

Animated Interior

Paramita Atmodiwirjo, Yandi Andri Yatmo

*Universitas Indonesia
Indonesia*

An animated interior represents a departure from the idea of interior space as a permanent and timeless entity. The term *animate* originated from the Latin word *animare*, which means “to give life to,” whereas *animare* came from the word *anima*, meaning “breath, soul”; the verb *animate* means “to make or design in such a way as to create apparently spontaneous lifelike movement” (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). In practice, animation is a technique to bring life to inanimate objects, things, or figures. When integrated into architecture and interior practice, the idea of animation that could give movements to inanimate objects eventually “challenges assumptions about constructions of time and space, as well as movement” (Wood, 2006, p. 150), while offering possibilities to expand our architecture and interior design methods.

The animated character of the interior emerges in relation to the inhabitation of the interior by human beings who are also animated beings. Human beings act as the “lived body” that occupies space (Tuan, 1977, p. 35), and the space that the body inhabits becomes the “space of action” (Bollnow, 1963/2011, p. 191). The interior becomes animated when it acts as a setting where the human’s lived body moves and experiences its surrounding space through time. It is also animated in parallel with the dynamic occupation of everyday space. Furthermore, human beings and their spaces are part of the animated environment (Nute, 2018). All their actions, as well as their spaces, are surrounded by the dynamic entities of the environment—the changing weather, the passing of time, the day–night rhythm, and the movement of various elements of nature.

Correspondence Address: Paramita Atmodiwirjo, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus UI, Depok 16424, Indonesia. Email: paramita@eng.ui.ac.id

The inhabitation of an interior cannot be separated from the inhabitation of time. Human beings not only occupy the interior space but also “dwell in time” (Pallasmaa, 2016, p. 51). The interior emerges in relation to various animated factors—temporality, changes, ephemerality, and the dynamic experience. The interior becomes “a product of flux” (Attiwill, 2012, p. 12), which creates the temporal and spatial composition of the interiors enabling inhabitation. The idea of an animated interior challenges the notion of the built environment as “timeless,” as a quality which has long been dominant in designing buildings and spaces (Taylor, 2016). The introduction of time into architecture creates the temporal condition that challenges the permanence of architecture (Till, 2009). It is no longer possible to consider architecture and interior as purely permanent and static; “architecture can be recognised and valued as an evolving and uncertain process extending over time rather than as an immutable, pristine object imprisoned by a single moment” (Franck, 2016, p. 17). This point of view brings awareness of the potential role of animation in bringing life to the inanimate, as a way of making time a critical element of interior inhabitation.

The idea of an animated interior encourages the practice of design to include time as a critical element of design processes and approaches. Animation has the capacity to establish the setting of action and create a meaningful site for engagement; it possesses “the versatility of animation to depict spaces where possibilities have not yet fully subsided” (Wood, 2016, p. 150). Likewise, animation has the capacity to “reposition complex multidimensional information” (McGrath, 2016, p. 91). The understanding of animated characters in the interior allows for the emergence of our complex relationship with space through various forms of engagement. The understanding of an animated interior offers further possibilities that become the basis of design practice. This issue of the *Interiority* journal presents a collection of inquiries and approaches that reveal various animated qualities of the interior in various contexts. The articles address the character of the interior, which is dynamic and dependent upon various temporal conditions of inhabitation. At the same time, they demonstrate the possible design practices that could emerge from the understanding of animated interiors.

The first three articles present inquiries into the dynamic interior experiences that are characterised by the dynamic nature of interior boundaries and the changing experience through the passing of time. They demonstrate how design practice could celebrate the potential elements producing the interior experience that transcends beyond the idea of architectural space as static

and bounded. Ane Pilegaard presents a thorough analysis of the dynamic interior experience in Rosenborg Castle. She argues on the role of boundaries and thresholds in establishing the layers of interior experience as opposed to the common delineation of interior space. Karim Musfy, Marco Sosa, and Lina Ahmad reflect on the intimate experience of public interior space within the Louvre Abu Dhabi Dome. Through a series of visual and textual narratives, they illustrate the animated character of interior as spaces in flux. Javier Fernández Contreras challenges the common portrayal of architecture in the media that tends to prioritise the appearance of architecture in daytime. Through the approaches of the *El Croquis* special edition that highlights nighttime architecture, he argues the idea that night is a forgotten paradigm in the construction of modern and contemporary architectural discourse.

The next two articles highlight the changing production of interior space driven by temporality and virtuality. They address how temporality and virtuality emerge as the animating characters in the contemporary inhabitation of the interior through some case studies that demonstrate the transcendence beyond the reality and permanence of space. Lucy Marlor demonstrates several ways in which new kinds of interior territories could emerge as triggered by temporality and virtuality. She suggests four types of interior scenarios based on an open platform interior, momentary spatial encounter, interiority in non-interiority spaces, and virtual interiority. Adam Nash further discusses the practice of *virtual*, which produces a different kind of interiority as an ongoing network of relations in space and time. He highlights some possibilities for translating the idea of virtual interiorities into the design practice of the future.

The idea of an animated interior also suggests the need to manoeuvre amongst various forms of complexity and relationships of the interior inhabitation. The final two articles demonstrate the possibility of design practice as a form of negotiation amongst different aspects of occupation and environment. They illustrate the importance of inquiry and experimentation in defining the appropriate negotiation within the design practice. Elena Marco, Katie Williams, and Sonja Oliveira present the process of negotiating everyday domestic practice, particularly to develop a design that responds to the needs for storage in the domestic environment. Rana Abudayyeh illustrates the negotiation between the natural and the synthetic through the methods of grafting interiority, which responds to the fluid relationship between external parameters and the interior volumes.

The articles in this journal issue expand the possibility of

understanding the interior as animated and dynamic, which is always open for ongoing transformation. “Transformation, then, is not only found in an ongoing intensive experience of space, but in shifting encounters that reveal the multiplicity of meanings from either the perspective of chronology or different points of view” (Wood, p. 139). Such multiplicity of meanings presents a further challenge for our design research and practice to expand the animated qualities of the interior that produce our inhabitation of space and integrate them into the production of interior and architecture.

References

- Attiwill, S. (2012). Beyond building—interior design. *Proceedings of IDEA Symposium- Interior: A State of Becoming*. <https://idea-edu.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/P79.pdf>
- Bollnow, O. F. (2011). *Human space* (C. Shuttleworth, Trans.). Hyphen Press. (Original work published 1963)
- Franck, K. A. (2016). Introduction: Designing with time in mind. *Architectural Design*, 86(1), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.1996>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Animate. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/animate>
- McGrath, B. (2016). Drawing time. *Architectural Design*, 86(1), 88–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.2006>
- Nute, K. (2018). *Naturally animated architecture*. World Scientific.
- Pallasmaa, J. (2016). Inhabiting time. *Architectural Design*, 86(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.2001>
- Taylor, M. (2016). Time matters: Transition and transformation in architecture. *Architectural Design*, 86(1), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.2000>
- Till, J. (2009). *Architecture depends*. MIT Press.
- Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Wood, A. (2006). Re-animating space. *Animation*, 1(2), 133–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746847706068896>