relationship between drawing and architecture.² The painted version most frequently illustrated in this recent architectural writing is by the architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel.

A myth exists through its retellings. There is no *one* definitive text. In each version (painted or textual) the myth is simultaneously retold, reinterpreted and illustrated. Each rendition is at once *the* myth, and a re-vision of it. Mieke Bal calls this effect the “emptiness of the myth”. Arguing that there is no essence behind or within these retellings, she suggests that a myth is itself a screen for projection.³ We might also think of the myth as a picture plane – a surface onto which things are projected and traced, drawn and redrawn, reworked and revised. Thus, when neoclassical painters and architects retold the myth of Diboutades, it was as a receptive screen onto which romantic allegories of fidelity might be projected, traced and painted. In contemporary architectural discourse these neoclassical painterly versions are themselves the material onto and out of which various writers construct their own projections of the relationship between drawing and architecture. But screens and picture planes are not without effect. The materiality of a surface always affects the qualities of the thing drawn. There is always resistance: gaps and blurs, details that do not quite fit. From these blurs and disjunctions one might construct alternative readings, tell more stories, and make other projections.

The stories I want to tell explore drawing (on paper, on the computer screen etc) as an embodied practice – a practice in which subjectivity and agency, desire and sexuality, are always at stake. By picturing drawing as an event in the world, these paintings invite us take drawing seriously as a productive, corporeal activity. And they remind us that all practices of making are somehow embodied, and that all bodies are sexually marked.

By attending to the processes and production of drawing, one might attend to the production of architectural subjectivities. This follows Elizabeth Grosz’s work on corporeality and sexually specific signatures, and Mieke Bal’s work on the marks left by the labour and work within an image. The signature, Grosz suggests, is not simply a proprietary mark. It is an effect of the text’s mode of materiality, and effect of labour. She writes, “In paying attention to the production of the text (including that production that is commonly subsumed under the text’s reception), we are perhaps able to see more clearly how the question of sexuality – that is, sexual specificity – is relevant to the question of

textuality.”⁴ She proposes this as a feminist strategy for engaging with texts (understood in the broadest sense) in a manner that moves beyond understanding any work only in terms of the sex of the author or reader/viewer. As such this work offers great potential for architecture.

Making do

The presence of the mythic origins of drawing in architectural discourse indexes the recent interest in architectural drawing and projection. These architectural writers do not, however, assume that things are clearest at such mythical origins. Instead, I would suggest that these images of origins have been added to architecture precisely because they ‘picture’ drawing as a motivated activity. This eventfulness invites readings which diagrammatic presentations of technique resist. Yet, as a myth, the tale also tends towards abstraction, allowing particular interpretations to be generalised back into broader discussions of architectural drawing.

Diboutades’ invention of painting (or drawing) is a kind of ‘making do’ with the materials at hand. Different versions depict these materials and processes differently. Robin Evans uses the specificity of context and articulation in two such paintings to speculate about the differing roles played by drawing in art and architectural practice. Evans compares Schinkel’s rendition with that of Scottish painter David Allan.⁵ Schinkel places the scene outside, with the sun as the light source and a smooth rocky outcrop as the drawing surface. Diboutades directs the process rather than making the tracing herself. In Allan’s depiction, the event is inside, the shadow is cast by lamplight and Diboutades draws herself. Evans argues that for Schinkel, an architect, drawing precedes and prefigures architecture: architecture is absent until drawing is invented.⁶ Further, he suggests that, with the sun as the light source, the projection of the architect is axonometric rather than perspectival. Finally, Evans suggests that in the Schinkel the role of the architect as one who directs the making of buildings, rather than directly making them, is already apparent – Diboutades has relegated the actual work of tracing to a “shepherd”.

But Schinkel’s painting is enigmatic. Werner Oechslin’s description of the same image throws this ambiguity into sharp relief. “Schinkel places a analogous event in a strangely bucolic setting: a young man outlining with a piece of charcoal the profile of a young girl projected onto a piece of rock, while the girl is instructed and assisted in maintaining a quiet pose by her girl friend.”⁷ Oechslin’s interpretation shifts the locus of creative invention to the figure that Evans named a “muscular shepherd”. The obviously female figure, which Evans takes for Diboutades, Oechslin describes as a “helpful girlfriend”, while the sitter is now a young girl being taught to “maintain a quiet pose”, rather than a young man about to leave for war. Where Evans interpreted Schinkel’s altered version in

terms of the architect as director; Oechslin's description retrieves it in terms of the conventional gendering of artist and model, of subject and object.⁸

The ambiguous figure of the departing lover/young girl might stand for drawing itself. Architectural drawing (like architecture) is described in different situations in terms that are variously constructed masculine or feminine, both implicitly and explicitly. It is not my intention to fix or suspend this play. The question is rather what are the effects of such gendering, and might they be reworked in other, productive, ways.

Allegory

Oechslin moves the agency for invention from Diboutades to the lover. His description easily aligns with allegorical readings of the myth in terms of lessons in feminine virtue (she is being instructed how to sit quietly). The myth as allegory has not received much attention in architectural writing about these images. Nevertheless these readings may be useful for broadening the frames of reference and opening up other possibilities.

Allegory works as extended metaphor.⁹ One text is read through another – as one story is re-told, other meanings are simultaneously conveyed to the reader/viewer. This can be both productive and problematic.¹⁰ Like other neoclassical allegorical painting, those depicting the origins of painting re-presented contemporary ideals of love and feminine fidelity, devotion and faithfulness, to the neoclassical viewer in terms of the classical past. Diboutades is depicted as the active inventor of drawing, but the supplementary allegorical reading characterises her in terms of subsequent passive and faithful waiting. The suggestion that the inventor of drawing might have been a woman is submerged and superseded by lessons in feminine virtue. But we might also fabricate other (mis) readings. Waiting, for instance, might not be passive. It might be the occasion for active making. As Roland Barthes writes in *A Lover's Discourse*, "Historically, the discourse of absence is carried out by the Woman: Woman is sedentary, Man hunts, journeys; Woman is faithful (she waits), Man is fickle (he sails away, he cruises). It is Woman who gives shape to absence, elaborates its fiction, for she has time to do so; she weaves and she sings..."¹¹ This active waiting emphasises Diboutades' role as inventor, as maker.¹²

Virtue, fidelity, waiting and inventiveness are also at stake in the companion piece to Joseph Wright's *Corinthian Maid, Penelope Unraveling her Web by Lamp-light*. Both images involve ingenuity and artifice, and the double nature of allegorical structures allows other interpretations that explore ideas of duplicity and artifice, cunning and evasion. In an essay called "Penelope at Work", Peggy Kamuf suggests that the shuttling nature of "Penelopean labour" offers ways of working and of making that might be available to women.¹³ Penelope has also been retrieved for architectural discourse by Ann Bergren in a reading that celebrates artifice and cunning.¹⁴ Might Diboutades be similarly

retrieved? Similar modes of working and making are already the subject of discussion in texts about drawing. Writing of architecture as a “crafty” art, Marco Frascari identifies one of the virtues of the architect is a musing, cunning, quick-witted intelligence (*mêtis*, the same type of intelligence that Ann Bergren ascribes to Penelope), while Robin Evans suggests that drawing is the architectural location of artifice and ingenuity:

...not so much as a work of art or a truck for pushing ideas from place to place, but as the locale of subterfuges, evasions that one way or another get round the enormous weight of convention that has been architecture’s greatest security and at the same time its greatest liability.¹⁵

This tale of the invention of drawing suggests that drawing itself might be inventive as well as mimetic.

However, Diboutades’ fidelity is also entangled with the expectation that the drawing itself be somehow faithful. To trigger memory and thereby preserve her fidelity the drawing must faithfully stand for Diboutades’ lover. Marco Frascari describes the proto-drawing of the lover’s shadow as an example of the “threefold semiotic nature of the sign”, “a tool for memory, a sensitive icon, a template for love”.¹⁶ It physically resembles the lover in some way and it is a trace of the moment of drawing. This traced line enables a return to the moment of separation – the split both of the shadow from the lover and the lover from Diboutades.

Reading the lover’s silhouette as faithful involves a complicated interweaving of iconicity and indexicality. But both indexical and iconic readings presumes a degree of similarity and connection that, as Umberto Eco points out, is not essentially there – it is an effect of culture and of interpretation. The tracing, then, is not essentially iconic, nor indexical, but it might be *read* as icon and index. Diboutades relies on a kind of certainty that is not in the drawing, but that might exist in her memory. Fidelity exists in the reading of the drawing, not in the drawing itself. Potentially always intact, fidelity is also potentially always at risk. Likewise, the relationship between an architectural drawing and its object is can be understood as a mix of the iconic, the indexical and the symbolic. Again, this is not essential. If we follow Eco, the difference between the signifier and the signified is always greater than the similarity – but similarity is made pertinent through cultural ascription. Architectural drawings, then, are always potentially unfaithful (this is where their power for invention may lie), but they are read as if they *are* faithful.

Desire

One of the intriguing things about the myth is that it appears to invert sexually specific subject/object positions in the visual field, positions which are often illustrated with Durer's etching *Draughtsman Drawing a Recumbent Nude*. (Another picturing of drawing which has been imported into architectural writing about drawing). This image is understood as a paradigmatic example of Laura Mulvey's famous formulation of woman as image and man as possessor of the look. This look is one of both desire and possession – the desire to possess. In the myth of Diboutades, it is the woman who invents, who draws and traces. She looks and desires. But, her motivation is presented as love not possession. Barbara Stafford contrasts these positions, comparing Diboutades 'look' with that of the physiognomist (the scientific tracer of silhouettes), who Stafford aligns with the anatomist: "Free of the cruel hooks that tore the flesh... the physiognomist's confined subject nevertheless was equally stripped. What a striking contrast between observer and observed in Joseph Wright of Derby's *Corinthian Maid*. Lover faced sleeping beloved and tenderly recorded his cast shadow."¹⁷

Of course, power relations cannot be inverted so easily. The issue, as Kaja Silverman points out in another context, is not simply that the 'look' of Durer's draughtsman is a desiring one, but that it is aligned with institutional structures and equates subject/object positions with sexual difference.¹⁸ Diboutades may be the one who looks, who draws, who makes, but she is also reinscribed into the traditional patriarchal visual economy. Her look is domesticated through the repeated invocation of love, fidelity and virtue. However, such reinscription is never complete, never exclusive. Details and variations of the mythical representations provide openings and gaps through which to make other readings. If Diboutades looks, if she desires, what effect might this have? What role does her lover assume? What effect would this have on the architectural discourse that deploys these images?

A number of writers use the idea that the origins of drawing lie in the desire to prevent loss to suggest a similar desire at the heart of much representational activity. Victor Burgin uses the myth of the Corinthian maid to theorise photography, suggesting that the origins of graphic images are found in the portrait, and that the origin of the portrait is in the "desire for protection against the loss of the object, and the loss of identity."¹⁹ In an architectural context, Stanley Allen also argues that the myth is about absence. It not only projects the lover's leaving, but suggests that he is already absent to a certain degree – Diboutades traces the shadow of her lover rather than his body. The myth, Allen suggests, posits drawing as mimetic. But what, he asks, does architecture imitate? Nature, proportion, the primitive hut? He goes on to suggest that "each of these stories of origins returns to an empty square: a void to which the desire for origins is ceaselessly directed".²⁰ For Allen, the ordinary architectural object is always absent - "only in an architectural drawing can a disembodied abstraction cast a shadow" – and architects are always removed from the

material reality of their discipline.²¹ Architectural drawings, he concludes, are “disembodied, dematerialised indices of absence”.

These readings turn, in some way, around a conception of desire associated with lack, and the wish to fill that lack. Not surprisingly Elizabeth Grosz points out that this construction, the basis of dominant Western conceptions of desire, leaves no room for women as desiring subjects. But Grosz also identifies another tradition of thinking desire, one that stretches from Spinoza to Deleuze and Guattari. She suggests that aspects of this secondary tradition might be deployed to reconceptualise desire as a positive productive activity, rather than one which “is doomed to consumption, incorporation, dissatisfaction, destruction of the object”. This model, she suggests “cannot be identified with an object whose attainment provides satisfaction, but with processes that produce... Desire is the force of positive production, the action that creates things, makes alliances and forges interactions.”²²

Grosz’s refiguring of desire in terms of production, collaboration and activity allows one to relocate Diboutades as an active, desiring subject, where the production of desire is a collaborative act. The look she directs towards her lover might then be similar to that outlined by Kaja Silverman: a look which is desiring but communicative, not appropriating, a look to which women might also have access.²³ Diboutades might embody what has been described as the paradox of the woman artist: she who incorporates both objectivity and subjectivity. She is the subject who invents, while also remaining the object: “No longer positing herself solely as the object of male gaze (or ignoring her inevitable position as such) or simply claiming a subject position to which her access is problematic, she establishes herself as both subject and object.”²⁴

This condition pertains to all women who speak, who write, who draw, who design, who build: women who actively make. Grosz’s reformulation of desire suggests that subject/object positions may not be fixed according to sexual specificity. Diboutades is both subject and object. So is her lover. We might read this complicated position into the Schinkel: the stick of charcoal resting exactly on the outline of the lover’s eye might point to his ability to look, to desire, to communicate. He is not simply a desired object; there is an instability or dynamism in their respective positions.

Grosz deploys metaphors drawn from architecture to describe what desire-as-production is not. “As production, desire does not provide blueprints, models, ideals or goals. Rather it experiments; it makes: it is fundamentally aleatory, inventive.”²⁵ This articulates a common understanding of architectural representation as a transparent, instrumental means to convey already fixed information. However, the conjunction of a productive, inventive desire and the invention of drawing as an outcome of desire enables other ways

of thinking drawing. It suggests that drawing itself might be productive and inventive rather than simply projective and reproductive.

Desire-as-production engages vision, but vision does not limit or circumscribe it. It is also a tactile, physically engaged, inscriptive activity. Grosz conceives desire and sexuality within broader social practices: desire concerns connection, not only the connection and adjacencies of human bodies, but also the connection of human bodies and other bodies. Drawing is a physical, pleasurable activity. Allen's description of drawing as the disembodied notation through which the architect must work to address the "material reality of the discipline" might be reconsidered in terms of drawing's own material and bodily qualities. If desire is productive, then the economy of desire – which he suggests is already bound up in the mythic origins of drawing – is not the desire for the absent object or to fill some lack, but the desire to produce a material event. The desire to make, and to have an effect. Drawing is corporeal activity, which might operate as an analogy for the production of building, as well as being an image of it. It is not simply a matter of abstract notation, not only a means of deferral and distance.

Jacques Derrida's account of Diboutades also invokes absence and loss, but in a way that enables – in a quite different way – the thinking of drawing as an active, inventive and productive process. Derrida deploys the Corinthian maid in more general discussion which argues that at the moment one draws one is blind: the object drawn is necessarily unseen; the body is always already lost.²⁶ This loss is an effect of the inability to simultaneously look at the drawn object and draw it. Drawing, for Derrida is concerned with blindness, with a crisis of looking. The argument seems at once peculiar and banal, but it allows us to consider aspects of drawing which lie outside vision. Derrida also problematises drawing's origins in mimesis:

Even if drawing is, as they say, mimetic, that is, reproductive, figurative, representative, even if the model is presently facing the artist, the *trait* must proceed in the night. It escapes the field of vision. Not only because it is *not yet* visible, but because it does not belong to the realm of the spectacle, of spectacular objectivity – and so that which it makes happen or come cannot in itself be mimetic. The heterogeneity between the thing drawn and the drawing *trait* remains abyssal, whether it be between a thing drawn and its representation or between the model and its image. The night of this abyss can be interpreted in two ways, either as the eve or the memory of the day, that is as a reserve of visibility (the draughtsman does not presently see but he has seen and will see again...), or else as radically and definitively foreign to the phenomenally of day.²⁷

The mythical origins of drawing belong, Derrida argues, not to mimesis and perception but to memory and recollection. “Detached from the present of perception, fallen from the thing itself - which is thus divided - a shadow is a simultaneous memory, and Butades’ stick is a staff of the blind.”²⁸ Drawing, in this sense, is re-membering, re-collecting. It is a process of finding one’s way about a design, of making architecture. You do not know what you draw until it is drawn; nothing is already complete in the mind’s eye. In architecture, one might argue, one only sees as one draws. The pencil – Butades’ stick, (the staff of the blind) – is the way to feel one’s way through architecture. In making a drawing, one simultaneously re-members the shadow of an idea, invents and produces.

Exchange

The mythical origin of painting presents drawing as a mediating device and as an agent of exchange. They acknowledge the “in-betweenness” which is conventionally the lot of drawing in architecture and suggests it as an active and powerful site. Drawing might have a translational role that is not based in transparency: one, which embraces the potential of drawing as medium.

Diboutades is cast as both the agent of mediation and the object of exchange. Her status as object of exchange is signalled most obviously through her name, which is in fact no name. Diboutades simply means “of Butades”, Butades being her father’s name.²⁹ Although cited as the inventor of drawing she is, as Geoffrey Batchen points out, known only as the daughter or ‘shadow’ of her father, or the delineator of the shadow of her lover.³⁰ The fable, if not the images, sites her ‘between men’. A number of painted versions, including Wright of Derby’s, also locate this event within her father’s pottery. As Diboutades traces the shadow, her relations with her father and her lover potentially circumscribe her.

But other versions of this story refer to Diboutades as simply a ‘Corinthian Maid’. This opens up the possibility of other, more convoluted issues of exchange and mediation. In his discussion of the origin of the Corinthian column, George Hersey analyses the ‘Corinthian Maid’ as trope. He points out that Corinth was an important site for sacred prostitution and suggests that the Corinthian maid of the myth of the Corinthian column was such a sacred prostitute. With this in mind the title of Wright’s allegorical painting of love and fidelity, *The Corinthian Maid*, can only be read ironically. This slippery detail opens up to other readings.

Shannon Bell explains that the temples of Aphrodite at Corinth were important sites of learning. The sacred prostitutes were key teachers of erotics, philosophy and rhetoric who operated outside the normal restrictions placed by the state on other women.³¹ These Corinthian ‘maids’ had power, knowledge and influence, although Bell contends that these functions have subsequently been written out of ancient history. As a trope, then, the

Corinthian maid is not so easily contained. She circulates, participating in society: she does not simply stay at home, waiting and longing.³²

Prostitution and allegorical figures also enter the discourses on architectural drawing in another way. At the end of “Translations from Drawing to Building” Robin Evans makes a brief mention of *L’Architettura*, a seventeenth century painting by Giacinto Brandi, another allegorical figuring of architecture. He writes of :

...the uncharacteristic expression on her face and in her posture. It is the kind of expression normally reserved in seventeenth century painting for prostitutes and courtesans. The picture’s subject is uncertain, its title a modern supposition resting on the fact that she holds dividers, nothing more. One might ask what such a figure is expected to do with the instruments she shows us.³³

Jennifer Bloomer responds:

What, indeed?

In the hand of Blake’s architect, the pair of compasses describes geometry, measures, and bisects lines and angles. It is an instrument of *emplotment*. In the hand of Brandi’s allegorical shadow person, the purpose of the tool is ambiguous. Held in the position and with the delicacy of gesture of a sewing needle, it is perhaps an instrument of penetration, of puncturing. Or is it a tool for marking, tapping, making little black spots on surfaces? ...It is an instrument of *dissemination*.³⁴

In the uncertain naming of this painting the instruments of drawing signify architecture. For Bloomer the compasses become a means of drawing: they make marks. Architecture is always multiple, always ambiguous, as are the instruments of the architect. These instruments perform abstract functions – they project, measure, bisect – but they also mark, make and mar. The architect is a maker, as well as a transcriber or an instructor. The architect projects, but for those projections to have an effect she must also trace. Tracing is unpredictable in its materiality; it is mark making (marring) activity. What is it about *L’Architettura* which leads Evans to identify her as a prostitute or courtesan? It is her expression and her pose – smiling, she looks directly at the viewer. She looks, she knows, she does not avert her eyes. With her amused smile and the instruments of knowledge, names and descriptions are uncertain.

Pliny cites the tale of Diboutades as the origin of sculpture. He tells how her father, Butades later made a relief from the tracing and fired it in the kiln. Drawing is not only a memory device; it also becomes a pattern or template for future making. This might appear to shift the inventive and creative role from Diboutades to her father (placing Diboutades in a role akin to the draughtsperson). But then we remember that architects make drawings; they generally make buildings only indirectly.

Located in between, drawings mediate between architect and building. Drawing wanders about architecture. Not easily contained, it crosses and recrosses boundaries, negotiating and renegotiating them, marking out new possibilities. Like Hersey's Corinthian maid, drawing does not stay put. It is both the agent and the object of exchange. Drawing might discipline and underwrite architecture, underpinning the authority of the architect but it is also a vital site from which architecture can be challenged and changed. As Robin Evans suggests, drawing's precision is capable of "disengaging architecture from those same stolid conformities of shape, propriety and essence, but from within the medium normally used to enforce them".³⁵ Drawing shifts and moves. It enables architecture to be shifted and moved.

This paper has taken a circuitous route, venturing beyond architecture to bring new speculations to bear on drawing. These meanderings have wound issues of body and sexuality, desire and materiality up with drawing. Nonetheless the motivations for it were already lodged in architectural discourse, through the presence of this myth. The tale of Diboutades invention of drawing might be understood as presenting drawing as a representational practice based in mimesis, but it also allows us to think of drawing itself as an inventive creative practice. Drawing is not simply a site of reproduction; tracing and projecting cannot be easily consigned to the realm of neutral technique; drawing's substance cannot be easily effaced, and nor can the bodies of those who draw. In varying ways this paper has described the complicity of drawing, exploring it as an active, activating, productive bodily practice.

Justine Clark is Assistant Editor of Architecture Australia, the magazine of the RAAIA. She is the author, with Dr Paul Walker, of Looking for the Local: Architecture and the New Zealand Modern (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2000). Her current research interests focus on architectural drawing and on the index in architecture. This is a development of earlier work. Smdge@bigpond.com

-
- ¹ Robert Rosenblum 'The Origin of Painting: A Problem in the Iconography of Romantic Classicism' *Art Bulletin*, 39 (1957): pp.279-290. Geoffrey Batchen *Burning with Desire: The Conception of Photography*, The MIT Press, 1997, p.114.
2. The mythical origins of drawing are discussed in Robin Evans, 'Translations from Drawing to Building' *AA Files* 12 (Summer 1986); Stanley Allen, 'On Projection' *Harvard Architectural Review*, 9 (1993): pp.122-137; Stanley Allen 'Projections: Between Drawing and Building' *A+U*, 259 (April 1992): pp.40-65; Werner Oechslin, 'Geometry and Line: The Vitruvian Science of Architectural Drawing' *Daidalos*, 1(1981): pp.20-43; Marco Frascari, 'A Secret Semiotic Sciagraphy: the Corporal Theatre of Meaning in Vicenzo Scamozzi's Idea of Architecture' *Via* 11, pp 33-51; and James Corner, 'Representation and Landscape: Drawing and Making in the Landscape Medium' *Word and Image*, 8, 3 (July-Sept 1992): pp.243-275.
3. Mieke Bal *Reading 'Rembrandt': Beyond the Word-Image Opposition*, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 1991, p.418n.
4. Elizabeth Grosz 'Sexual Signatures: Feminism after the Death of the Author' in *Space, Time and Perversion: The Politics of Bodies*, St Leonards, NSW, Allen & Unwin, 1995 pp. 21-2.
5. Evans 'Translations', pp 6-7.
6. Marjan Hawley suggests that the rock face on which the shepherd traces the lover's shadow has the visual characteristics of Parian marble. If this is so, the raw (projected) building material provides the ground for drawing, and thence building. Marjan Hawley personal comment.
7. Oechslin 'Geometry and Line', p.25.
8. Abigail Solomon-Godeau points out that women were rarely models prior to the nineteenth century and that the image of a passive and feminised masculinity was a recurring motif between the last decades of the 18th century and the end of the third decade of the 19th century, when the shift to female nudes took place. This timeframe coincides with the popularity of the Diboutades myth. Abigail Solomon-Godeau 'Male Trouble: A Crisis in Representation' *Art History*, 16, 2 (June 1993): p.287.
9. Bal, Reading "Rembrandt", p. 60.
10. Craig Owens 'The Allegorical Impulse: Toward a Theory of Postmodernism' in *Art After Modernism: Rethinking Representation* ed. Brian Wallis, New York, Boston: New Museum of Contemporary Art and David R. Godine, Publisher, 1984.
11. Roland Barthes *A Lovers Discourse: Fragments*, trans. Richard Howard, New York: Hill and Wang, 1978, pp.13-14.
12. Robert Rosenblum suggests that similar readings were made in the neoclassical period, during which a number of women painters achieved unprecedented prominence, but that they remained secondary. "It was only natural that the many women painters of an era which so often disguised itself in antique clothing should be proud that Greek legend held the inventor of their art to be a woman..." Rosenblum 'Origin of Painting', p.288.
13. Peggy Kamuf *Signature Pieces: On the Institution of Authorship*, Cornell University Press; Ithaca, 1988, pp.145-171.
14. Ann Bergren "The (Re)Marriage of Penelope and Odysseus: Architecture, Gender, Philosophy" *Assemblage* 21 (1993): pp.6-23.
15. Evans 'Translations', p.16.
16. Marco Frascari 'A Secret Semiotic Sciagraphy', p.35.
17. Barbara Maria Stafford, *Body Criticism* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1991, p.98.
18. Kaja Silverman 'Fassbinder and Lacan: A Reconsideration of Gaze, Look and Image' *Camera Obscura*, vol. 19 (1989): p.62. Writing about Hollywood films Silverman suggests "The problem... is not that men direct desire towards women, in Hollywood films, but that male desire is so consistently and systematically imbricated with projection and control".
19. Geoffrey Batchen 'For an Impossible Realism: an Interview with Victor Burgin', *Afterimage* 16, 7 (February 1989): p.4.
20. Allen 'Projections', p.41

-
21. Allen 'Projections', p.41.
22. Grosz 'Refiguring Lesbian Desire' in *Space, Time and Perversion*, p.179. Grosz acknowledges the problems in this material for feminist readers. However she suggests that their work "does not have to be followed faithfully to be of use in dealing with issues that they do not, or perhaps even cannot, deal with themselves", p.180. Grosz uses this material to suggest some possibilities for lesbian desire. She suggests that the question of how to conceive lesbian desire is the most acute way in which the question of women's desire can be formulated: it is "the pre-eminent and most unambiguous exemplar of *women's desire*". Lesbian desire is not overtly at stake in the various versions of the Diboutades myth, but Grosz's work is invaluable in the possibilities it opens for rethinking desire more broadly.
23. A look which "directs desire towards him... rather than referring to... as an 'object of desire'". Kaja Silverman "Fassbinder and Lacan", discussed in Mieke Bal *Reading "Rembrandt"*. Silverman points out that feminist film theory has tended to collapse the male look and the gaze. However, as she shows, not all films collapse them so. Silverman, "Fassbinder and Lacan", p.62. Silverman's work is grounded in psychoanalysis and Grosz's reworking of desire is, in part, in a rejection of psychoanalysis. Yet, Grosz's account of desire seems to make room for accounts of the look such as Silverman's.
24. Bridget Orr "From Intercession to Intervention: Women in the Middle" in *Mediatix: New Work by Seven Women Artists* ed. Priscilla Pitts, Auckland, NZ: Artspace, 1992.
25. Grosz *Space, Time and Perversion*, p.180.
26. Derrida refers to paintings by Jean-Baptiste Regnault and Joseph-Benoît Suvée, where Diboutades does not look at her lover. In the Schinkel, however, she is free to look at him (but not simultaneously at the drawing) as the shepherd performs the task of tracing. Jacques Derrida *Memoirs of the Blind: The Self-Portrait and Other Ruins* trans Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
27. Derrida *Memoirs of the Blind*, p.45.
28. Derrida *Memoirs of the Blind*, p.51. Other writers also refer to memory when discussing this image. However, they do not separate memory from perception in such an explicit way. For example, Ewa Keryluk compares the myth with the contemporary habit of photographing those who are about to depart.
29. In some versions she is simply called Butades. Following the paintings by Jean-Baptiste Regnault - *Butades or the Origin of Drawing* - and Joseph-Benoît Suvée - *Butades Tracing the Portrait of her Shepherd or the Origin of Painting*, Derrida describes her as "Butades, the young Corinthian lover who bears the name of her father, a potter from Sicyon." Derrida *Memoirs of the Blind*, p.49.
30. Geoffrey Batchen "Tom Wedgwood and Humphrey Davy: "An Account of a Method " *History of Photography*, 17, 2 (Summer 1992): pp.172-183.
31. Shannon Bell *Reading, Writing and Rewriting the Prostitute Body*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994, p.21.
32. Through a rereading of Plato, Bell discusses Diotima and Aspasia - *hetairae* and teachers of rhetoric - in these terms. Bell *Reading, Writing and Rewriting the Prostitute Body*.
33. Evans 'Translations', p.16. Evans discusses Diboutades in this same article.
34. Jennifer Bloomer *Architecture and the Text: The (S)cripts of Joyce and Piranesi* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993, p.108.
35. Evans 'Translations', p.16.

