

Ornament, Crime, Myth, and Meaning

CHRISTOPHER LONG

University of Texas at Austin

Among Adolf Loos's writings, his famed polemic "Ornament und Verbrechen" (Ornament and Crime) holds a special place. Not only is it the most widely cited and discussed of Loos's many published works, but it is also often regarded as the defining text of Loos's ideology, the requisite clue for unraveling his idiosyncratic approach to building and design. Yet in many ways "Ornament and Crime" remains one of the least well understood of all of the early twentieth-century programs and manifestoes. Its origins have been surprisingly little studied, and Loos's intentions and the broader meanings of the essay have been consistently misunderstood and misrepresented.

In his article on Loos in the *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects*, Carter Wiseman succinctly summed up the conventional view of "Ornament and Crime":

In his writing, Loos came increasingly to focus on what he regarded as the excesses of decoration in both traditional Viennese design and in the more recent products of the Vienna Secession and the Wiener Werkstätte. Loos expressed his irritation most strongly in "Ornament and Crime," a short essay published in 1908 that flew in the face of contemporary practice. . . . The essay caused a furor and was widely circulated abroad. (Le Corbusier referred to it as "an Homeric cleansing of architecture"). It rapidly became a key document in the modernist literature.¹

This same set of "facts," has been consistently reproduced—with remarkably little variation—in virtually every account of "Ornament and Crime" since the 1930s. But if one carefully reexamines the circumstances surrounding the essay's writing and publication and the wider context in which it appeared, a different picture emerges. Indeed, on closer inspection nearly every element of this standard view proves to be either untrue or, at the very least, misleading.

Among the most persistent myths about the essay has to do with when Loos actually wrote it. Almost all of the accounts that have appeared in the past sixty years give 1908 as the date of composition,² and a considerable number of authors also assert that the essay was published the same

year—despite the fact that none of them are able to supply a citation for 1908. In fact, evidence recently discovered by Burkhardt Rukschcio, one of the co-authors of the massive Loos biography that was published in the early 1980s, suggests that Loos did not write the piece until late 1909 or early 1910, or approximately a year and a half to two years later.³ Moreover, it appears that unlike most of Loos's essays, "Ornament and Crime" was not originally written for publication, but rather for a public lecture. Loos presented the lecture for the first time not in 1908, but on 21 January 1910 under the auspices of the Vienna Akademischer Verband für Literatur und Musik (Academic Association for Literature and Music).⁴

The original manuscript in the Loos Papers in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina is not dated, but a passage that makes reference to Josef Hoffmann's Apollo Candle Factory Shop, which was omitted from the later published versions, provides a vital clue to the date of its composition. Loos writes:

The interior of the Apollo Candle Factory Shop in Vienna, in soft and colorfully painted wood, which was executed eleven years ago, is not nearly as intolerable Hoffmann's works are today. Or as they will appear to be in eleven years. The Café Museum, however, designed according to my principles and opened on the same date as the candle shop, will not become unusable until the glue no longer holds the furnishings together.⁵

Since both the candle shop and the Café Museum were both completed in 1899, this would imply that Loos wrote the essay during the first weeks of 1910, in all likelihood a short time before he presented the lecture on 21 January.⁶ There is some evidence, however, that Loos may have been confused about the date that the Candle Factory Shop and the Café Museum opened. In another of his essays of the same period "Architektur" (Architecture), which can be reliably dated to 1910, Loos mentions in passing that the Café was completed twelve years before, so that he in fact was off by a year.⁷ Loos apparently committed the same error in his 1908 essay

“Kulturentartung” (Cultural degeneration), in which he writes that the two works had been completed “ten years ago.” If Loos made the same mistake when writing the original draft of “Ornament and Crime” this suggests that he penned the piece in 1909, probably in the later months of the year.

The confusion over the date of the essay’s composition stems in large part from the reference Loos makes in the later published versions to the year 1908. Loos writes:

I may be living in the year 1908, but my neighbor is living in 1900, and the one across the way in the year 1880.⁸

But in the original manuscript Loos writes: “Ich lebe vielleicht im Jahre 1910. . .” (I may be living in the year 1910).⁹ In order for the passage to retain its contemporaneity, Loos altered the date in subsequent versions. A slightly revised manuscript for his 1912 lecture cites this later date,¹⁰ and Loos no doubt altered the date again when he once more presented the lecture the following year.

The passage was also updated when the essay was first published in 1913. Contrary to the general assumption, “Ornament and Crime” was initially published not in German, but in French, in *Les cahiers d’aujourd’hui*, in a translation by Marcel Ray.¹¹ Ray, who apparently based his translation on Loos’s 1912 lecture manuscript, altered the line to read “Il se peut que je vive en l’an 1913.”¹² When Le Corbusier reprinted the essay in the second issue of *L’Esprit nouveau* in November 1920, he used Ray’s translation and retained the 1913 date.¹³ This same version also appeared in *L’architecture vivante* in 1926.¹⁴ The essay was finally published in German for the first time in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in 1929.¹⁵ But rather than changing the date back to 1910, Heinrich Kulka, who was assisting Loos (by then already seriously ill, with less than three years to live), apparently altered the date to 1908. When the essay was reprinted in *Trotzdem*, the collection of Loos’s later writings that appeared in 1931, the reference to the year 1908 was retained, and it was subsequently cited over and over by later commentators, who assumed incorrectly that it referred either to the date of composition or first publication, or both. The belief that the essay was written in 1908 was also reinforced by Kulka’s 1931 monograph on Loos, which became one of the most important sources for material on Loos work and ideas. Describing Loos’s long fight against ornament, Kulka referred to his “1908 lecture ‘Ornament and Crime.’”¹⁶

Whether Kulka, who probably did not have access to the original manuscript, merely assigned the incorrect date by mistake, or whether Loos misremembered the date or—perhaps more significantly—intentionally misrepresented it, is not clear. Rukschcio has argued that Loos in fact may have deliberately moved the date back two years to establish primacy in what was then an ongoing debate about ornament.¹⁷ Indeed, Loos was not the only figure at the time concerned with the problem of ornament. As early as 1897, German architect Fritz Schumacher had warned that the new

ornamental *Jugendstil* language violated tradition and detracted from the more important functional aspects of building.¹⁸ Joseph August Lux, writing in 1907, similarly cautioned against the use of ornament that was merely “applied” and had no “organic” connection with the larger whole.¹⁹ And by 1908–1909 a number of other architects and critics, including Wilhelm Michel, Otto Scheffers, Richard Schaukal, and Otto Schulze-Eberfeld, were openly questioning what role ornament should have in modern architecture.²⁰ But no one, aside from Schaukal, took the step of issuing a wholesale condemnation of ornament. And Schaukal, at the end of his essay, readily acknowledges that it was Loos who had first made the call for the abolition of “arbitrary” (*willkürlich*) ornament.²¹ Loos, moreover, had long been on record in his opposition to “superfluous” ornament—as Kulka notes extending all the way back to 1897—and a wide range of writers prior to 1908 had made note of Loos’s anti-ornament ideas.²² It thus seems unlikely that Loos would have deliberately moved the date of composition back a mere 18 to 24 months, as Rukschcio has asserted. More likely, he was simply mistaken about the date, as he was with dates on a number of other occasions in his writings.

Loos’s (and for that matter Kulka’s) confusion is more readily understandable when one examines “Ornament and Crime” in the context of Loos’s other writings of the period. Loos’s equation of the trend toward “*ornamentlosigkeit*” with cultural development runs through many of his essays of the years after 1906, and a number of the phrases and images he employs in “Ornament and Crime” appear in both his previous and subsequent writings. His essay “Die überflüssigen” (The superfluous ones), for example, written and published in 1908, clearly presages his later essay. Loos writes:

The decoration of objects of daily use is the beginning of art. The Papuan covers all of his household objects with ornament. The history of mankind shows us how art seeks to free itself from the profane by emancipating itself from the object of daily use, from industrial production.²³

Comparable phrases and ideas also appear in *Wohnungswanderungen* (Residential walking-tours), which he published privately in 1907.²⁴ Loos writes, for example, that “the evolution of mankind goes hand in hand with the removal of ornament from utilitarian objects”²⁵—a formulation which is almost identical to one of the central lines in “Ornament and Crime.” “The evolution of culture is synonymous with the removal of ornament from utilitarian objects.” Another passage reads: “For the cultivated man, an untattooed face is more beautiful than a tattooed one, even if the tattoo is designed by Kolo Moser himself.”²⁶

Loos also had employed many of the images and ideas in “Ornament and Crime”—including the primitive Papuan, degeneracy, and tattooing—for years in his frequent talks and impromptu coffee house lectures, and they were widely known and cited in articles about Loos in the years prior to

the time he first delivered “Ornament and Crime.” In his writings in *Die Fackel*, Loos friend, the satirist Karl Kraus, for example, made several references to Loos’s anti-ornament ideas, often using language similar to that Loos employs in “Ornament and Crime.”²⁷ And the basic premises of “Ornament and Crime” are succinctly summarized in a sketch on Loos written by the journalist Robert Scheu that appeared in the summer of 1909.²⁸

In truth, Loos had in some sense been working on “Ornament and Crime” for more than a decade before he actually wrote the version we now know. He evidently began to formulate his attitude toward ornament even before he returned from his trip to the United States in the mid-1890s, and, as his subsequent writings show, he gradually added the various features of his argument during the course of the following years. Loos, indeed, may have worked out the basic outline for the piece by 1908; but he probably polished it—in various *Kaffeehaus* discussions—for the next year or two until he wrote it down in final form in 1909 or early 1910.

The specific timing of the 1910 lecture, however, is important, because it reveals a great deal both about Loos’s intentions and the role the essay played in subsequent debates about the place of ornament in modern architecture. Given that Loos had been voicing his ideas about ornament for more than a decade, the fundamental question about “Ornament and Crime” is why he felt compelled to once again restate his views on ornament, and to do so more dramatically and more stridently than ever before? The oft-repeated assertion that the piece was intended by Loos merely as a programmatic manifesto for his work is, I think, misleading. As a statement of intention, as Burkhardt Rukschcio has argued, “it would have come at least ten years too late, and would have ‘lagged’ considerably behind Loos’s built work.”²⁹

A number of commentators have pointed to the Secession and the Wiener Werkstätte (and their foremost proponent Josef Hoffmann) as Loos’s principal targets. Reyner Banham, for example, in his 1957 article on “Ornament and Crime” writes that the “historical key” to the essay may be found in the paragraph that mentions Otto Eckmann, Van de Velde, and Olbrich. Loos, Banham writes, “had a personal quarrel with Hoffmann and the *Wiener Sezession*, and any stick would serve to beat the *Wiener Werkstätte*.”³⁰ But this in many respects is a curious statement because neither Hoffmann nor the Wiener Werkstätte are actually mentioned in the published version of the essay, and Banham certainly never saw the recently rediscovered original manuscript, which contains the deleted passage about Hoffmann. Loos had indeed specifically targeted Hoffmann on a number of occasions prior to his writing of “Ornament and Crime,” and he was hardly one to omit Hoffmann’s name for fear of offending him.³¹ Moreover, as Banham himself notes, by 1908, the *Jugendstil* was already losing its impetus and was beginning to give way to a renewed interest in Neoclassicism and other historical idioms.

What Banham and others have missed, however, is that

the despite the turn away from the Jugendstil in Vienna, which in fact began already around 1906, there was a growing interest in other forms of ornament, especially in folkish and primitive decorative forms. This may in part explain the contrast Loos attempts to draw between the “modern primitives,” such as Van de Velde, Hoffmann and Olbrich, whose products he views as contrived and lacking any viable connection to the new urban, industrial reality, and the Papuan, whose ornamented world, although representing a “lower” state of development, was for Loos both “authentic” and appropriate.

Yet, Loos’s antipathy toward the “new primitivism” of Hoffmann and the other modern decorative artists alone, I think, is an insufficient explanation of his intentions. It also obscures the larger part that “Ornament and Crime” played in Loos’s career and the reception of his work in the early 1910s. Here the redating of the essay provides a crucial clue. In January 1910, when he first presented “Ornament and Crime,” Loos was already at work on what would be his first major Viennese building, the Haus am Michaelerplatz (or Looshaus). Loos had produced his first designs for the project in the summer of 1909, and by the time he gave the lecture in January he had made a number of drawings and a model which approximated the building’s finished form.³² Loos apparently showed the model (which seems to have had an even simpler facade design than the first project he submitted to the building authorities) to various “interested parties”³³ in late 1909 or January 1910. But the strikingly plain design evidently prompted a good deal of criticism, and Loos, who was still stinging from his failure to win the 1908 competition for the War Ministry Building and the 1909 competition for the Technisches Museum, was concerned about adverse professional and public reaction. Loos submitted his finished design to the building authorities in late February or early March 1910 and a building permit was issued on 11 March.³⁴ But as a result of a growing storm of protest, Loos was forced to alter the facade design several times during the course of construction. Though neither the original draft of the essay nor the later published version refer explicitly to the building, Loos apparently intended it—at least in some part—as a justification for his radical paring down of the facade’s features. It thus perhaps represents the first salvo fired in what would become a very a public battle by year’s end.

The close relationship between “Ornament and Crime” and the controversy over the Haus am Michaelerplatz is clearly illustrated by the response to the essay and Loos’s subsequent alterations to the manuscript. Another of the persistent myths concerning the essay is that there was an immediate and negative reaction to it. Wiseman, for example, echoing many other commentators, remarks that “the essay caused a furor.” But in fact Loos’s first presentation of “Ornament and Crime” in January 1910 appears to have generated little if any real controversy. In fact, compared with Loos’s lecture “Mein Haus am Michaelerplatz” of the following year, “Ornament and Crime” received only scant coverage in the press. An article that appeared in the Vienna

daily *Fremden-Blatt* the day after Loos's talk noted that it lasted barely half an hour and that the audience loudly applauded afterward. The lecture was followed by "a rather animated discussion," but one which, the reporter added, for the most part did not rise above the level of "idle banter" (*müßige Timpeleien*).³⁵

This lack of "furor" is not difficult to explain. Loos's ideas about ornament were relatively familiar to professionals and the interested public in Vienna, and would hardly have been expected to evoke great surprise. Moreover, many within the Viennese design community sympathized with Loos's contention that building was being degraded into a graphic art—that the use of ornament was often overblown and obscured the underlying formal aspects of the buildings or objects to which it had been applied. The question, however, was a matter of degree; because Loos in January 1910 had yet to execute any works in Vienna aside from a handful of interiors, and because, moreover, he says almost nothing about building in the talk, it would have been quite difficult for most in the audience to fully gauge exactly what Loos intentions were in architectural terms.

Loos repeated the talk on 3 March 1910 in Berlin,³⁶ (evidently at the behest of Herwarth Walden, editor of *Der Sturm*) but again the response was muted. Though the Berlin weekly satirical journal *Ulk* (Joke) ran a piece poking fun at Loos for his anti-ornament stance (portraying him as slightly unhinged zealot who wanted to report to the authorities all of those "criminals" who dared to use floral wallpaper patterns)³⁷ Loos's visit to Berlin otherwise apparently went largely unreported by the press.

Loos repeated the lecture on at least three subsequent occasions, in 1911, 1912 and 1913. But the growing controversy over his design for the Haus am Michaelerplatz—which erupted in earnest in the fall of 1910—focused renewed attention on his ideas on ornament and forced Loos into an increasingly defensive posture. Thus, when Loos presented "Ornament and Crime" in Prague on 17 March 1911, he greatly expanded the original talk, appending to it a discussion of architectural issues in general and specific problems inherent with the Michaelerplatz site. Though the manuscript of the Prague lecture has not survived, a rather detailed write-up in the *Prager Tagblatt* allows us to roughly reconstruct it. Loos evidently began his talk with the original text of "Ornament and Crime," changing the date of the passage "I may now be living..." to the year 1911, but including the section comparing Hoffmann's Apollo Candle Shop with Loos's Café Museum. Rather than ending where the later published text does, however, he added a long section, which, to judge from the newspaper description, must have been an abbreviated version of his essay "Architektur" (Architecture).³⁸

Loos had written "Architecture" in 1910, probably in the latter part of the year as the debate over the Haus am Michaelerplatz intensified.³⁹ The themes and general tone of the two essays are quite similar, but "Architecture" provides a much more explicit guide to Loos's ideas about the problem

of building; it also deals directly with the Haus am Michaelerplatz and its relationship to Loos's ideas about ornament and cultural evolution.⁴⁰ In his Prague talk, Loos evidently used at least the first portion of "Architecture," which compares the modern architect's approach to building in the countryside with the peasant's, and he added to it a specific defense of his Michaelerplatz design, which has evidently not survived in manuscript form.

Loos must have similarly altered the text of the essay in his two known subsequent presentations of "Ornament and Crime" in Munich in 1912, and in Vienna again in 1913. His changes and additions to the Prague lecture demonstrate the close link between the essay and the public debate over the Haus am Michaelerplatz. Even if Loos may not have originally intended "Ornament and Crime" as a defense for his radical design, by late 1910 or early 1911, it had become inextricably linked in the public mind with the debate over the building, and Loos in turn used it as the cornerstone for his defense of his work.

By 1911, "Ornament and Crime" was indeed provoking a furor, a furor, however, that stemmed as much from the public and professional reaction to the Michaelerplatz building as Loos's more general pronouncements on ornament. Both the stridency of the debate and Loos's polemical tone in the talk, however, led many to draw conclusions that were different than Loos intended. This becomes particularly apparent if one reads "Ornament and Crime" within the larger context of Loos's writings of the period, which adopt a somewhat more conciliatory line. The German-speaking audiences who heard Loos lecture and followed the dispute about the Michaelerplatz building in the period between 1910 and 1913, later vividly recalled the essay's title and some of its key features. But because the essay was not published in German until nearly two decades later, there was a good deal of confusion about precisely what Loos had actually said. The generally shared recollection was that Loos had merely equated ornament and crime (which in fact he never does) and that he had called for the systematic abolition of ornament (which he also does not do); and it was this view of Loos as the intractable enemy of ornament that became the standard interpretation in the 1920s and 1930s. A short entry on Loos in *Wasmuths Lexikon der Baukunst*, published in 1931, succinctly sums up this view: "In his writings and in his comparatively few projects, Loos already by 1897 was calling for a complete purity of architecture as part of a fundamental rejection of all ornamentation."⁴¹ Anticipating many later writers, Walter Curt Behrendt, took it even a step further: "Ornament," he wrote, "roused all of [Loos's] passions, and to such an extent that he once flung from the table of his café in Vienna the sharply pointed remark: "Ornament is a crime. . . ."⁴²

The image of Loos as the fabled slayer of ornament (*Ornamententöter*) who had, in Le Corbusier's oft-cited phrase, provided "an Homeric cleansing of architecture" also dominated the discourse about Loos and his ideas in France in the 1920s. Though "Ornament and Crime" was

evidently read by a broad segment of the avant-garde in France, especially after it appeared in *L'Esprit nouveau*, the French, like their German-speaking counterparts, viewed the essay as a portentous expression of the radical purism of the postwar years. Indeed, by the time Loos moved to France in 1922, he was already celebrated as one of the pioneers of the new architecture. Loos initially reveled in the attention, but over time he became more and more concerned that his views on architecture and ornament had been distorted and that the careful distinctions he sought to draw in his writings were being blurred by a new machine-age pathos. By the mid-1920s, the repeated misrepresentations of his ideas finally prompted Loos to issue a rejoinder. In "Ornament und Erziehung" (Ornament and Education), which first appeared in 1924, Loos sought to set the record straight about his attitudes toward ornament. After reaffirming his fundamental notion that cultural evolution was marked by the gradual disappearance of ornament from objects of daily use, Loos added: "I never meant, as the purists have asserted ad absurdum, that ornament should be systematically and completely abolished. Only that once its time has come to disappear that one can no longer be applied."⁴³

Loos's corrective, however, which was published in an obscure Czech journal, had no impact on the already powerful mythology that had grown up concerning "Ornament and Crime." The modernists of the interwar years, seeking to establish a clear lineage for the evolution of their ideas, saw in Loos's writings and work only those aspects which seemed to point in the direction of the new, functionalist aesthetic. That Loos himself had often drawn profoundly different conclusions about architecture and design was simply brushed aside. By the early 1930s, when "Ornament and Crime" was finally published in German, its notoriety prompted most to read it in isolation, and to ignore its place in Loos's larger corpus of works and ideas. The misdating of the essay when it appeared in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in 1929 and again in *Trotzdem* in 1931 only served to further obscure the essay's origins and to reinforce the misunderstandings about the context in which it appeared. Despite the ample clues in the historical record that the circumstances surrounding "Ornament and Crime" were in fact other than was usually represented, deep-rooted expectations about the essay and its meanings have served to perpetuate up to the present day the view of the essay that had grown up in the 1920s and 1930s.

NOTES

¹ Carter Wiseman, "Adolf Loos," in Adolf K. Placzek, ed., *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects* (London: The Free Press, 1982), vol. 3, 31.

² One rather notable exception is the article on Loos that appeared in *Wasmuths Lexikon der Baukunst*, edited by Leo Adler (Berlin: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth), vol. 3, 546, which asserts that the essay was written in 1907.

³ See Burkhardt Rukschcio, "Ornament und Mythos," in Alfred Pfabigan, ed., *Ornament und Askese im Zeitgeist des Wien der Jahrhundertwende* (Vienna: Verlag Christian Brandstätter, 1985): 57-68.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁵ "Die Einrichtung der Apollokerzenfabriksniederlage in Wien, in weichem Holz, farbig gebeizt, die vor elf Jahren ausgeführt wurde, wirkt lange nicht so unerträglich, wie die heutigen Arbeiten Professor Hoffmanns. Oder wie die Arbeiten Hoffmanns in elf Jahren wirken werden. Das Café Museum aber, das in meinem Sinn ausgeführt am selben Datum eröffnet wurde, wie jener Verkaufsladen, wird erst unerträglich wirken, bis die Tischlerarbeit aus dem leim geht." Adolf Loos, "Ornament und Verbrechen," Lecture manuscript, Loos Papers, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna, 17.

⁶ Loos, "Architektur," in *Trotzdem 1900-1930* (Innsbruck: Brenner Verlag, 1931), rpt. Vienna: Georg Prachner Verlag, 1982), 96.

⁷ Loos, "Kulturentartung," in *Trotzdem*, 76.

⁸ "Ich lebe vielleicht im Jahre 1908, mein Nachbar aber lebt um 1900 und der dort im Jahre 1880." Loos, "Ornament und Verbrechen," in *Trotzdem*, 82.

⁹ Loos, "Ornament und Verbrechen," Lecture manuscript, 9.

¹⁰ Rukschcio, "Ornament und Mythos," 61.

¹¹ Loos, "Ornement et crime" *Les cahiers d'aujourd'hui* 5 (June 1913): 247-56.

¹² *Ibid.*, 250.

¹³ Loos, "Ornement et crime," *L'Esprit nouveau* 2 (November 1920): 159-68.

¹⁴ Loos, "Ornement et crime" *L'Architecture vivante* (Spring 1926): 28-30.

¹⁵ Loos, "Ornament und Verbrechen," *Frankfurter Zeitung*, 24 October 1929. The essay was also reprinted in the *Prager Tagblatt* on 10 November 1929.

¹⁶ "Schon 1897 hat Loos die historische Tatsache festgestellt, die er dann 1908 in dem Vortrage 'Ornament und Verbrechen' nach allen Richtungen hin erörtert, dass 'Evolution der Menschheit gleichbedeutend sei mit dem Verschwinden des Ornaments aus dem Gebrauchsgegenstände.'" Heinrich Kulka, *Adolf Loos: Das Werk des Architekten* (Vienna: Anton Schroll & Co., 1931), 7.

¹⁷ Rukschcio, "Ornament und Mythos," 61.

¹⁸ Fritz Schumacher, "Die Sehnsucht nach dem 'Neuen,'" *Deutsche Bauzeitung* 31 (1897), 632ff. See also Mitchell Schwarzer, *German Architectural Theory and the Search for Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 243-44.

¹⁹ Joseph August Lux, "Die Erneuerung der Ornamentik," *Innen-Dekoration* 18 (1907), 286-92; 353-54.

²⁰ Richard Schaukal, "Gegen das Ornament," *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration* 23(1908), reprinted in Adolf Opel, ed., *Konfrontationen: Schriften von und über Adolf Loos* (Vienna: Georg Prachner Verlag, 1988), 32-35; Wilhelm Michel, "Die Schicksale des Ornaments," *Innen-Dekoration* 20 (1909), 231-37; Otto Scheffers, "Zweckform und Ornament," *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration* 24 (1909), 234-38; Otto Schulze-Eberfeld, "Über Ornament-Symbolik," *Innen-Dekoration* 21 (1910), 378-87.

²¹ Schaukal writes: "Ein Tüchtiger hat schon vor Jahren den Kampf gegen das willkürliche Ornament aufgenommen: *Adolf Loos*, ein Wiener Architekt. Ihm ist die Lösung: 'Los vom Ornament!' eine Glaubens- und Gewissenssache. Er sieht in der ornamentlosen Zukunft, die er erträumt, die Menschheit von einem Fluch befreit, sieht nutzlose Arbeit abgetan, die Produktion vereinfacht, den Gewinn, zumal der Handwerker, mit geringern Mitteln erzielbar. Er predigt das Material und seine elementare Wirkung, die Harmonie der Farben und Flächen, den Akkord der Metalle und Hölzer, der Ziegel und Steine." Schaukal, "Gegen das Ornament," 34-35.

²² See, for example, Ludwig Hevesi, "Adolf Loos," *Fremden-Blatt*, 22 November 1907, reprinted in Opel, ed.,

- Konfrontationen*, 16-21; Wilhelm von Wymetal, "Ein reichbegabtes Brüner Kind," *Tagesbote aus Mähren und Schlesien*, 4 January 1908, reprinted in Opel, ed., *Konfrontationen*, 21-31.
- ²³ "Die Verzierung des Gebrauchgegenstandes ist der Anfang der Kunst. Der Papuaner bedeckt seinen ganzen Hausrat mit Ornamenten. Die Geschichte der Menschheit zeigt uns, wie sich die Kunst aus der Profanierung dadurch zu befreien sucht, dass sie sich von dem gebrauchsgegenstände, dem gewerblichen Erzeugnisse, emanzipiert." Loos, "Die überflüssigen (Deutscher Werkbund)," *März* 1 (August 1908), reprinted in *Trotzdem*, 71-73.
- ²⁴ Loos, *Wohnungswanderungen* (Vienna, 1907), reprinted in Adolf Loos, *Die Potemkin'sche Stadt: Verschollene Schriften 1897-1933*, Adolf Opel, ed. (Vienna: Georg Prachner Verlag, 1983): 106-15.
- ²⁵ "Die Evolution der Menschheit geht Hand in Hand mit dem Entfernen des Ornaments aus dem Gebrauchsgegenstände." *Ibid.*, 108.
- ²⁶ "Für den kultivierten Menschen ist ein nichttätowiertes Antlitz schöner als ein tätowiertes und wenn die Tätowierung von Kolo Moser selbst herrühren sollte." *Ibid.*, 107-08.
- ²⁷ In *Die Fackel* 10, Nr. 224 (27 February 1909), 22, for example, Kraus writes of the "Indianerfreude an Ornament"—a clear reference to Loos's primitive Papuan. See also Kraus, "Tagebuch," *Die Fackel* 11, Nr. 279-80 (13 May 1909), 8.
- ²⁸ "Die blankeisernerne Schönheit der angelsächsischen Industrie, die glatte Fläche wird sein Idol und das Ornament sinkt ihm hinab zur "Tätowierung." Sein Lebensgedanke steigt herauf: Überwindung des Ornaments! Je weiter wir in der Kultur vorwärts schreiten, desto mehr befreien wir uns vom Ornament. Goldene Tressen sind heute noch ein Attribut der Hörigkeit. Das Bedürfnis zu ornamentieren durchschaut er als Indianerstandpunkt." Robert Scheu, "Adolf Loos," *Die Fackel* 11, Nr. 283-284 (26 June 1909), 32-33.
- ²⁹ Rukschcio, "Ornament und Mythos," 58.
- ³⁰ Reyner Banham, "Ornament and Crime: The Decisive Contribution of Adolf Loos," *Architectural Review* 121 (February 1957), 87.
- ³¹ See Rainald Franz, "Josef Hoffmann and Adolf Loos: The Ornament Controversy in Vienna," in Peter Noever, ed., *Josef Hoffmann Designs*, exh. cat. (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1992), 11-15.
- ³² See Hermann Czech and Wolfgang Mistelbauer, *Das Looshaus*, 3rd. ed. (Vienna: Löcker Verlag, 1984), esp. 18ff; and Burkhardt Rukschcio and Roland Schachel, *Adolf Loos: Leben und Werk*, 2nd. ed. (Salzburg and Vienna: Residenz Verlag, 1982), 163-68, 460-69.
- ³³ Robert Orley, "Jahresbilanz," *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft Österreichischer Architekten, Vereinsjahr 1909/10* (Vienna, 1910), 87ff.
- ³⁴ Czech and Mistelbauer, *Das Looshaus*, 18ff.
- ³⁵ "Ornament und Verbrechen," *Fremden-Blatt*, 22 January 1910.
- ³⁶ See the advertisement in *Der Sturm* 1:1 (3 March 1910), 8.
- ³⁷ M.[?], "Der Ornamentenfeind," *Ulk: Wochenbeilage zum Berliner Tagblatt*, 18 March 1910. Loos, not to be outdone, responded in a short piece that appeared in *Der Sturm*, remarking acidly that "there would come a time when jail cells designed by court wallpaperer Schultze or Professor Van de Velde would be considered as cruel and unusual punishment (*strafverschärfung*)." Loos, "Ornament und Verbrechen," *Der Sturm* 1: 6 (7 April 1910), 44.
- ³⁸ [Ludwig Steiner?], "Vortrag Adolf Loos," *Prager Tagblatt*, 18 March 1911, 9, reprinted in Adolf Opel, ed., *Kontroversen: Adolf Loos im Spiegel der Zeitgenossen* (Vienna: Georg Prachner Verlag, 1985), 47-48. See also Vladimir Slapeta, "Adolf Loos' Vorträge in Prag und Brünn," in Burkhardt Rukschcio, ed., *Adolf Loos*, exh. cat. (Vienna: Graphische Sammlung Albertina, 1989), 41-42.
- ³⁹ Loos presented it as a talk entitled "Über Architektur" (On architecture) at the Architektenhaus in Berlin on 8 December 1910. A small section of the essay (with minor variations from the later version published in *Trotzdem*) was reprinted in *Der Sturm*. See Loos, "Über Architektur," *Der Sturm* 1 (15 December 1910), 334.
- ⁴⁰ See Harry F. Mallgrave, "Adolf Loos and the Ornament of Sentiment," *Midgård* 1 (1987): 79-87.
- ⁴¹ "In seinen Schriften und den verhältnismässig wenigen ausgeführten Bauten setzte sich Loos bereits seit 1897 für eine reine Sachlichkeit in der Baukunst ein unter grundsätzlicher Ablehnung aller Ornamentik." *Wasmuths Lexikon der Baukunst*, vol. 3, 546.
- ⁴² Walter Curt Behrendt, *Modern Building: Its Nature, Problems, and Forms* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937), 96-97.
- ⁴³ "Ich habe aber damit niemals gemeint, was die Puristen ad absurdum getrieben haben, dass das Ornament systematisch und konsequent abzuschaffen sei. Nur da, wo es einmal zeitnotwendig verschwunden ist, kann man es nicht wieder anbringen." Loos, "Ornament und Erziehung," *Nas smer* (10 October 1924), reprinted in *Trotzdem*, 177.