


# Mies's Representations as Zeitwille: Großstadt between Impersonality and Autonomous Individual

**Conference Paper**

**Author(s):**

Charitonidou, Marianna 

**Publication date:**

2019-10-19

**Permanent link:**

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000371187>

**Rights / license:**

In Copyright - Non-Commercial Use Permitted

**Mies's Representations as *Zeitwille*: *Großstadt* between Impersonality and Autonomous Individual**

This paper focuses on the relationship between *Zeitwille* and impersonality in Mies van der Rohe's "Baukunst und Zeitwille".<sup>1</sup> It sheds light on the phenomenon of inhabitants distancing themselves from the chaos of the city, a particular effect of Mies's interiors, associating this aspect of Mies's way of representing interiors with his belief in the autonomous individual and his conviction that in "town and city living [...] privacy is a very important requirement".<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 1) The ambiguity of his simultaneous interest in impersonality and the autonomous individual is pivotal for understanding the tension between universality and individuality in his thought. Mies believed in the existence of a universal and generally understandable visual language. His interiors function as fields within which the subjects are autonomous individuals, and as mechanisms permitting to overcome the tension – characterising the modern metropolis – between the frenetic city and the private bourgeois dwelling. They could be perceived as indoor fragments of the metropolis. The way he represented his interiors, blending linear perspective and photomontage, intensifies the sensation of leaving behind the chaos of the metropolis. According to Dan Hoffman, the representational ambiguity produced by the visualisation strategies elaborated by Mies provokes a non-possibility to take the distance that is inherent in the use of perspective and in the way the viewer sees images produced using perspective representation<sup>3</sup>. The contrast between the discreet symmetrical fond with the grid and the non-symmetrical organisation of the intense surfaces and artworks that are placed on it activates a non-unitary sensation in the way the observers perceive the Mies's drawings, which is in opposition with the unitary dimension of Erwin Panofsky's understanding of perspective. Mies, due to the ambiguity that is produced thanks to his visualisation strategies, overcomes Panofsky's conception of the linear perspective apparatus as a "Will to Unification"<sup>4</sup>. As Manfredo Tafuri claims, in "Theatre as a Virtual City: From Appia to the Totaltheater", the stagelike experience of Mies's interiors is related to a specific attitude of the inhabitant towards the metropolis.<sup>5</sup> Tafuri relates Mies's interiors to a specific kind of "negativeness" towards the metropolis, which brings to mind what Georg Simmel called "blasé attitude"<sup>6</sup>. He draws a parallel between the visitors' experience in Mies's Barcelona Pavilion and stage experience, as understood by the Swiss architect and theorist of stage lighting and décor Adolphe Appia, who, as we can understand by reading his text entitled "Ideas on a Reform of our

Mise en Scène<sup>7</sup>, intended to reinvent stage design, through light and actors' movement in space. The reinvention of spatial experience through the movement of users is a characteristic of the Barcelona Pavilion. According to Tafuri, the exact quality that is a common parameter of Mies and Appia's approach is the effect of rhythmic geometries on how space is perceived and experienced. Tafuri claims that the *mise en scène* of a stagelike experience by Mies in the Barcelona Pavilion activates a specific kind of perception of the relation between the spatial experience of the interior of the Barcelona Pavilion and the city. The Barcelona Pavilion, according to Tafuri, rejects the "attempts to synthesize 'the trick and the soul.'"<sup>8</sup> He associates the sensation of "the impossibility of restoring 'syntheses'", which is provoked by the perception of the interior of the Barcelona Pavilion as an "empty place of absence", with a specific kind of "negativeness" towards the metropolis that could be interpreted as a *mise en suspension* of the synthesis or suspended perception, which brings to mind Robin Evans' remark that in the case of Mies's Barcelona Pavilion "[t]he elements are assembled, but not held together"<sup>9</sup>.

A trait of Mies's interior perspective representations, especially during the first decade after he moved to the United States, is the avoidance of the representation of human figures. Tafuri analyses the effect of non-resolved emptiness of space produced by Mies's Barcelona Pavilion, noting: "In the absolute silence, the audience at the Barcelona Pavilion can thus 'be reintegrated' with that absence"<sup>10</sup>. The fact that Mies preferred the observers of his images and the users of his spaces not to meet other people while they mentally visualised or physically experienced his spaces shows that he prioritised the solitary experience of space. The sensation of meditation and of taking distance from the chaotic rhythms of metropolitan life was reinforced by this choice. Walter Riezler, in "Das Haus Tugendhat in Brünn" – published in 1931 in *Die Form*, the official journal of the Werkbund – juxtaposed the experience based on a conception of the house as a "living machine" ("machine à habiter"), as defined by Le Corbusier, with the experience of the interior space of Mies's Villa Tugendhat, noting:

*no one can escape from the impression of a particular, highly developed spirituality, which reigns in these rooms, a spirituality of a new kind, however, tied to the present in particular ways and which is entirely different therefore from the spirit that one might encounter in spaces of earlier epochs... This is not a "machine for living in", but a house of true "luxury", which means that it serves highly elevated needs, and does not cater to some "thrifty", somehow limited life style.<sup>11</sup>*

Riezler's article provoked the reactions of Justus Bier, Roger Ginsburger and Grete and Fritz Tugendhat, who also published articles commenting on the same building in the same journal. What these exchanges reveal is that Mies's Villa Tugendhat activated a new mode of inhabiting domestic space. Bier, in his provocative article entitled "Can one live in the Tugendhat House?" ("Kann man im Haus Tugendhat wohnen?") associated the living experience in the Villa Tugendhat with an ostentatious living ("Paradewohnen") and a representational living ("Ausstellungswohnen"). According to him, the special characteristic of this new mode of inhabitation was its capacity "to lead a kind of representational living ("Ausstellungswohnen") and eventually overwhelm the inhabitants' real lives"<sup>12</sup>. Grete and Fritz Tugendhat, Mies's clients and first inhabitants of the house, responded to Bier and Ginsburger's critiques, asserting that their experience of the spaces of

the Tugendhat house was “overwhelming but in a liberating sense.” They related the liberating force of the space of the house to its austerity, claiming that “[t]his austerity makes it impossible to spend your time just relaxing and letting yourself go, and it is precisely this being forced to do something else which people, exhausted and left empty by their working lives, need and find liberating today.”<sup>13</sup>

It would be interesting to juxtapose the concept of the “living machine” (“machine à habiter”) in Le Corbusier’s thought and that of the “meditating machine” (“machine à méditer”) in Mies’s approach, borrowing the latter expression from Richard Padovan’s text entitled “Machine à Méditer”, where the author claims that Mies desired to convert buildings into objects of meditation<sup>14</sup>. The following words by Mies confirm his desire to create objects that pushed him to think and to further activate his intellect: “I want to examine my thoughts in action.... I want to do something in order to be able to think.”<sup>15</sup> One could relate the “representational living” (“Ausstellungswohnen”), described by Bier to Mies’s desire concerning the capacity of space to further stimulate the intellect through “action”. The attention paid by Mies to the intellect becomes evident in an interview he gave to some students of the School of Design of North Carolina State College, in 1952: “The shock is emotional but the projection into reality is by the intellect”<sup>16</sup>. Mies understood “Baukunst” as an action given that he considered it to be a result of the “Zeitwille”<sup>17</sup>. “Zeitwille” implies a state of continuous becoming and a state of action. Mies’s understanding of “Baukunst” as “Zeitwille” is characterised by the following ambiguity: on the one hand, it shows that Mies was attracted by man’s capacity to convert his spiritual energy into something tangible, such as a building, and, on the other hand, it demonstrates that he was interested in the impact that products of human creation can have on civilisation. This is very close to the binary relationship between “subjective life” and the “its contents”, as described by Simmel, in “On the Concept and the Tragedy of Culture”, where the author examines the “radical contrast: between subjective life, which is restless but finite in time, and its contents, which, once they are created, are fixed but timelessly valid”<sup>18</sup>.

Simmel also analyses how culture can help us resolve the dualism between object and culture. Mies’s insistence on the importance of the understanding of architectural praxis as an expression of civilisation and the fact that he perceived architecture as an act in “the realm of significance”<sup>19</sup> are compatible with Simmel’s theory. Mies until his late days believed that “architecture must stem from sustaining and driving forces of civilisation.”<sup>20</sup> He was convinced that if the architect, during the procedure of concretising his ideas, manages to capture the “driving forces of civilization” and convert them into a space assemblage through the process of “Baukunst”, then the products of human intellect – the architectural artefacts – can acquire a universally and timelessly valid effect on the human intellect. For Mies, in order to achieve this timeless and universal validity, the architect had to grasp the specificity of the “Zeitwille”.

Georg Simmel examines the notion of objectivity in “On the Concept and the Tragedy of Culture” and “The Stranger” among other texts. In the former, he associates the “potentialities of the objective spirit” with the fact that it “possesses an independent validity”. He claims that this independent validity makes possible its re-subjectivisation after “its successful objectification”. For him, the wealth of the concept of culture “consists

in the fact that objective phenomena are included in the process of development of subjects, as ways or means, without, thereby losing their objectivity”<sup>21</sup>. One could make the hypothesis that Mies understands “Baukunst” as an objective means, believing that only if “Baukunst” is based on objectifiable, impersonal and generalizable processes of representation and fabrication invite the subject to appreciate their visual interaction with the built artefact. Mies, in “Baukunst und Zeitwille”, associates “Zeitwille” with impersonality, declaring: “These buildings are by their very nature totally impersonal. They are our representatives of the will of the epoch. This is their significance. Only so could they become symbols of their time.” He also affirms: “The building-art can only be unlocked from a spiritual centre and can only be understood as a life process”<sup>22</sup>. The German and original version of this aphorism is: “Baukunst ist raumgefaßter Zeitwille”, while the term “Zeitwille” expresses simultaneously a Schopenhauerian “will of the age” and a “will of time”. A characteristic of the concept of “Zeitwille” that should not be overlooked is the fact that it is always in a state of becoming. The process of “Baukunst” is, thus, perceived by Mies as being in a permanent state of becoming and, for this reason, is conceived as a crystallisation of an epoch. Mies declares in “Bürohaus”, published in the first issue of the journal G:

*We reject every aesthetic speculation, every doctrine, and every formalism.*

*The art of building is the will of our time captured in space.*

*Living. Changing. New.*

*Not yesterday, not tomorrow, only today can be formed.*

*Only this practice of building gives form.*

*Create the form from the nature of the task with the means of our time.*

*That is our task.*<sup>23</sup> (Fig. 2)

In “The Preconditions of Architectural Work”, Mies claims that “[t]he act of the autonomous individual becomes ever more important”<sup>24</sup>. As Robin Schuldenfrei notes, the “phenomenon, of the inhabitant set apart from his surroundings, was a particular effect of Mies’s interiors”. Schuldenfrei associates this aspect of Mies’s way of representing interiors with his belief “in the autonomous individual”<sup>25</sup>. The place of the “autonomous individual” in Mies’s thought is an aspect that needs to be examined attentively, if we wish to understand the ambiguity between universality and individuality in his thought. Mies gives credence to the acts of the autonomous individual, but mistrusts the endeavour to “express individuality in architecture”, as is evident when he affirms that “[t]o try to express individuality in architecture is a complete misunderstanding of the problem”<sup>26</sup>. The individual’s autonomy preoccupied not only Mies, but Simmel as well, who introduces “The Metropolis and Mental Life” with the following phrase: “The deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to preserve the autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, of external culture, and of the technique of life.”<sup>27</sup>

Regarding the Barcelona Pavilion, Mies held the following claim: “I must say that it was the most difficult work which ever confronted me, because I was my own client; I could do what I liked.”<sup>28</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright, in a letter he sent to Mies in 1947, wrote: “the Barcelona Pavilion was your best contribution to the original “Negation””<sup>29</sup>. Mies responded to this letter telling Wright: “About “Negation” – I feel that you use this word

for qualities that I find positive and essential”<sup>30</sup> (Fig. 3). We could make the hypothesis, however, that the “original ‘Negation’” to which Wright refers in his letter is related to the fact that the Barcelona Pavilion constitutes a reaction “against both classical and modern [...] simultaneously and *in extremis*”<sup>31</sup>, as Robin Evans suggests. Through the design of this building Mies expressed his rejection of both symmetry and asymmetry. Tafuri, analysing this building, refers to the “‘negativeness’ towards metropolis” and interprets its “‘signs’ as devoid of meaning”<sup>32</sup>. Wright’s comment on the contribution of Mies’s Pavilion “to the original ‘Negation’” and Tafuri’s remark regarding the “negativeness” of Mies’s stance towards metropolis might seem an oxymoron if we think that “[t]he Elementary design proclaimed by the Berlin circle around Mies, Ludwig Hilberseimer and Hans Richter outwardly promoted an unconditionally affirmative, yes-saying attitude toward reality”<sup>33</sup>. The “negativeness” towards metropolis, to which Tafuri refers in the above-mentioned article, brings to mind the phenomenon of claustrophobia produced by Mies’s collages for the Resor House project, which Martino Stierli has analysed in “Mies Montage”<sup>34</sup> among other issues. The dimension of *berührungsangst* in Mies’s representations is intensified during the first years of his life in the United States. Simmel’s understanding of *berührungsangst* as the fear for public spaces could be related to claustrophobic aspect of Mies’s representation. For Mies, “Baukunst” functioned as an antidote to the complexity and the chaos of metropolis. Francesco Dal Co associates Mies’s approach to Nietzsche’s “Beyond Good and Evil”<sup>35</sup>, associating the conflict between the *arete* (ἀρετή) of *operari* and its historical determination in Nietzsche’s thought with the tension between architecture and “Baukunst” in Mies’s thought. Mies understood “Baukunst” as an expression of spirit and “[a]rchitecture [as] [...] the real battleground of the spirit”<sup>36</sup> (Fig. 4), and elaborated the term “Baukunst” to capture the practice of building as a spiritualised art.

MIES VAN DER ROHE

ARCHITECT F.A.I.A. • 230 EAST OHIO ST. • CHICAGO 11, ILLINOIS • PHONE WHITEHALL 3-0686

January 29, 1962

Mr. Stefano Desideri  
Corso Romana 65  
Montecatini Terme, Italia

Dear Mr. Desideri:

C  
Thank you for your recent letter regarding the court houses. I made these projects at the Bauhaus and during the years 1931 to 1938, and it was a pity that they were not built at that time. I am sure that the court house is one of the best solutions possible for low dwellings, and I think that it is particularly suitable for town and city living where privacy is a very important requirement.

O  
During the thirties we made plans for court houses of various sizes, some with one court, others with two or three courts. The use of free standing walls and large glass areas within a peripheral enclosing wall gave these plans a great richness, even when the house was quite small. However, without the large glass areas I think that the essential character of these plans would not have been possible.

P  
Y  
If a city block were to be developed with court houses, in either tight or loose arrangements, I am certain that the access spaces between the houses could be developed in a very interesting way. The walls of the houses could be set back from the access roads and paths and the space between planted with trees and shrubs.

Of course, a court house is, also, possible in the country. I proposed such a house in 1935 for Ulrich Lange. This would have been built near the Dutch border where the climate is pleasant but where outside living can be spoiled by strong winds. The Lange house had two courts. The court for the kitchen and garage formed an enclosed space. The court for the living room remained open to permit views of the surrounding country but provided the necessary protection against the wind.

Certainly, these projects developed from the architectural ideas of my earlier buildings. Both the brick house and the Barcelona Pavilion possessed structural and spatial characteristics which may be seen in the court houses.

I think that a really good architectural idea will stand development and variation in this way because a really good idea will always have a general application. I think this attitude is very important in architecture today.

Sincerely yours,

Mies van der Rohe

tst

Figure 1. Mies van der Rohe, letter to Stefano Desideri, 29 January 1962. Credit: Mies van der Rohe papers, Box 4, Folder "Personal Correspondence 1930-69 D" Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.



Kunst soll das Leben nicht erklären, sondern verändern  
K. Murr

gebemöglichkeit mit Hilfe eines kleinen Kondensatormikrophons. Der wissenschaftliche Nachweis, daß sogar weit kleinere Kapazitätsänderungen, als sie der Film erwarten läßt, für die deutliche Wiedergabe ausreichen, wurde 1920 durch einen kleinen Cylinderkondensatortröhler erbracht.

Aber vom sprechenden Film zur Optophonik ist noch ein großer Schritt. Als erster hat der Erfinder des Aniphons, Plenner, in einer Schrift „Die Zukunft des elektrischen Fernsehers“ diese Frage behandelt. Er sagt darin: „Kann der Lichtstrahl gezwungen werden, (mittels einer Selenzelle) Induktionsströme zu erzeugen oder zu verändern, so muß ein in die Leitung geschaltetes Hörtelefon solche induzierten Erscheinungen in Klänge verwandeln. Was also in der Empfangstation als Bild eintritt, würde im Zwischenapparat als Ton erscheinen und wenn am Ursprung bewegte Bilder, sichtbare Vorgänge, aufgenommen werden, so müssen sich diese als eine Folge von Tönen kundgeben, und umgekehrt. Die Gestalt eines Vierecks muß bei akustischer Verwandlung ein anderes Tonbild hervorrufen, als das von einem Dreieck oder Kreis genommene, ein Würfel muß anders klingen als ein Kegel oder Prisma. Kristalle und Sterne werden zu reden beginnen, in welcher Sprache, in welchem Tongebill? Das liegt noch gänzlich im Felde der Ahnung, aber aus dem Nichtwissen wird dereinst das Verstehen aufsteigen.“

Nun liegt dieser Vorstellung, wie auch dem Tonbildfilm, ein Naturalismus zugrunde, um den es sich für uns heute keineswegs mehr handeln kann. Daß die Musik in ihrer letzten Form (auch die der Futuristen) unserer Weltbewußtheit nicht mehr entspricht, so wie ihr die akustische Malerei nicht mehr entspricht, ist eine unlesbare Tatsache. Wir müssen also neue, für uns gültige Gesetze, eine neue Funktionalität für beide finden. Wir müssen die Zugehörigkeit der Formationalität zu den Schwingungsintensitäten in einer grundlegenden Weise ermitteln; um über das Zufällige zu einer neuen Formverbündlichkeit zu gelangen.

Berlin R. Hausmann

Dieser Film hat den Charakter einer optischen Demonstration, in der bestimmte elementare Filmgebildelemente euklear entfaltet werden. Das Filmbild ist ein Spiel von Lichtverhältnissen.

Die Lichtverhältnisse haben qualitativen und quantitativen Charakter: Hell- und Dunkelheit, die aufeinanderfolgenden „Formen“ sind die in sich begrenzten von Vergleichs- in verschiedenen Dimensionen (oder von Dimensionen in verschiedenen Zeitabständen) abgegrenzten, die Fläche aus Begrenzung bei Raumverhältnissen. In der Zeitabgrenzung der Fläche (oder der Zeitabgrenzung der Fläche) sind die in sich begrenzten von Vergleichs- in verschiedenen Dimensionen (oder von Dimensionen in verschiedenen Zeitabständen) abgegrenzten, die Fläche aus Begrenzung bei Raumverhältnissen. In der Zeitabgrenzung der Fläche (oder der Zeitabgrenzung der Fläche) sind die in sich begrenzten von Vergleichs- in verschiedenen Dimensionen (oder von Dimensionen in verschiedenen Zeitabständen) abgegrenzten, die Fläche aus Begrenzung bei Raumverhältnissen.

Das eigenartige Konstruktionsmittel ist das Licht, dessen Intensität und Menge, Helligkeit ist die Aufgabe für das Ganze.

Dieser Film ist also prinzipiell in drei, ein solches, der das  $\square$  und die  $\square$  als Kompositionsmittel gebraucht — etwa kontrastiert und entwickelt —, sondern er enthält in sich die „Form“ (ob abstrakt oder natürlich) — ist verneinend.

Die in sich begrenzten Formen sind weder Analogie noch Symbole, noch Schmeicheleien.

Sondern der Film vermittelt in seinem Ablauf (Vorführung) zwar eigentlich die zwischen hell und dunkel, groß und klein, schnell und langsam, horizontal und vertikal etc. etc.

Es ist versucht, den Film so zu organisieren, daß die einzelnen Teile untereinander in aktiver Spannung stehen, so daß das Ganze in sich gegliedert bewegt bleibt.

Berlin


Jede ästhetische Spekulation,  
jede Doktrin,  
und jeden Formalismus } lehnen wir ab.

Baukunst ist raumgefäßler Zeitwille.  
Lebendig. Wechselsind. Neu.

Nicht das Gestern, nicht das Morgen, nur das Heute ist formbar.  
Nur dieses Bauen gestaltet.

Gestaltet die Form aus dem Wesen der Aufgabe mit den  
Mitteln unserer Zeit.

Das ist unsere Arbeit



# B Ü R O H A U S

Das BürohauS ist ein Haus der Arbeit der Organisation der Klarheit der Ökonomie.  
Helle weite Arbeitsräume, übersichtlich, ungeteilt, nur gegliedert wie der Organismus des Betriebes. Größter Effekt mit geringstem Aufwand an Mitteln.

Die Materialien sind Beton Eisen Glas  
Eisenbetonbauten sind ihrem Wesen nach Skelettbauten. Keine Teigwaren noch Panzertürme. Bei tragender Binderkonstruktion eine nichttragende Wand. Also Haut- und Knochenbauten.

Die zweckmäßigste Einteilung der Arbeitsplätze war für die Raumlänge maßgebend; diese beträgt 16 m. Ein zweistufiger Rahmen von 8 m Spannweite mit beidseitiger Konsolaustragung von 4 m Länge wurde als das ökonomischste Konstruktionsprinzip ermittelt. Die Binderentfernung beträgt 5 m. Dieses Bindersystem trägt die Deckenplatte, die am Ende der Kragarme senkrecht hochgewinkelt Außenhaut wird und als Rückwand der Regale dient, die aus dem Rauminnen der Übersichtlichkeit wegen in die Außenwände verlegt wurden. Über den 2 m hohen Regalen liegt ein bis zur Decke reichendes durchlaufendes Fensterband.

Berlin, Mai 1923

Mies v. d. Rohe

**G** MATERIAL DER  
NÄCHSTEN NUMMERN:

Fiat | Element und Erfindung | Neue Optik | Bauhandwerk u.  
Bauindustrie | Topographie der Typographie | Lunapark | Photo-  
plastik | Kinderspielzeug | Acrobatie des Schauspielers | |  
Das neue Wohnhaus | Die Internationale Verkehrszeichensprache.

Figure 2. Page from G: Material zur elementaren Gestaltung, no. 1 (1923).



November 25th,  
1947.

My dear Frank:

Thank you so much for your letter.

It was an exaggeration if you heard that my feelings  
were hurt by your remarks at my New York show.


If I had heard the crack " Much ado about next - to -  
nothing " I would have laughed with you. About " Negation "  
- I feel that you use this word for qualities that I find  
positive and essential.

It would be a pleasure to see you again sometime in  
Wisconsin and discuss this subject further.

As ever

Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright.  
Taliesin,  
Spring Green, Wisc.

Figure 3. Mies van der Rohe, Letter to Frank Lloyd Wright, 25 November 1947. Credit: Mies van der Rohe papers, Box 60, Folder "Wright, Frank Lloyd 1944-69". Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress.



**Figure 4.** Mies van der Rohe's drafts for speeches. Credit: Ludwig Mies van der Rohe papers, BOX 61. Manuscripts division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

<sup>1</sup> Mies van der Rohe, "Baukunst und Zeitwille," *Der Querschnitt* 4, no. 1 (1924): 31-32.

<sup>2</sup> Mies van der Rohe, letter to Stefano Desideri, 29 January 1962. Credit: Mies van der Rohe papers, Box 4, Folder "Personal Correspondence 1930-69 D" Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

<sup>3</sup> Dan Hoffman, "The Receding Horizon of Mies: Work of the Cranbrook Architecture Studio," in *The Presence of Mies*, edited by Detlef Mertins (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994), 77-95.

<sup>4</sup> Erwin Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als „symbolische Form“,“ in *Aufsätze zu Grundfragen der Kunstwissenschaft* (Berlin: Volker Spiess, 1985), 144.

<sup>5</sup> Manfredo Tafuri, "Il teatro come 'città virtuale.' Dal Cabaret Voltaire al Totaltheater/The Theatre as a Virtual City: From Appia to the Totaltheater," *Lotus International* 17 (1977): 30-53.

<sup>6</sup> Georg Simmel, "Metropolis and Mental Life," in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, edited by Kurt Wolf (New York: Free Press, 1950); "Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben," in *Die Großstadt. Vorträge und Aufsätze zur Städteausstellung*, edited by Theodor Petermann (Dresden: von Zahn und Faensch, 1903).

<sup>7</sup> Adolphe Appia, "Ideas on a Reform of Our Mise en Scène" (1902), in *Adolphe Appia: Texts on Theatre*, edited by Richard Beacham (London; New York: Routledge, 1993), 59-65.

<sup>8</sup> Tafuri, op. cit.

<sup>9</sup> Robin Evans, "Mies van der Rohe's Paradoxical Symmetries," *AA Files*, no. 19 (1990): 56-68. Reprinted as "Mies van der Rohe's Paradoxical Symmetries," in *Translations From Drawing to Building and Other Essays* (London: Architectural Association, 1997), 233-77.

<sup>10</sup> Tafuri, op. cit.

<sup>11</sup> Walter Riezler, "Das Haus Tugendhat in Brünn," *Die Form*, no. 9 (1931): 321- 32.

<sup>12</sup> Justus Bier, "Kann Haus man im Tugendhat wohnen?," *ibid.*, no. 11 (1931): 392-93; Dietrich Neumann, "Can one live in the Tugendhat House? A Sketch," *Wolkenkuckucksheim | Cloud-Cuckoo-Land* 32 (2012): 87-99.

- <sup>13</sup> Grete and Fritz Tugendhat, "Die Bewohner des Hauses Tugendhat äußern sich," *Die Form* no. 11 (1931): 437-38; Reprinted in Daniela Hammer-Tugendhat, *Tugendhat House. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2014), 74-77.
- <sup>14</sup> Richard Padovan, "Machine à Méditer," in *Mies van der Rohe: Architect as Educator*, edited by Rolf Achilles, Kevin Harrington, and Charlotte Myhrum (Chicago: Illinois Institute of Technology, 1986), 17.
- <sup>15</sup> Mies van der Rohe cited in Padovan, "Machine à Méditer," op. cit., 17.
- <sup>16</sup> Mies van der Rohe, interview given to six students of the School of Design of North Carolina State College, 1952. Mies van der Rohe papers, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC. "6 Students Talk with Mies," *Student Publications of the School of Design*, Raleigh, vol. 2, n° 3 (1952): 21-28.
- <sup>17</sup> Mies van der Rohe, "Baukunst und Zeitwille!," *Der Querschnitt* 4, no. 1 (1924): 31-32.
- <sup>18</sup> Georg Simmel, "On the Concept and the Tragedy of Culture," in *The Conflict in Modern Culture and Other Essays*, edited by Peter Etzkorn (New York: Teachers College Press, 1968), 27-46; "Der Begriff und die Tragödie der Kultur," in *Philosophie der Kultur Gesammelte Essays* (Leipzig: Werner Klinkhardt, 1911), 245-77.
- <sup>19</sup> Text of an address by Mies van der Rohe at a dinner Monday April 17, 1950 in the Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Mies van der Rohe papers, Manuscripts division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- <sup>20</sup> Revised version of a speech that Mies gave in January 1968, Mies van der Rohe papers, Manuscripts division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- <sup>21</sup> Georg Simmel, "On the Concept and the Tragedy of Culture," op. cit.
- <sup>22</sup> Mies van der Rohe, "Baukunst und Zeitwille!," op. cit.
- <sup>23</sup> Mies van der Rohe, "Bürohaus", *G*, n° 1 (1923): 3.
- <sup>24</sup> Mies van der Rohe, "The Preconditions of Architectural Work". Lecture held at the end of February 1928 in the Staatliche Kunstbibliothek Berlin; also on March 5, 1928, at the invitation of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft for Frauenbestrebung (Work Association for the Women's Movement) of the Museumsverein and the Kunstgewerbeschule Stettin in the auditorium of the Marienstiftsgymnasium in Stettin; as well on March 7 at the invitation of the Frankfurter Gesellschaft for Handel, Industria und Wissenschaft (Frankfurt Society for Trade, Industry and Science) in Frankfurt am Main. Unpublished manuscript in the collection of Dirk Lohan, Chicago. Fritz Neumeyer, *The Artless Word: Mies van der Rohe on the Building Art*, trans. Mark Jarzombek (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1991), 299-300.
- <sup>25</sup> Robin Schuldenfrei, "Contra the Großstadt: Mies van der Rohe's Autonomy and Interiority," in *Interiors and Interiority*, edited by Ewa Lajer-Burchard, Beate Söntgen (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2016), 287.
- <sup>26</sup> Mies van der Rohe, "Wohin gehen wir nun?," *Bauen und Wohnen* 15, no. 11 (1960): 391.
- <sup>27</sup> Georg Simmel, "Metropolis and Mental Life," op. cit., 409.
- <sup>28</sup> Mies van der Rohe cited in Schulze, *Mies van der Rohe: a Critical Biography*, op. cit., 117.
- <sup>29</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright, letter to Mies van der Rohe, 25 October 1947. Mies van der Rohe papers, Box 60, Folder "Wright, Frank Lloyd 1944-69", Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- <sup>30</sup> Mies van der Rohe, letter to Frank Lloyd Wright, 25 November 1947. Mies van der Rohe papers, Box 60, Folder "Wright, Frank Lloyd 1944-69". Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- <sup>31</sup> Evans, "Mies van der Rohe's Paradoxical Symmetries," op. cit. 239.
- <sup>32</sup> Tafuri, "Il teatro come 'città virtuale.' Dal Cabaret Voltaire al Totaltheater/The Theatre as a Virtual City: From Appia to the Totaltheater", op. cit.
- <sup>33</sup> Fritz Neumeyer, "Nietzsche and Modern Architecture," in *Nietzsche and "An Architecture of Our Minds"*, edited by Alexandre Kostka, Irving Wohlfarth (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999), 289.
- <sup>34</sup> Martino Stierli, "Mies Montage," *AA Files*, no. 61 (2010): 64.
- <sup>35</sup> Francesco Dal Co, "La culture de Mies considérée à travers ses notes et ses lectures," in *Mies Van der Rohe* (Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou, 1987), 78; Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*, trans. Judith Norman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Original edition: *Jenseits von Gut und Böse: Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft* (Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, 1886).
- <sup>36</sup> Text of an address by Mies van der Rohe at a dinner Monday April 17, 1950 in the Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe papers, BOX 61. Manuscripts division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.