Ann C. Huppert’s article Envisioning New St. Peter’s: Perspectival Drawings and the Process of Design investigates the new role that drawings played within Renaissance architectural practice and examines the designers’ choice of representational techniques. This aspect of the early-sixteenth-century rebuilding of St. Peter’s at the Vatican has remains little addressed, despite an extensive body of literature. Challenging the rhetorical stance presented in the texts of Alberti and Raphael, who advocated orthographic representation for use by the architect, as well as the position promoted in much modern scholarship, her close examination of the drawings by Bramante, Raphael, Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, and Baldassarre Peruzzi reveals their continued reliance on perspective. By reassessing both the graphic and written evidence, the author proposes that in a period in which architecture emerged as a profession distinct from the figural arts, the early designers of St. Peter’s expanded their use of perspectival techniques for pragmatic purposes.

In Production Space: John Fritz, Alexander Lyman Holley, and the American Bessemer Building, Mark M. Brown argues that the transfer of Bessemer steel technology to the United States set a significant milestone in industrial architecture. American engineers reconceptualized the internal arrangement of factories in order to accommodate the British technology and thereby dramatically increased both productivity and efficiency. Fritz’s 1873 Bessemer plant at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Holley’s 1876 Bessemer building for the Vulcan Iron Works near St. Louis highlight the contrasting spatial visions of two engineers. Fritz arranged the machinery as in a rolling mill—a heavy industry building type. Holley transformed the foundry type into a three-dimensional interlocking of architecture, space, and machine. The author demonstrates how personality and experience shaped the reconciliation of the conflicting demands of production technology, labor, and architecture. This architectural innovation was a critical contribution to the rise of American industrial power.

Adolf Loos’s famed article “Ornament and Crime” remains one of the most often read and cited discourses on modern design. Yet its origins have been little studied, and Loos’s intentions and the essay’s broader meanings have been consistently misunderstood or misrepresented. In The Origins and Context of Adolf Loos’s “Ornament and Crime,” Christopher Long reexamines the essay’s genesis and wider context. Long explores the sources of Loos’s ideas, his specific aims, and how the later myths about it arose. He shows that Loos did not write the essay until late 1909 or early 1910—at least a year later than has been long assumed—and that Loos originally intended it as a contribution to a larger debate that was then taking place in Austria and Germany on the appropriateness of ornament in modern design. By 1910, however, when the controversy over Loos’s Haus am Michaelerplatz erupted, the essay took on a new role, as he began to employ “Ornament and Crime” to defend his controversial design.

In his article Representing National Identity and Memory in the Mausoleum of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Christopher S. Wilson studies the tomb of the leader of the Turkish War of Independence and first president of the Republic of Turkey, who died in the Dolmabahçe Palace, Istanbul, on 10 November 1938. After resting in several temporary locations, his body was placed in his mausoleum, Anıtkabir (“memorial tomb”), which was completed and opened in 1953. Anıtkabir is more than the final resting place of Atatürk’s body or a tribute to a single man: it is a public monument, a stage set for the nation, and a representation of the hopes and ideals of the Republic of Turkey. Freestanding and relief sculpture, floor paving, and even ceiling patterns are combined in a narrative spatial experience that recounts an imagined history of the Turks, their struggle for independence, and the founding of their modern republic. Wilson investigates the architectural attempts to symbolize both the man and the nation. He discusses the projects produced for the international competition and the mausoleum that was actually built, including decisions on its placement. Projects by Auguste Perret, Bruno Taut, Clemens Holzmeister, Johannes Krüger, Adalberto Libera, Giovanni Muzio, Arnaldo Foschini, Sedad Hakki Eldem, and Emin Onat, among others, are analyzed within the context of Turkey’s Second National Style of the 1940s.