

Marble Craft and Ornament

CLAIRE ZIMMERMAN
Florida A&M University

I.

In his foreword to a recent book on the Villa Müller, the architect and educator John Hejduk dwells on the effect of marble surfaces in Adolf Loos's interiors.¹ Hejduk describes the physical and, for lack of a better word, spiritual interiority of the space, an archetype for the Loosian marble interior. He also characterizes the Loosian imagination as "tumultuous," a term of exaggerated subjectivity that strikes a sympathetic chord with respect to Loos and his context: Vienna at the turn of the nineteenth century. Recent commentaries on Loos acknowledge the connection between his interiors and a construction of interiority that reverberates throughout the culture, an aspect of cultural identity, in addition to a spatial habit.² "Tumultuous" goes, in fact, a long way towards a subjective description of Loos's practice, where ornament is eschewed (sometimes) in favor of a more compelling intensification of interior space: that to be gained through an intense celebration of construction material itself.

Architectural critics find Loos to be a figure of remarkable appeal. Not only extraordinarily good at assembling a well-crafted building, Loos also maintained a critical independence that seems to have been fostered by his clients rather than compromised by them.³ His engagement with questions on the nature of private versus public life has made his work retain contemporary relevance, so directly did it engage many of the ongoing challenges of modernity. His close relationship with other intellectuals, Peter Altenberg, Karl Kraus, and Arnold Schönberg among them, also confirms his wider cultural significance in the 20th century. Finally, his apparent refusal to be compromised by the market forces behind a commercial practice earn him the highest respect of today's architects and critics. Some of these opinions prejudice the current work, whose author hopes nevertheless to add to them some queries about the absolutist tone and extreme nature of Loos's rhetoric, and about his contradictory contributions—written and built—to a construction of society and, by extension, gender, particular to Vienna at this time.

This paper will study the close connection between Loos

and his friend and fellow culture-critic, Karl Kraus,⁴ on the way to examining a group of Loos interiors. While articles and books on Loos's architecture acknowledge Kraus's influence, it is texts on Kraus or on fin-de-siècle Viennese thought that draw the closest connections between their work.⁵ The importance of such connections in Loos's case lies in understanding Kraus's linguistic mission in order to elucidate Loos's architectural one. The anti-rational, poetic basis of much of Kraus's thinking—the strength of *desire* in his writing—figures strongly in Loos's work as well, emerging from the juxtaposition of mute, 'functionalist' exteriors and livid interiors in his work, and against the backdrop of his writings on cultural life and production. While associations between the white box of the modern house and a rationalizing agenda have been assisted by Loos's houses themselves (in spite of their meticulous hand-crafting, and the fact that nothing could have been further from Loos's intentions⁶), Loos was, in fact, more interested in tradition than abstraction, more interested in the poetic than the rational.

Loos's particular construction of interiority can be brought out by looking comparatively (and selectively) at the treatment of marble in his domestic and commercial interiors. The emphasis of the paper rests on the former, but it is in comparison to the latter that a possible understanding emerges. Specifically, I will present two alternatives: the domestic interior as a space coated in marble, where the coating responds to the logic of the particular moment; and the commercial interior as a space in which a gridded framing structure sheathed in marble implies spatial and constructional unity, but which establishes this unity through the extended use of mirror reflection. This touches on a larger point: the specific, highly intentional way in which Loos deploys the same materials and configurations in different combinations—as language elements speaking different things. For Loos, the domestic interior is the stage on which the events of private life are played out; organized by the cataclysmic—conception, birth, death—and configured by unrestrained human emotion—love, hatred, sadness, desire. The very fecundity of the private provides the subject matter

for these domestic interiors. As receptacles for the dramatic, Loos's domestic interiors are settings in which emotion is unleashed through the obsessive distribution of finely crafted material.

II.

In 1905, Loos completed an interior renovation for the apartment of Alfred Kraus, a brother of Karl Kraus, in Vienna,⁷ that is characterized in photographs by the striking marble patterning that covers the walls of the dining room. While the architecture is free of ornament, doors and moldings are heavily, even traditionally articulated. Marble is used for door frames, fireplace, infill paneling above the doors, and for wall cladding between other elements. The wall ensemble of mahogany doors, mirror, gas fire elements, and marble filling one end of the room is a complicated series of framing and framed elements stretched between the parquet floor and the slanting mahogany frieze at the ceiling-wall edge. In this wall, the marble serves both to frame individual elements or spatial moments (doorways, windows), and to clad; it also serves as a nominal kind of built-in furnishing. This use of marble resists the conventional Modern paradigm of structure and cladding—the door frames, for instance, have an almost baroque profile, and die gracefully into the wall in such a way that frame and cladding are indistinguishable. The fact of the material as interior covering supersedes clear readings of its structural or non-structural function. This is rendered still more noticeable by the bold pattern of the material itself. The marble is Loos's favored Cipollino marble. The pattern is exotic; it overwhelms the regularity of the mahogany that accompanies it. The interior is disturbing, as if the controlled conventionality of the detailing and the appointments of the room is contradicted both by the ad hoc distribution of the material—here a door frame, here a wall surface—and by the uncontrolled pattern of the marble.⁸

The Alfred Kraus interior predates the appearance of "Ornament and Crime" by three years. Yet Loos's thoughts on ornament had already appeared in the essays he wrote for the Vienna Jubilee of 1898. He says,

"Let us briefly review a few chapters of the history of civilization. The lower the cultural level of a people, the more extravagant it is with its ornament, its decoration. The Indian covers every object, every boat, every oar, every arrow with layer upon layer of ornament. To see decoration as a sign of superiority means to stand at the level of the Indians. But we must overcome the Indian in us. The Indian says, 'This woman is beautiful because she wears gold rings in her nose and ears.' The man of high culture says, 'This woman is beautiful because she does not wear rings in her nose and ears.' To seek beauty only in form and not in ornament is the goal toward which all humanity is striving."⁹

The Alfred Kraus interior highlights a certain tension between Loos's treatment of a naturally patterned material, itself producing a decorative effect, and his vitriolic comments on applied ornamentation. After all, it is not possible to consider the patterning of marble in this interior as *form*, even while it is not precisely *ornament* either. The difference in relative productions is self-evident: but the difference in final effect? What is it? While Loos's understanding of ornament is clear enough—ornament is a highly worked material surface somehow applied to or pulled from its object, to which it is functionally and structurally irrelevant—his use of a highly patterned marble wall cladding suggests an analogous process, where polishing replaces other ornamental practices. The tattoo-like pattern of the marble even recalls the citation above. Perhaps Loos's interest in the material itself has led him into the fetishization of, in this case, marble, that bears strong resemblance to a different kind of fetish, the fetish of the ornament?¹⁰ The pattern of the marble could be said to be irrelevant to the disposition of this otherwise conventional bourgeois interior—another layer of information having little to do with the elegant use of a fine material. Marble goes beyond understated elegance here. Loos presents us with the raw sensuality of a natural material in all its decorative beauty.

Two related points are thus raised: Loos considered natural materials in a state of natural finish as desirable building materials, no matter how bold their patterning. In fact, highly patterned or textured natural materials constituted one of the few permissible kinds of decorative information¹¹ to be used in his interiors. Further, Loos's use of natural materials had a moralizing dimension; revealing natural material in its unexpected beauty was equated to moral truth. Processing—in this case quarrying, cutting, polishing, trimming—has everything to do with exposing the material's innate nature, what Hejduk called "the soul of marble." In the case of ornament applied to, say, a carriage, the process is one of concealing the nature of the object behind a forest of unrelated anecdotal information. Human intervention in this case adds up to subterfuge.¹²

This ethical interpretation of material essence versus ornamental excrescence, with overtones of Semper, Ruskin, and William Morris, calls up Karl Kraus's views on ethics and language. Kraus, on ornament in language, says: "In the art of language, one calls metaphor that which is used to convey a meaning other than its own. Therefore metaphors are the perversions of language..."¹³ For both Loos and Kraus, a particular subject (architecture or literature) is grounded in a larger agenda: the restoration of meaning to cultural production. For Kraus, operating in the spheres of journalism, theater, and literature, Viennese culture was burdened with meaninglessness engendered by inaccuracies in the use of language. The confusion was spread, intentionally or not, by journalists who dressed opinion in the guise of objective reporting; dramatists who darkened the theater with *gesamtkunstwerk* productions, essayists who prolifer-

ated that most despised form of writing, the anecdotal *feuilleton*. For Kraus, misuse of language amounted to an ethical crime; a direct correspondence between words and meaning was the sign of moral quality.

Kraus quotes Confucius on the relationship of language, correctly used, to the moral identity of a nation: "If concepts are not right, words are not true; if words are not true, works are not achieved; if works are not achieved, morality and the arts do not thrive; if morality and the arts do not thrive, justice miscarries; if justice miscarries, the nation does not know where to put its hands and feet. Therefore, disorder in words must not be tolerated."¹⁴ In speaking of the mission shared by himself and Loos, Kraus makes his famous chamber-pot comment: "Adolf Loos and I—he literally and I grammatically—have done nothing more than show that there is a distinction between an urn and a chamber pot and that it is this distinction above all that provides culture with elbow room. The others, those who fail to make this distinction, are divided into those who use the urn as a chamber pot, and those who use the chamber pot as urn."¹⁵ In this distinguishing of appropriate use of form and function, Kraus locates the moral heart of culture. The collage of two agendas into one didactic anecdote gives a particularly concentrated statement of what these two figures share. The effort is to clearly name the thing and its purpose, through the treatment (representation) of the thing itself. For Kraus, language is the representation that can contain essential meaning ("Word and essence—the only connection I ever sought in my life."¹⁶); for Loos, architecture, furniture, clothing—the artifacts of material culture—play the same role. For each, the clear distinction between function (in writing, the statement of fact; in architecture, the provision for use) and expression (art, or "fantasy" for Kraus) is critical.

Like Loos, Kraus believes in the enduring importance of tradition in the use of language. His statement, "Only a language which has cancer is likely to create new words.... To use unusual words is bad literary manners,"¹⁷ bears a marked similarity to Loos's strictures on formal invention.¹⁸ Both Kraus and Loos locate this engagement with history in a search for originary or essential forms (*Ursprungen*) in their work.¹⁹ Language provides Kraus with an originary subject—the subject of representation itself. Within this form, he searches further for clarity among the medium's different forms. For Loos, the language model is transferred to architectural form through the mediation of function. Function provides a guidepost for the determination of essential or originary form, function together with received use, or tradition. Both Kraus and Loos believe firmly in the existence of the Origin, the essential, that contains meaning *through* its representation, and yet somehow *beyond* representation. In this belief in an irreducible Essential, their project is deeply Modern, in spite of, or perhaps in line with, its endorsement of tradition.

III.

In 1907, Loos began an interior for Arnold and Julius Bellak

in Vienna. The project was not completed for six years, because of the difficulty of procuring the marble cladding that lines the walls of the main living room.²⁰ Loos used Cipollino marble again in this project, streaked in green and white. The room, in its original state, was filled with antique furniture and pictures that in at least one instance the marble was specifically cut to frame. The surface of the wall again oscillates between framed elements and wall surfacing; and again involves the framing of discrete images or moments, not structural elements.²¹ Over one canvas, set into the wall above a small ornamental fountain at the wall base, a slab of marble is set horizontally, as if to mimic a lintel block. This arrangement is duplicated over a doorway in the corresponding position at the other end of the room, and on the short wall adjacent to the fountain; a horizontal wall base molding occupies the bottom of the wall, in contrast to the vertical orientation of the marble patterning above. The frieze course in this room belongs to the wall, not the ceiling; it is a frieze of young Bacchantes, a type drawn from Classical relief sculpture. This interior, too, is characterized by a strange disjunction between the bourgeois respectability of its parts and the "tattooing" of its marble walls. The marble again calls attention to itself, a wild element within an otherwise highly tamed bourgeois interior.

Through these distant black and white images, Loos offers materiality as a primary component of architecture. The Bellak interior offers the sensual experience of marble through the creation of a bourgeois domestic interior. Loos describes his intentions as follows, "...what I want in my rooms is for people to feel substance all round them, for it to act upon them, for them to know the enclosed space, to feel the fabric, the wood, above all to perceive it sensually, with sight and touch, for them to dare to sit comfortably and feel the chair over a large area of their external bodily senses, and to say: this is what I call sitting!"²² The use of material as the trigger for sensual bodily experience is part of Loos's search for originary experience in architecture. "Matter must become divine again. Materials are utterly mysterious substances. We must feel a deep, respectful wonder that such things were created at all."²³ Making the space for this material encounter is thus a primary focus of Loos's architecture. If construction material offers what we might call a "language element," or perhaps a *class* of elements in his work, it is in some sense authoritative, a primary one.

Kraus uses forms of language as autonomous materials, as Loos uses construction materials. The characteristics of language, like the particular characteristics of marble, are dictated by the weight of tradition and established usage,²⁴ both grammatical and typological. For Kraus, language has independent integrity, and its beauty, like that of the marble slab, is revealed by the craftsman. His aphorisms hint at the independence of the material, language, from its user: "Language is the mother of thought, not its handmaiden," "Language is the only chimera whose illusory power is endless, the inexhaustibility which keeps life from being impoverished. Let men learn to serve language," "Let language be

the divining rod that finds sources of thought,” and “I have drawn from the well of language many a thought I do not have and which I could not put into words.”²⁵ Kraus’s aphorisms also hint at the sensuality of language. Throughout his writings, suggestions of a sensual experience, even a physical experience, of language, surface repeatedly: “When I don’t make any progress, it is because I have bumped into the wall of language. Then I draw back with a bloody head. And would like to go on.”²⁶ Other comments take on the terminology of an erotic relationship: “A poet’s language, a woman’s love—it is always that which happens for the first time,” and “My language is the common prostitute that I turn into a virgin,” and, in one of many derogatory comments on fellow writers, “Heinrich Heine so loosened the corsets of the German language that today every little salesman can fondle her breasts.”²⁷ The experience of language is a continual engagement, an intercourse between the material and its writer. Looking back to the physicality of architecture, a similar exchange is theorized by Loos. In his interiors particularly, Loos initiates a relationship between inhabitant and shell through the sensual play of veins in marble, the comfort of an upholstered chair, the placement of familiar belongings within the well-crafted interior. The domestic interior is the stage on which the events of life are played out; it serves as both setting and prompter.²⁸

IV.

There is another “basic language element” that demands attention in Loos’s work, and that is the frame. Loos adopts the Semperian model as a model for his own understanding of frame and cladding.²⁹ Like Semper, Loos interprets the frame as the structural necessity that makes cladding possible. This would seem to indicate a clear distinction between what holds up—the frame—and what hangs from—the cladding. And yet, in the interiors described above, there is a distinct lack of interest in the clear expression of frame and cladding. In Loos’s deployment of marble in his domestic interiors the composition of the material itself supercedes didactic lessons about the theoretical genesis of architecture.

The fact of *marble* wall cladding in the *domestic* interior might itself seem to blur the line between skin and structure. In conventional historical usage, marble is either a structural material, or a cladding for building exteriors or monumental public interiors. In Loos’s houses, marble cladding is used in domestic spaces such that its nonstructural function is repeatedly aligned with its apparently structural form. In the interior wall between living and dining room in the Müller House, the four columns (two freestanding, two engaged double pilasters) that separate the two spaces are not always structural (one is merely a mechanical chase). The stepped half wall of which the pilasters form one part is itself clad with the same marble that wraps the columns. At the base of this wall, the distinction between column and infill is no more than a joint between two pieces of veneer.³⁰ Equally provocative is the section of wall above the two inset aquaria.

From the living room, these aquaria float in the middle of an apparently unbroken wall surface. From the dining room, however, the tanks are directly accessible through a bronze grate; the section of marble above this level is a mere apron, a thin slab³¹ stretched between the third and fourth pilasters, of which one is structural, one not. Here in one wall are combined three different architectural identities for the same contiguous material: marble as wall veneer, marble as pilaster or column (veneer), and marble as solid slab. The material supersedes theoretical distinctions between structure and cladding. The creation of this interior, as in many of Loos’s other interiors, is following a different logic: a logic of the material’s poetic presence.

While Loos outlines “the law of cladding,” in his essay “The Principle of Cladding,” he has very little to say about any rules that govern the frame. In the case of the Müller House, the frame is difficult to trace as a structural reality. Where it exists, it is as a fiction that provides the cladding with some apparently rational basis (the expression of four ‘columns’). There *are* projects in which Loos deploys a spatial frame more consistently, although still without any consistent structural function. In the Looshaus interior, Goldman and Salatsch, and in the interior of the Kärtner Bar, the gridlike frame of columns is heightened by its reflection in pieces of mirrored glass that serve as infill between columns.³² The same arrangement appears in isolated instances in a number of other projects, where a pair of engaged columns, generally clad in marble, flank a centered piece of mirrored glass.³³ The mirror reflection of these rectangular piers invariably completes them, often making them appear as if square in section, doubling the apparent expanse of marble.

It is useful to contrast photographs of the Goldman and Salatsch interior, published at the time of the project’s completion, with photographs of its recently reconstructed interior. In the latter, the apparent lateral extension of the frame, as a result of its reflection, is immediately striking. In the former, all sense of this effect is suppressed by the rendering of mirrored surfaces as non-reflective.³⁴ In considering the deployment of the frame in this interior, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that here Loos represents a frame that is not clad, through the representative device of a column that is. The mirror disappears in its own depiction of a plausible reality—the lateral extension of space. In the Knize Paris interior, the illusionistic “completion” of the columns, combined with inset fireplace and display case placed as if standing between freestanding columns, combine to reinforce the sense of a column grid standing in space. Again, cladding is reserved for the “structural” members themselves. Looking back to the side wall of the Goldman and Salatsch interior, a grid of columns stretches off into space, point elements set on a rational matrix, reflected in the least rational of spaces—the space created by reflection.

Here, then, are two alternatives, drawn selectively from Loos’s *oeuvre*: spaces framed by an implied grid of sheathed columns; and spaces whose walls are covered in marble willy nilly, where implications of a structural frame or an organiz-

ing grid are irrelevant. Goldman and Salatsch, the Kärntner Bar, the Knize interior, are all public interiors. The Müller House, the Alfred Kraus interior, and the Bellak interior are all private. The question arises: are these ways of deploying structure and frame related to the nature of the spaces outfitted?³⁵ Does Loos care more about didactic clarity in his public interiors, more for sensual experience in his private ones?

V.

Beatriz Colomina has touched on the role of women and the feminine in Loos's domestic interiors.³⁶ She notes how women are Loos's subjects in these interiors, that while he empowers them with visual control over the interior realm, he also puts them on display, subjects them to a kind of visual scrutiny that gives form to vulnerability. Among other authors, Colomina quotes the Spanish critic José Quetglas and his interpretation of the Loosian interior as "an architecture of the womb."³⁷

Raising the issue of gender with respect to Loos's work brings one back to Kraus. Like Loos, Karl Kraus had a theory of the essential difference between men and women that had corollary expressions in contemporary Viennese intellectual culture.³⁸ Women's identity was seen as constructed of pure sensuality; man's of reason and imagination.³⁹ In the midst of this highly egocentric view of women's role in society, Kraus is ready to attribute to women a critical role in the sustenance of the male intellect. He is ready to worship the feminine in its manifestation as pure sensuality, as he does in allying it with his search for linguistic purity. Language is, in fact, feminine.⁴⁰ Do we find a similar construction in Loos? Is the complicated sensuality of the domestic interior part of Loos's construction of the feminine? His comment that, "The house does not have to tell anything to the exterior; instead, all its richness must be manifest on the interior,"⁴¹ is not conclusive. More to the point, though, is the way in which Loos's treatment of the domestic interior, and specifically his treatment of natural materials within that interior,⁴² reflects a level of sensuality that appears as a feature of Viennese private life. The question of how this indulgence in a radical experience of sensuality fits specifically into a construction of femininity is provocative. Equally provocative is the question of its importance in the construction of interior life, in a construction of private eroticism or sexuality. I would suggest that Loos's exploration of rich surfaces of luxurious marble is precisely that: an essay into the construction of the erotic. The extent to which these surfaces serve as the decorative backdrop for the women who inhabit Loos's interiors can only be imagined. The extent to which his own and others' understanding of the feminine gave rise to this unrestrained use of a luxurious material is also unknown. But in the face of his overwhelming rejection of the depravity of ornament, with its clear affiliation to sexuality, we have Loos's own work, the tumultuous rendering of the exotic marble surface.

NOTES

- ¹ van Duzer, L. and Kleinman, K., *Villa Müller, A Work of Adolf Loos* (New York: 1994), p. 14.
- ² See Beatriz Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media* (Cambridge: 1994).
- ³ See client-architect contract between Loos and Frantisek Müller, as well as Müller's letters to Loos, in van Duzer and Kleinman, *Villa Müller, A Work of Adolf Loos*.
- ⁴ Similar constructions might perhaps be made with respect to Loos's close relationships to Peter Altenberg and Arnold Schönberg.
- ⁵ Walter Benjamin's essay on Karl Kraus makes these connections clearly. See "Karl Kraus," in *Reflections* (New York: 1978).
- ⁶ For these associations, see the canonical histories of Modern Architecture, including Henry Russell-Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, *The International Style* (New York: 1932), Siegfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture* (Cambridge: 1941). Also, for a contemporary critique of this vision of modernism, see Mark Wigley, "White Out: Fashioning the Modern," in Efrat, El-Khoury, Fausch, Singley, eds., *Architecture: In Fashion* (Cambridge: 1995).
- ⁷ Photographs of this interior appear in Ludwig Münz and Gustav Künstler's *Adolf Loos, Pioneer of Modern Architecture*, (London: 1966), pp. 64, 65, and in Burkhardt Rukschcio and Roland Schachel, *Adolf Loos, Leben und Werk* (Wien: 1982), p439.
- ⁸ In the case of the Villa Müller, Loos's client writes, "Dear Architect, Yesterday I spoke with the Marmorea Firm and I was informed by Mr. Weizman that the two cipolin blocks measuring 400/66/60 (cm) are probably already underway, so he cannot give me any information about their appearance. He assured me, however, that they are stripped parallel to their length.....the firm buys the blocks at their own risk and delivers the slabs to us with thicknesses of 2,4,8 cm and according to the exact measurements, with a width of 47 cm and with a total area of about 80m square...." Frantisek Müller to Loos, June 22, 1929, in van Duzer and Kleinman, *Villa Müller, A Work of Adolf Loos*, p.94.
- ⁹ "The Luxury Vehicle", in Adolf Loos, *Spoken Into the Void*, p 40.
- ¹⁰ See Miriam Gusevich, "Decoration and Decorum, Adolf Loos's Critique of Kitsch" *New German Critique* 43 (1988): 97-123 for a discussion of the fetish, and specifically, ornament as fetish, in Loos's writing.
- ¹¹ For a consideration of Loos's preference for Classical Antiquity as a source for form and legitimate ornamentation, see Dietmar Steiner, "The Strength of the Old Masters: Adolf Loos and Antiquity," in Safran, Y. and Wang, W., *The Architecture of Adolf Loos*, (exh. cat., London: 1982) and Hubert Locher, "'Enough of the original geniuses! Let us repeat ourselves unceasingly!' Adolf Loos, the New, and 'The Other,'" *Daidalos* 52, pp.76-85.
- ¹² For Loos on the carriage, see "The Luxury Vehicle," in *Spoken into the Void*.
- ¹³ Karl Kraus, "Beim Wort genommen", *Sprüche und Widersprüche (1909)* Munich, 1955, p. 26. Quoted in Benedetto Gravagnuolo, *Adolf Loos: Theory and Works* (New York: 1988), p. 66.
- ¹⁴ Quoted in the Introduction to the English translation (by Frederick Ungar) of Kraus's *The Last Days of Mankind* (New York: 1974), p.xviii.
- ¹⁵ Quoted in Allen Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (London: 1973), p.89, among other places. For commentary in English on Kraus's association between language and ethics, see Chapter Three of Janik and Toulmin, as well as Wilma Abeles Iggers, *Karl Kraus: A Viennese Critic of the*

Twentieth Century (The Hague: 1967), Chapter II, "The Absolute Value of Language"; Harry Zohn, *Karl Kraus* (New York: 1971), Chapter Four; Edward Timms, *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Satirist*, (London: 1986), and Frederick Ungar's Introduction to Karl Kraus, *The Last Days of Mankind* (New York: 1974). For a critique of Kraus's language-system, see J.P. Stern, "Karl Kraus's Vision of Language," *Modern Language Review*, January: 1966.

For connections between Kraus and Loos, see Timms, *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Satirist*, Chapter 6; Janik and Toulmin, Chapter Four; Paul Engelmann, *Letters from Ludwig Wittgenstein, With a Memoir* (Oxford: 1967), Chapter VII; Walter Benjamin, "Karl Kraus," in *Reflections* (New York: 1978).

¹⁶ Karl Kraus, *No Compromise: Selected Writings of Karl Kraus* translated and edited by Frederick Ungar (New York: 1977), p. 228. This aphorism is also translated as follows: "Word and substance—that is the only connection I have ever striven for in my life." in Karl Kraus, *Half-Truths and One-and-a-half Truths*, transl. Harry Zohn (Quebec: 1976), p. 36.

¹⁷ *Sprüche und Widersprüche*, (Wien: 1909), p.175 (from Iggers, p.27).

¹⁸ For a discussion of Loos's use of historical precedent and limited belief in invention, see Yehuda Safran, "Adolf Loos: The Archimedean Point," in Safran, Y., and Wang, W, *The Architecture of Adolf Loos* (exhibition catalogue, London: 1982), Hubert Locher, "Enough of the original geniuses!..." and Benedetto Gravagnuolo, *Adolf Loos*.

¹⁹ For a brief discussion of Kraus's search for origins, see Janik and Toulmin, chapter 3.

²⁰ Burkhardt Rukschcio and Roland Schachel, *Adolf Loos, Leben und Werk*, pp. 453, 454, and Ludwig Münz and Gustav Künstler, *Adolf Loos, Pioneer of Modern Architecture*, pp. 70-72, 204.

²¹ Lauren Weingarden, in conversations with the author, connects this strategy to strategies of the nineteenth century Picturesque.

²² Adolf Loos, "Regarding Economy", in Max Risselada, ed., *Raumplan versus Plan Libre* (New York: 1987), p. 139f.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

²⁴ In this sense it is easier to make a correlation between Loos's embrace of traditional form in architecture and Kraus's in language. But Kraus is interested in forms of language more essential than those offered by tradition and history, as is Loos, in architecture. For a general discussion of these points, see Janik and Toulmin, *op. cit.*

²⁵ Karl Kraus, *Half-truths and One-and-a-half Truths*, pp.62-63.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67. Kraus also writes, "My helplessness grows with the completion of what I have written. The closer I come to a word, the more it bleeds, like a corpse in the presence of a murderer....." *Ibid.*, p. 58.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 68, 69, and 65, respectively. Also see Allen Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (London: 1973), p. 88, on Kraus's relationship to Heine.

²⁸ In this context I think of Loos's comment in *Das Andere*, whose relationship to *Die Fackel* has been briefly explored by Gravagnuolo: "Try to describe how birth and death, the screams of pain for an aborted son, the death rattle of a dying mother, the last thoughts of a young woman who wishes to die...unfold and unravel in a room by Olbrich! Just an image: the young woman who has put herself to death. She is lying on the wooden floor. One of her hands still holds the smoking revolver. On the table a letter, the farewell letter. Is the room in which this is happening of good taste? Who will ask that? It is just a room!" Cited in Beatriz Colomina, "Intimacy and Spectacle: The Interiors of Adolf Loos," p. 9. Presumably Loos created interiors in which he thought these events could unwind in a more appropriate manner, although what that manner might be remains mysterious. Easier to comprehend in this context is the

excerpt from his Jubilee essay: "Here was the table, a totally crazy and intricate piece of furniture, an extension table with a shocking bit of work as a lock.....Every piece of furniture, every thing, every object had a story to tell, a family history. The house was never finished; it grew along with us and we grew within it. Of course, it did not have any style to it," from "Interiors in the Rotunda," *Spoken into the Void*, p. 23f.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ I am grateful to Morgen Fleisig for pointing out possible connections to Alberti in this context.

³¹ But not as thin as the veneer slabs; here, perhaps, the explanation for the 2, 4, and 8 cm widths specified in Frantisek Müller's letter to Loos; see note 11 above.

³² The Kärtner Bar does actually have cladding below the mirrored surface as well, creating an illusion of bounding an unbounded (because mirrored) space.

³³ This is the case, for instance, in the interior of the Paris Knize shop (fig. 10), the Hans Brummel interior in Prague (fig. 11), and a number of other interiors. See Rukschcio and Schachel. One interesting effect in some of these cases is the way in which the fireplace, that sits below the mirrored surface, is made to look as if it was the last thing placed in the "empty," columned space, the thing that *follows* the placement of columns and glass, rather than the element that has *given rise to* columns and infill, as is in fact the case.

³⁴ This is perhaps related to Loos's comments on the use of photographs in understanding his projects. See Adolf Loos, "Regarding Economy," in Risselada, ed., *Raumplan versus Plan Libre* (New York: 1988), pp. 137-141.

³⁵ Clearly not in any dogmatic way, since the Hans Brummel project is itself a private interior, and Loos's use of mirrored surfaces is in no way confined to public projects. It is, though, a question of degree. When Loos uses the motif of mirror between two engaged columns or pilasters, in a domestic project, it is generally a single instance. It functions in that instance as a pictorial moment, like the canvases that are actually framed into the wall in other projects. In his public projects, this configuration tends to be part of a larger ensemble, as in the Knize interior.

³⁶ Beatriz Colomina, "Intimacy and Spectacle: The Interiors of Adolf Loos," *AA Files* 20 (1990), pp.5-15.

³⁷ The reference comes from José Quetglas, "Lo Placentero," *Carrer de la Ciutat* no.9-10, January, 1980.

³⁸ I am thinking of, at least, Freud and Otto Weininger, a contemporary of Kraus's whose book, *Sex and Character*, outlines a theory of gender that proposes a thematic understanding of gender as related to aspects of cultural production, similar to that adopted by Jung and Freud. See Loos's "Ladies Fashion" and "Ornament and Crime" for commentary on women's social role. See Karl Kraus's aphorisms on the feminine in *Half-Truths and One-and-a-half Truths* and *No Compromise*, his *Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität*, and commentary in Janik and Toulmin, Chapter 3.

³⁹ Iggers, *Karl Kraus*, Chapter VII, "The Social Role of Women", and Timms, *Karl Kraus*, Chapter Four, "Pandora and the Prostitute" both contain useful commentary on Kraus's attitude toward women.

⁴⁰ As quoted above. Both Karl Kraus's construction of femininity and the inclusion of feminine and masculine principles in Otto Weininger's construction of social life are of interest here. See Janik and Toulmin, p. 70-73 for a discussion of Kraus and Weininger on gender.

⁴¹ From Adolf Loos, "Heimat Kunst," (1914), in *Trotzdem* (Innsbruck: 1931), quoted in Colomina, "Intimacy and Spectacle".

⁴² I would expect a similar study on Loos's use of wood in his interiors to have rich results.

⁴³ Karl Kraus, *Sprüche und Widersprüche*, p.192f. (from Iggers, *Karl Kraus*, p.25). Iggers translates the pronoun for language as "it," noting that in German it is actually feminine. I substitute the feminine pronoun here.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stanford. "Architecture in a Cultural Field." In *Wars of Classification: Architecture and Modernity*. Edited by Taisto H. Mäkela and Wallis Miller: 9-35. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1991.
- . "Critical Conventionalism: Architecture." *Assemblage* (October 1986): 6-23.
- Benjamin, Walter. "Karl Kraus," in *Reflections*. New York: Schocken Books, 1978.
- Chapple, Gerald, and Hans H. Schulte. *The Turn of the Century: German Literature and Art, 1890-1915*. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 1981.
- Colomina, Beatriz. "Intimacy and Spectacle: The Interiors of Adolf Loos." *AA Files* 20 (Autumn 1990): 5-15.
- . *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994.
- Czech, Hermann. "The Loos House." *A+U* (January 1978): 87-96.
- el-Dahdah, Farès. "The Josephine Baker House: For Loos's Pleasure." *Assemblage* 26 (April 1995): 72-87.
- Engelmann, Paul. *Letters from Ludwig Wittgenstein, With a Memoir*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.
- Gravagnuolo, Benedetto. *Adolf Loos: Theory and Works*. New York: Rizzoli, 1982.
- Iggers, Wilma Abeles. *Karl Kraus: A Viennese Critic of the Twentieth Century*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967.
- Janik, Allen and Stephen Toulmin. *Wittgenstein's Vienna*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.
- Kraus, Karl. *Half-Truths and One-and-a-Half Truths: Selected Aphorisms*. Quebec: Engendra Press, 1976.
- . *In These Great Times: A Karl Kraus Reader*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- . *No Compromise: Selected Writings of Karl Kraus*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1977.
- Locher, Hubert. "'Enough of the Original Geniuses! Let Us Repeat Ourselves Unceasingly!' Adolf Loos, the New, and the Other." *Daidalos* 52 (June 1994): 76-85.
- Loos, Adolf. *Spoken into the Void: Collected Essays 1897-1900*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982.
- Loos, Adolf. *The Architecture of Adolf Loos*. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1988.
- Münz, Ludwig, and Gustav Künstler. *Adolf Loos: Pioneer of Modern Architecture*. New York: Praeger, 1966.
- Oechslin, Werner. "Raumplan versus Plan Libre." *Daidalos* 42 (December 1991): 76-83.
- Risselada, Max, ed. *Raumplan versus Plan Libre: Adolf Loos and Le Corbusier, 1919-1930*. Delft: Delft University Press, 1988.
- Rogers, Ernesto, and Aldo Rossi. *Casabella 233* (1959). Entire issue devoted to Loos.
- Rukschcio, Burkhardt. "Adolf Loos Analyzed." *Lotus* 29: 95-102.
- Rukschcio, Burkhardt, and Roland Schachel. *Adolf Loos: Leben und Werk*. Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1982.
- Timms, Edward. *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Satirist*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Tournikiotis, Panayiotis. *Adolf Loos*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.
- van Duzer, Leslie, and Kent Kleiman. *Villa Müller: A Work of Adolf Loos*. Foreword by John Hejduk. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.
- Vergo, Peter. "'Der grösste Meister.'" *AA Files* 7 (September 1984): 106-108.
- Zohn, Harry. *Karl Kraus*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971.