

An Exchange on the Surface: Sullivan, Berlage, and Loos

In his indispensable study devoted to the life and work of the Austrian-American architect, Richard Neutra¹, the Los Angeles architectural historian Tom Hines describes an encounter between Neutra and Louis Sullivan. Neutra arrived in Chicago in the spring of 1924 to work with Frank Lloyd Wright but was unable to set up a meeting with the elusive architect. He therefore put his free time to good use by going to see Wright's and other Chicago architects' buildings and by paying a visit to Sullivan. Neutra had a specific reason for visiting the aging master. Not only did he want to meet the mentor of the architect for whom he wanted to work, but he also had something that he wanted to return to Sullivan, namely a copy of the manuscript of Kindergarten Chats that a few years earlier Sullivan, with the help of Rudolf Schindler, had sent to Adolf Loos in Vienna hoping that Loos would be able to find a publisher in Austria or Germany willing to publish this book. I will say more about this manuscript later in my presentation. For the time being, I would like to focus on one part of the conversation between the two architects as described in Hines's book. Apparently, Sullivan, who by the time of this visit had less than a month left to live, was in a desperate mood. When Neutra tried to buoy his spirits by assuring him that "his work had indeed made a difference not only in Chicago and America but in Europe as well, Sullivan replied, 'Perhaps in Sweden and Germany, but not here.'"²

It is difficult to determine whether Sullivan meant this seriously or if he said it off-handedly to suggest that possibly, somewhere far away, where it was not going to provide him any new work, he may have had success, but not in his own immediate environment. If he was serious about the remark, was he really imagining Sullivanesque architecture in Sweden or Germany? If there was one American architect who had been influential in Sweden in the second half of the nineteenth century, it was Henry Hobson Richardson. There are in fact several buildings in that country that are designed in a Richardsonian Romanesque style; but Wainwright- or Guaranty-inspired buildings are, to my knowledge, not to be found there. Similarly, the connection of Sullivan with Germany is also not very evident. Which architect or building was he thinking of? It cannot have been Peter Behrens and his AEG buildings, or Walter Gropius and his Fagus Werke. These buildings, like Sullivan's, exhibit an interest in the structure, but they are very different from Sullivan's work when it comes to the treatment of the surface. As we will see, Sullivan always used the surface materials to dress up the structure and make it look lighter by using ornament to suggest upward movement. Neither Behrens nor Gropius would ever do that. Their surface materials were meant only to cover the structure (if at all) and make it understandable to the viewer, not to give it an esoteric meaning.

So, if we cannot detect a direct influence, perhaps Sullivan was talking about an indirect connection, about recognizing a relationship between his own work and that of a number of architects, who were active not specifically in the two countries Sullivan mentioned, but in Northern Europe in general. I would like in this talk to explore this hypothesis by examining the work of two Northern/Central European architects in

addition to that of Louis Sullivan: the Dutch architect Hendrik P. Berlage and the Austrian architect, Adolf Loos.

Again, at first glance it is hard to imagine three more different architects. Let's take as examples three buildings of more or less the same period: Sullivan's Schlesinger and Mayer, better known as the Carson Pirie Scott store (1899/1903-1904), Berlage's Amsterdam Beurs or Stock Exchange (1898-1903), and Loos's Haus am Michaelerplatz (also known as Goldman und Salatsch) of 1908-1909. All three are commercial buildings. Two of the three (the store buildings by Sullivan and Loos) show a marked emphasis on the street level where the contents of the buildings are presented to the people who pass by. And all three buildings are clearly designed to allow large groups of people quickly to enter into the interiors. The solutions, however, are totally different. Carson Pirie Scott is a typical Chicago building consisting of a steel frame covered in white terra cotta and bronze-colored cast iron. It has two striking features. The first thing the viewer on the street sees is the ornament on the lower levels of the façade. Cast iron plants and leaves swirl around the windows and frame the commodities offered for sale in the show windows. The ornamentation demands the viewer's attention and prevents his/her eye from wandering off to the upper floors which from the vantage point of the street seem to have no ornamentation on the facades at all. Once the viewer's eye does move upward, the main feature to be seen is the rounded corner, which because of the way it is set back seems to act like a hinge suggesting that the two facades on State Street and Madison can move with the help of that hinge and are loosely placed in front of the building's steel frame structure.

The Amsterdam Stock Exchange couldn't look more differently. Having a little bit of the appearance of a religious structure, this building seems to lack ornament altogether. A huge somber-looking building in dark-red brick with a pitched roof and a bell tower looms ominously over the street and the little plaza in front. Only when one approaches close-up, can one see that the building does have sculptural ornamentation in its facades: statues that, as in a Romanesque church, are flush with the exterior wall yet seem to try to push themselves forward, out of the building's brick surface, the main function of which appears to be to mask the internal steel structure with a skin that is pulled tightly around the inner space, thus giving expression to the spatial arrangements inside.

The Haus am Michaelerplatz is an architect's attempt on the one hand to make a building conform to the environment of upper-class office and apartment buildings in downtown Vienna, while at the same time making it stand out and attract the viewer to the products for sale in the store. The upper stories are stuccoed and have no articulation other than the regular repetition of the windows. The lower levels, however, are framed in the most richly-veined stone; one can't miss that part of the building. This two-part division is not unlike what one sees in Sullivan's Carson Pirie Scott store. However, Loos's building does not display any kind of figurative decoration at all, which should not be a surprise considering the fact that the building was designed by the author who had just published an essay condemning ornament as a crime."

Here then are three totally different approaches to architecture, one (Sullivan's) which is about staking out a place and making sure that the building will not be overlooked; a second (Berglage's) that does not want to stand out through its material presence, but rather through its spatial encapsulation; and finally Loos's building, which

is a combination of bowing to historical precedents and creating an architectural form appropriate for its function. Yet, as I hope to show in this lecture, while the three architects used very different architectural vocabularies, they had in common the way they treated the building's surface in its relationship to its structure. All three architects had been influenced in their thinking by German architectural theoreticians, in particular by the authoritative Gottfried Semper. As for Berlage, who had studied in Zurich at the school where Semper had taught until a few years before the young Dutchman's arrival, and Loos, who had studied in Dresden, another city where Semper had lived, built, and taught, this is no surprise. As for Louis Sullivan, the Semper connection may be harder to fathom. Sullivan, because of his education at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris, is generally considered to be a French-influenced architect, but he was certainly familiar with the work of German architectural theorists whose ideas had over time been incorporated into his thinking. Roula Geraniotis showed almost 20 years ago that German architects, their buildings and writings were well known in Chicago.³ Not only were there many architects in this city who had come to the United States after having completed their studies in their native Germany, but there were also American-trained architects of German descent who kept up contact with their country of origin and read what the leaders in their field in Germany had to say. Dankmar Adler, Sullivan's partner for about 15 years, was one such architect. The library in Adler and Sullivan's office may very well have held a number of German architecture books. And, even if Sullivan could not read these books, he could learn about their contents through discussions with friends, such as John Edelman, and in the professional associations of which he was a member. One important essay, Gottfried Semper's "Über Baustyle" of 1869, was translated by architects John Root and Fritz Wagner and published as "Development of Architectural Style" in Inland Architect between December 1889 and March 1890.⁴ As has been shown by several historians, including Giovanni Fanelli and Roberto Gargiani in their book Il Principio del Rivestimento and Kenneth Frampton in his Studies in Tectonic Culture,⁵ it was Semper's theory about the wall's origin in the woven mat hung in between timber posts as a protection against the environment, and in the woven hangings that continued to exist in early construction even when more sturdy wall materials had been introduced that all three had embraced and applied in their built work. This theory is generally known as Semper's *Bekleidungstheorie* or theory about "dressing" or "cladding". I hope to use the rest of this lecture to demonstrate the relationship between Sullivan, Berlage and Loos through this *Bekleidungstheorie*.

As Berlage's Stock Exchange was so shockingly and controversially new at the time of its opening and therefore received quite a bit of attention in the professional press, Louis Sullivan must have known Hendrik P. Berlage by name. There is however no evidence of any particular interest on Sullivan's part in the work of this Dutch architect. Conversely, Berlage must have known the work of Louis Sullivan, but it was not something that was prominent on his radar. As both Wessel Reinink and Pieter Singelenberg have shown, in the second half of the 19th century Dutch architects were certainly aware of and interested in the work of their American counterparts.⁶ It was however not Adler & Sullivan or Burnham & Root who drew their attention, rather it was Henry Hobson Richardson. The placement of windows in the surface of the Stock Exchange wall, and especially the solution of a raised entrance set back within the surface of the wall, and reachable by stairs that are parallel to the wall, are quotes that

come directly from Richardson's Trinity Parsonage in Boston and, of course, also the Glessner House here in Chicago. However, up to the moment that Berlage came to the United States in 1911, he seems not to have paid much attention to Sullivan's work. And one wonders if he would have made an effort to visit Sullivan personally if he had not been escorted by Sullivan's former disciple, William Gray Purcell, who had first met Berlage during a trip to The Netherlands in 1906 and had offered to be Berlage's guide if the Dutchman would ever come to the United States.

Judging from Berlage's book, Amerikaansche Reisherinneringen⁷ (American Travel Memoires), the big discovery during his trip to the United States was the work of Frank Lloyd Wright: his houses in the suburbs of Chicago and of course also Union Temple. The next highlight was definitely seeing the work of Louis Sullivan. It does not look like Berlage had expected to like Sullivan's work much, and when one looks at how Berlage had organized his trip one gets a feeling for what presumably were his main interests. After his arrival in New York, where he saw the famous highrise buildings, such as the Woolworth and the Singer Buildings, and then a quick visit to New Haven, he went to Boston, the city of his favorite architect, H.H. Richardson. However, he was rather disappointed with this architect's work. About the Trinity Church, for example, he wrote: "Yet, Richardson's church did not meet my expectations. It is much busier and visually restless than one can see in the illustrations. Moreover, it is purely Romanesque in style, so much so that one could even think it was a rather faithful copy of an existing monument."⁸ These remarks are followed by the conclusion that Richardson is not a real architectural innovator, an honor that should instead be given to Louis Sullivan. Speaking about the Bayard Building in New York, Berlage said: "It is after all the tendency in modern [architecture] to accept the most practical construction in relation to the function of the building. This by the way is in principle not something new, but it is new *again*, because modern thinking only aims to realize again the good principles which, even if they are realized in a different form, are of all times. And by having done that, it is Sullivan to whom the honor is due of being the predecessor of modern architecture in America."⁹

Why Berlage called Sullivan a predecessor and not the first modernist, will be explained in a minute. For now it should suffice to say that Berlage was clearly intrigued enough to want to set up a meeting with Sullivan through the help of his guide, Purcell. And it was during this meeting that Berlage realized that he and Sullivan were kindred spirits. The two must have felt comfortable with each other, as Sullivan decided to read some of his written work to Berlage, who was pleased to discover that Sullivan was a poet whose "ideas are completely congruent with those of the modern thinkers."¹⁰ Berlage most probably counted himself amongst those modern thinkers and recognized quite a few of his own ideas in Sullivan's "What is Architecture? A Study in the American People of Today," an essay of 1906 to which he referred in his travel memoires. A social democrat all his life, Berlage was pleased to discover, for example, that Sullivan had written that "a characteristic philosophy, poetry, and art of expression are vital to the healthful growth and development of a democratic people." But he also quoted Sullivan's statement that "a building is always the expression of an idea," which is something that Berlage himself could have written; and that is also true for Sullivan's opening sentence of "What is Architecture," which says "The intellectual trend of the hour is toward simplification."¹¹

The architects, however, had even more in common. Born in the same year (Berlage was slightly more than 6 months older than Sullivan), both architects were going through a downturn in their careers: while Sullivan's career after the turn of the century had slowly come to a near standstill, Berlage also had had great trouble finding new jobs after his controversial masterwork, the Stock Exchange, had been completed in 1903. From 1906 onwards, Berlage had particular trouble finding new clients. Most of the work done during that time was on competition entries, including the Peace Palace (which he did not win), or idealized projects, such as a design for a Pantheon of Mankind or a Beethovenhuis, none of which came to actual fruition. While Berlage never got into as desperate straits as Sullivan, he must have recognized the problems that this "thinker-architect" faced and must have felt sympathy for Sullivan's effort to keep a practice going.

There was one thing that Berlage did not understand and that was Sullivan's use of ornament. In his Amerikaansche Reisherinneringen, Berlage called Sullivan "an excellent decorator," and added that "one cannot deny that he has made a little bit too much use of [ornament]. For many of the buildings that I saw of his are literally covered with ornament. We should acknowledge immediately, however, that Sullivan, whose ornament has a very personal character, is able to make it completely subordinate to the actual organism of the building."¹² This is probably the reason why Berlage called Sullivan a predecessor of modern architecture in America, and why he did not say too much about such buildings as the Wainwright Building in Saint Louis or the Guaranty Building in Buffalo, NY. Instead, he praised the National Farmers Bank in Owatonna as Sullivan's most interesting building. Relatively small in comparison to Sullivan's earlier work and different in construction in the sense that the building does not present its structure clearly to the outside, this bank is a colorful, compact structure with two almost identical brick facades resting on a pink stone base. It is probably the tightness that Berlage liked so much. I would like to quote extensively from what Berlage said about the bank as it makes so abundantly clear where the common ground is between these two architects.

"[Sullivan's] most interesting building, that I did not get to see in person but got to know from illustrations, is a bank building in the small town of Owatonna. One could barely recognize Sullivan in that building. In his office building in New York and a store in Chicago he is still too much of the decorator; the massing of the building gets lost under the excess of ornament. In his bank building, however, he proves that he is an architect who wants to impress through the building's massing while at the same time excellently enriching the architecture through a carefully placed piece of ornament. (...) When we accept that power—not to be confused with crudeness—is the characteristic of a work of art that we want to regain, then the Owatonna bank is certainly a work of art." And then he added somewhat abruptly: "what struck me as particularly pleasant was the use of beautiful, multicolored brick."¹³

Berlage made it clear in this paragraph that he did not mind ornament (especially not when it was well placed like the cartouches in the upper corners of the two facades), but he rejected excess. He wanted the material to be an enclosure of the space inside and the colorful brick was particularly good for that purpose. In his own writings, Berlage made a distinction—in true Semperian fashion—between the structure (tectonics) and the cladding (the wall). In his "Thoughts on Style" of 1905, he had drawn the following

conclusion: “Since architecture is the art of spatial enclosure, we must emphasize the architectonic nature of space, in both a constructive and decorative sense. (...) Spatial enclosure is achieved through walls, and the space or the various spaces are expressed on the outside as a more or less complex arrangement of walls. Thus the prime importance falls on the wall, which in accordance with its nature should remain flat, for a too strongly modeled wall loses its intrinsic character.”¹⁴ Berlage never identified brick as the appropriate material to create this spatial enclosure. In fact, he wrote quite a bit about the advantages of concrete in achieving a seamless architecture (which is another Semperian idea), but lacking the technology to achieve that goal, and liking the modularly plastic quality of brick, he used it in almost all his work. Berlage probably did not know Sullivan’s essay “Artistic Brick,” which was published one year before the Dutch architect’s visit to the United States, but had he read it, he would have recognized striking similarities between its argument and his own ideas.

In that essay Sullivan described a new type of brick, one that is “not strictly uniform in color and shape” and that he deemed particularly appropriate for modern architecture. Without explicitly mentioning the bank he had just completed in Owatonna, but clearly referring to the materials used in constructing the two main facades of that particular building, Sullivan stated that this colorful brick opened new avenues for architects striving to design buildings that were a natural expression of the building’s function “as exhibited in its plan.” He added: “Manufacturers by grinding the clay or shale coarser, and by the use of cutting wires, produced on its face a new and most interesting texture with a nap-like effect, suggesting somewhat an Anatolian rug; a texture giving innumerable highlights and shadows, and a moss-like softness of appearance.”¹⁵ The reference to the Anatolian rug is very apt; one can immediately imagine how the purple and red colors create a mosaic-like effect before the viewers’ eyes, just as the patterns in a Middle-Eastern rug do. The rug analogy is of course also a reference to Gottfried Semper who as I indicated earlier had first developed the idea of the wall as *Bekleidung*, meaning dressing or cladding and who in his famous book *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten*, had referred quite often to Oriental carpets and their color schemes.¹⁶

Sullivan did not use the term “dressing” of architecture in his essay about brick, but in another one, entitled “Ornament in Architecture,” he said, for example, “We feel intuitively that our strong, athletic and simple forms will carry with natural ease the raiment of which we dream, and that our buildings thus clad in a garment of poetic imagery, half hid as it were in choice products of loom and mine, will appeal with redoubled power, like a sonorous melody overlaid with harmonious voices.”¹⁷ Berlage too was most definitely influenced by this *Bekleidungs* theory. This comes across not only in his writings, but also in his architecture. For example, in the Amsterdam Stock Exchange, especially in its interior, the color of the brick is rather monotone, but because of its English bond brickwork—an arrangement of rows of long stretchers alternating with rows of small headers thereby creating a cross-like configuration—each individual brick works like one stitch in a woven fabric or a crocheted work. The stone decoration underlines this textile quality, for not only do the ornaments engraved in the hard-stone columns suggest that they are covered with fabrics, the figurative sculptures also contribute to this analogy. They are so flat in relation to the wall that it seems as if the

wall draperies have been drawn away to unveil the sculptures. The taut flatness of the wall—an effect that both Sullivan and Berlage strove to convey—is nowhere interrupted.

The encounter between Sullivan and Berlage in Chicago in 1911 had an intriguing aftermath. Slightly more than a year after his return from the United States, Berlage decided that he could no longer wait for jobs to come to him; he wanted a regular appointment as an architect. He therefore accepted a position offered by Mrs. Helene Kröller-Müller to become the in-house architect for her family's shipping and mining business, Wm Müller and Co. The architect, who had been a social democrat all his life, went to work for the biggest capitalists in The Netherlands, businessmen who during the First World War—when Holland was officially neutral—made huge profits from their trade with Germany. For Berlage personally, the decision to work for this company (and by extension for the Kröller-Müller family) was very positive. While his colleagues in the architectural profession had trouble finding work during the war years, Berlage designed many buildings, including a large villa with a gallery for Mrs Kröller-Müller's art collection, planned for the suburbs of The Hague but never built (1913); and a hunting lodge, named St Hubertus (1915), for Mr. Kröller in the east of the country. In 1914, he was asked to design an office building for the Müller Company in London. The edifice he constructed is an obvious homage to Louis Sullivan. Resting on a shiny granite base, the building's steel skeleton is clearly exposed to the outside and covered in glazed grayish-green terra cotta. There is scarcely any ornament, save for a little bit of decoration in the center of the spandrels. In a sense this building is Berlage's interpretation of what Sullivan—had he been a “real” modernist rather than a “predecessor”—should have designed: a building that shows how it is put together, with cladding over the structure and no ornament to speak of. Berlage had said he thought that Sullivan “has made a little bit too much use of [ornament]”¹⁸ for him to appreciate most of the work. But he clearly had looked carefully at Sullivan's buildings and the London commission for Müller & Co. can be understood as his response.

Adolf Loos's relationship with Louis Sullivan was very different from Berlage's. Loos never met Sullivan, but he knew his work, probably from the time that he traveled to the United States to see the World's Columbian Exposition. Loos must have seen Adler and Sullivan's Transportation Building, but even though he wrote a lot about his experiences in America, he never mentioned that structure (but then, he did not mention many other American buildings by name either). It took about twenty-five years from the moment Loos left the United States in 1896 before a more direct contact between Sullivan and Loos was established. I will come back to that interaction at the end of my talk, for the moment I want to focus on the treatment of the surface.

While there is no evidence of a direct influence between the two designers, architecturally Sullivan and Loos were much more closely related than a comparison of their built work, or the titles of their written work, might suggest (take, for example, the titles “A System of Architectural Ornament” by Louis Sullivan, and “Ornament and Crime” by Adolf Loos). Like Sullivan and Berlage, Loos was also interested in Gottfried Semper's *Bekleidungstheorie* and even wrote an essay to which he gave the title Das Prinzip der Bekleidung or The principle of Cladding (1898). Revealing his indebtedness to Semper, Loos made a distinction between a building's structure and its cladding, stipulating that the structure's primary task was to hold up the cladding. In the first paragraph of his essay on “Cladding,” for example, he wrote: “The architect's general

task is to provide a warm and livable space. Carpets are warm and livable. He decides for this reason to spread out one carpet on the floor and to hang up four to form the four walls. But you cannot build a house out of carpets. Both the carpet on the floor and the tapestry on the wall require a structural frame to hold them in the correct place. To invent this frame is the architect's second task."¹⁹

This last sentence might suggest that the artistic expression of the load bearing function of a building's frame or structure was as important to Loos as it was to Sullivan and Berlage. This is, however, not the case. In almost all of Loos's work it is hard to determine how a given building is constructed and what holds up the structure. We already saw in the Haus am Michaelerplatz that the top half of the façade is covered with stucco while the lower half has a veneer made with plates of expensive stone. There is nothing visible in the façade to indicate that the building's structural frame is made of reinforced concrete. That frame is completely hidden behind the stucco and stone cladding. Loos's residences--for example, the Scheu House and Moller House, both in Vienna--are even harder to read. Completely covered in stucco, the only articulations in the bare facades are the window openings and the way these windows are framed in the surrounding wall. One can only guess what happens behind the layers of stucco and what keeps the structure standing. The only conclusion that one can therefore draw is that giving expression to a building's structural frame was of no interest to Loos. Instead, he wanted to capture a building's spaces in simple geometric forms and make those visible on the exterior. An exposed frame might impede that intention and it was therefore better not to draw any attention to it.

Turning now to Loos's interiors, these are treated very differently. While the outsides are in general "unclad," the interiors are covered in the richest kinds of materials--wood and stone especially. Loos chose materials with dramatic veining, as these are the materials that--to quote again from his essay on cladding--make the houses "warm and livable." In this same essay, Loos also noted that one reason for using cladding was to achieve what he called "a specific effect." His own interiors definitely fit into this category. The materials covering the walls speak of affluent domesticity. Their veined patterns give solidity to the walls while the seams between the plates of stone or wood make clear nevertheless that the material is no more than a veneer. The inside cladding is thus a kind of decoration of the wall. To make this claim with respect to the architect who wrote "Ornament and Crime" may sound like blasphemy. Yet, when one looks at that text, one realizes that Loos spoke up against the use of applied ornament (a tattoo, a painting on a wall, or a carving in wood) not an intrinsic ornament, an ornament that is part of the material. The use of materials in Loos's interiors is thus not very different from Louis Sullivan's use of terra cotta with an ornamentation that is not applied to, but integrated in, the surface and seemingly grows organically out of it.

Loos must have been aware of this affinity in architectural thinking, which is probably the reason why he decided to help Sullivan when he was asked to do so by one of his former students, Rudolf Schindler. It is here that we come back to Sullivan's manuscript for the "Kindergarten Chats" that I mentioned at the beginning of this lecture, for it is this text (a critique of architecture, design, and architectural education with Chicago as a backdrop) that could have brought Sullivan and Loos together.

Sullivan, who had first written the Kindergarten Chats around 1900 and had published them in 52 installments in Interstate Architect in 1901-02, had re-edited the

text in 1918 and attempted to find a publisher who would be willing to bring the 52 chapters out as a book. When this appeared to be impossible, Schindler promised Sullivan in late 1918 that he would ask his teacher in Vienna, Adolf Loos, if he would be able to find a publisher for this manuscript in Austria. Schindler took immediate action and sent a letter to Loos. It took, however, quite a while for Loos to answer (and actually, he never responded himself, as Schindler's first letter was answered by Loos's third wife, Elsie Loos-Altmann, and the second by someone in Loos's office named Otto Breuer), but Schindler was persistent and after a while he was able to convince Loos to look at the manuscript. Schindler sent the "Kindergarten Chats" manuscript off to Vienna in March 1920. The optimism on Sullivan's part about finding a publisher in Europe (an optimism that was initially strengthened by an inquiry from Loos to Schindler, asking if Sullivan might be interested in a teaching position in Paris where Loos was thinking of starting his own school) that optimism was short-lived, for Loos too was unable to find a publisher and after a while he passed the manuscript on to his former student, Richard Neutra, who was working in Berlin at that time. Sullivan was quite disappointed in Loos, as revealed in a letter to Schindler in February 1921: "I wrote to Loos four or five months ago and have had no answer. This gross incivility irritates me and I conclude that he is no good."²⁰ Neutra who seemed to have taken his task of finding a publisher more seriously than Loos was also unsuccessful; the economic situation in Germany was unable to support this kind of publication at the time. Eventually, Sullivan gave up and asked Schindler to get the manuscript back to Chicago. Sullivan became very worried about the whereabouts of this copy of the manuscript, but as I said at the beginning of the lecture, he had to wait until just a few weeks before his death in 1924 for Neutra deliver it personally.

This episode reveals that the indirect interaction between Sullivan and Loos never led to a greater understanding on the older architect's part. In fact, he decided that Loos was "no good." And Loos never tried to outdo one of Sullivan's buildings, the way Berlage had done in his London office building for Wm Müller and Co. So, the question still remains what Sullivan really meant when he spoke of his influence in Germany and Scandinavia. The generation after Sullivan, the one of Frank Lloyd Wright and architects in his circle, such as Walter Burley Griffin and, of course, Rudolf Schindler and Richard Neutra, had very direct contacts and interactions with The Netherlands, Germany, and Austria. In Sullivan's case, however, these interactions were about and on the surface. These relations were not direct ones like those between brothers, but distant ones like cousins twice removed, with Gottfried Semper as the Pater Familias.

¹ Thomas S. Hines, Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture: A Biography and History, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1982.

² Idem, p. 52.

³ Roula M. Geraniotis, "German Architectural Theory and Practice in Chicago, 1850-1900," in: Winterthur Portfolio, vol. 21, no. 4, 1986, pp. 293-306.

⁴ Gottfried Semper, Über Baustyle, Zürich, Friedrich Schulthess, 1869. For the English translation, see Inland Architect, December 1889-March 1890.

⁵ Giovanni Fanelli and Roberto Gargiani, Il Principio del rivestimento, Prolegomena a una storia dell'architettura contemporanea, Roma-Bari, Editori Laterza, 1994

Kenneth Frampton, Studies in Tectonic Culture. The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture, Chicago, Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, and Cambridge, MA., and London, England, The MIT Press, 1995.

⁶ A. Wessel Reinink, "American Influences on Late Nineteenth-Century Architecture in The Netherlands," in: The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, vol. 29, no. 2, 1970, pp. 163-174, and Pieter Singelenberg, H.P. Berlage, Idea and Style: The Quest for Modern Architecture, Utrecht, Haentjens, Dekker & Gumbert, 1972.

⁷ H.P. Berlage, Amerikaansche Reisherinneringen, Rotterdam, W.L.& J. Brusse, 1913.

⁸ Idem, p. 21.

⁹ Idem, p. 33.

¹⁰ Idem, p. 34.

¹¹ Idem, p. 34.

¹² Idem, p. 34.

¹³ Idem, p. 34-35.

¹⁴ H.P. Berlage, Gedanken über Stil in der Baukunst, Leipzig, Julius Zeitler, 1905. Translated as: "Thoughts on Style in Architecture," in: Hendrik Petrus Berlage Thoughts on Style, 1886-1909, Santa Monica, The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1996. The quote may be found on page 152.

¹⁵ Louis H. Sullivan, "Foreword to *Suggestions in Artistic Brick*, St. Louis, Hydraulic-Press Brick Co., ca. 1910. Reprinted in: Robert Twombly, ed., Louis Sullivan, The Public Papers, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1988, pp. 200-205. The quote may be found on p. 202.

¹⁶ Gottfried Semper, Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten:..., 2 vols., Frankfurt am Main, Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1860; Munich, F. Bruckmann, 1863. Translated as Style in the technical and tectonic Arts:..., Los Angeles, The Getty Research Institute, 2004.

¹⁷ Louis H. Sullivan, "Ornament in Architecture," in: The Engineering Magazine, vol. 3, 1892, pp. 633-634. Reprinted in Robert Twombly, ed., Louis Sullivan, The Public Papers, pp. 79-85. The quote may be found on p. 80.

¹⁸ H.P. Berlage, Amerikaansche Reisherinneringen, p. 34.

¹⁹ Adolf Loos, "Das Prinzip der Bekleidung," in: Neue Freie Presse, September 4, 1898. Translated as "The Principle of Cladding," in Adolf Loos, Spoken into the Void, Collected Essays, 1897-1900, Chicago, Ill., The Graham Foundation, and New York, The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, and Cambridge, MA and London, England, The MIT Press, 1982, pp. 66-69. The quote may be found on p. 66.

²⁰ Louis H. Sullivan in a letter to Rudolf Schindler dated February 22, 1921, reprinted in: Esther McCoy, Vienna to Los Angeles: Two Journeys, Santa Monica, Arts + Architecture Press, 1979, p. 146.