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Abstract
This study aims at analyzing the evolution and spatial characteristics of specific walls that distinguish Mies van der Rohe’s buildings, by introducing the concept of “the wall as objet” for an analysis tool. The wall as objet signifies that the wall has characteristics as a visual and plastic object. In Mies’s works, the wall as objet evolved gradually throughout his architectural career. In its early stage, the wall as objet becomes a visual object, while it functions as an independent element in self-complete form. However, it gradually changes to become a component of the whole rather than a self-complete element. As for its physical properties, while the earlier wall keeps its identity through materiality of the wall itself, characteristics of the objet as a pure image gradually increase, and eventually exclude materiality. This evolution process of dematerialization of the wall as objet is also accompanied by the gradual changes in its spatial characteristics which as a continuous and empty background.
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1. Introduction
Mies van der Rohe, in the first issue of the magazine “G” published in May 1923, states, “Architecture is the will of the age conceived in spatial terms.”1 This statement, however, more intriguing than explanatory leads us to ask what exactly Mies’s concept of space is. In numerous occasions, Mies’s architectural space has been defined as ‘flowing space’ and ‘universal space’. However, there is a limitation in defining Mies’s concept of space as such, since this concept of space might result oversimplified and abstract by concerning mainly the historical periods and the places which Mies worked. Furthermore, as for meaning of the concept, it is not easy to grasp the characteristics of the ‘flowing space’ even in such examples as ‘German Pavilion’ or ‘Tugendhat House.’ On the other hand, characteristics of universal space, which are theoretically comprehensible, can vary a lot when compared to individual buildings.

In analyzing an architect and tendency in his work, it is significant to set forth certain concepts to summarize the architect’s life-time body of work. However, by doing so, reduction of the complexity of the works into words is inevitable. Moreover, this kind of deductive method may lead to a partial understanding as if an architect had pursued certain particular concepts single-mindedly throughout his whole life.

For these reasons, a different approach may be required to understand Mies’s concept of architectural space. In order to investigate Mies’s idea of space, it is necessary to analyze specific elements of the individual buildings and to diagnose the evolution of changes appearing in them in the course of time before framing them with any generalizing concepts a priori.

To serve this purpose of study, this paper will delineate one of the constant themes shown in the work throughout Mies’s life and the ways in which they evolved. In doing so, this paper will focus on relationships between the interior space and the interior walls which have independent characteristics. The research will be done from the evolutionary point of view and according to the passage of time.

The author wishes to introduce the concept of “the wall as objet”2 to be used as an analysis tool for this study. Walls, traditionally, have a function to define a boundary. A boundary as an area defining factor, breaks up the space not only physically, but also psychologically and visually. The wall as objet, as used in this paper, signifies the wall which has characteristics of an objet rather than functional purpose as a boundary.3 In other words, the wall as objet represents the wall which is an object of appreciation and contemplation. Characteristic of “objet” signifies being an object that is, becoming a visual and plastic object, as “Objet d’art” conventionally indicates an artifact with artistic merit. Thus, “the wall as objet” will indicate an architectural element in course of becoming visual and plastic object in this paper. As criteria for the choice of examples, the following conditions were applied.

First, the wall is an interior wall spatially and in terms of its location, indicating the isolated vertical partitions within the boundary of the building context. Since the purpose of this paper is to deal with Mies’s interior space
exclusively, the paper will study interior walls only.

Second, formal and functional independent walls should not constitute an enclosure joined by each edges. Thus, this study also includes partitions as examples, even if they are not considered walls physically.

Third, the wall should have its innate physical properties. In other words, the identity of the wall should be determined by its texture, materiality, and color.

In this light, the examples of the wall as objet studied in this paper will include those found in his early exhibition works during 1927-9, Tugendhat House (Bruno, 1930), German Pavilion (Barcelona, 1929), Exhibition House for a Bachelor at Berlin Building Exposition(1931), Resor House (Wyoming, 1938, project), Museum for a Small City (1942), and New National Gallery (Berlin, 1968). In addition to these buildings, Brick Country House Project (1923), Urlich Lange House (Krefeld, 1935, project), Court House Series designed at Bauhaus (1934-5), the Collage of Concert Hall Project (1942) and Farnsworth House (1950) will be used for the analysis because of their similarities to the above examples.

What these examples have in common is that those walls as "objets" appear more often in the free spaces as open plans rather than the traditional enclosed spaces, so called box-like spaces. Since the spatial composition using an open plan, which is explained as "flowing space" and "universal space," represents Mies's spatial identity, the wall as objet can be considered one of Mies's signature methods to define space.

However, here lies a contradictory situation. Because the wall as objet has a formalistic characteristic, which is found in the space designed with an open plan, by analyzing the wall as objet along with the spatial characteristics it is possible to commit an error of reciprocal reference.

The premise of this paper, however, is that the wall as objet is neither completely subordinate to the surrounding space nor completely independent from it. The wall as objet and the surrounding space are mutually related but independent from each other as well. In other words, Mies’s wall as objet is influenced by the surrounding space, but functions as an important factor to constitute characteristics of the space at the same time. Therefore, the specific wall and the space around it should be considered in their interrelationship.

The study will develop into two directions. First, this paper will define the concept of the wall as "objet", and illustrate the evolutionary process. And then, the paper will study the changes in the spatial significance which the evolutionary process contains.

This paper will limit its study to determine characteristics of the wall as objet and to analyze the specific spatial effects produced by the wall. This paper will focus only on visual characteristics of the wall, that is, in terms of its form and the space. Non-architectural aspects such as conceptual or historical backgrounds of Mies’s architecture will be excluded as much as possible.

The approach used in the paper may have its limitation for comprehensive understanding of Mies’s architecture. However, the purpose of this paper is not to draw a universal and general architectural theory but to analyze specific characteristics shown in Mies’s architecture.

2. Characteristics and Evolution of the Wall as Objet

Early architecture by Mies includes neither free spaces with open plans nor the wall, which is an independent element. In his architecture, from his first work, Richl House (Neubabelsberg, 1907) to those designed until the year of 1923, all the walls constitute closed enclosures with their edges combined. It was also the case even in such experimental works as the two Glass Skyscraper projects (1921) and Concrete Office Building project (1922).

However, in 1923 in the Brick Country House project (Fig. 1), free space and the wall constituting it appear for the first time. The Brick Country House, generally known to had been influenced by De Stijl, is a precursory example of the wall as objet, with similar principle of composition to Theodo van Doesburg’s painting, “Rhythm of a Russian Dance”. The wall in this project is in the early form of the wall as objet, since the space is not determined as simple boxlike enclosures, and each wall is characterized for its independence. The walls constitute an important component in the floor plan. However, the view vanishes into the void between the walls in the three-dimensional space, and arrests on the wall in the floor plan. Most of the walls here are not visual objects, so that the perception is led to the directions to which they indicate or the space they make, or create vertical frames of these views.

Thus, the walls in Brick Country House do not yet show the criteria as the wall as objet completely, since the wall as objet should have characteristics of object in itself not in the two-dimensional plan but in real space. (Fig. 1) Despite this, the fact that Brick Country House seems to possess the early form of the “objet- wall,” is because of its free space, the function of the walls to make the space that way, and the independent quality of the walls, even though it is not accomplished yet. It also means that the walls here do not have innate properties to be visually independent.

Mies’s understanding of the wall as a visual object to
be appreciated in an interior space seems to have started as his interests in materialties of the wall increased. By the year 1927, materialties of walls in Mies’s architecture are only recognized in its exterior appearance. Because the interior appearance is covered with finishing materials and is not mentioned with further emphasis, it is hard to know about it. It is necessary to underline that after the collaboration with the interior designer Lilly Reich, different aspect and importance of the interior wall emerge in his following works. Among these works, the Glass Room in Stuttgart (1927), *Die Wohnung* (the dwelling) Exhibition (1927), Velvet and Silk Cafe in Berlin (1927), *Die Mode der Dame* (women’s fashion) exhibition, and Textile exhibition in Barcelona (1929) are significant. These projects seemed very special to the architect, because the projects were executed in limited spaces and were focused on the display. These projects were considered as the opportunity to experiment characteristics of interior walls where everything related to the exterior was excluded. In these exhibitions, Mies created various forms of walls and partitions, and also some columns using various materials including glass and cloth. The walls in these exhibitions go beyond those in traditional sense. (Figs. 2, 3) The displayed objects here also function in the circulation of the visitors, so that the walls become important visual objects by themselves and the materialities of the walls are mainly emphasized.

![Fig.2. Velvet & Silk Café, Berlin (1927)](image1)

![Fig.3. Textile Exhibition, Barcelona (1929)](image2)

The walls show characteristics of *objet* intensely. The walls here do not define space as in traditional architecture, nor lead the eyes towards the space between the walls as an auxiliary device designed for empty space. The walls here are the objects to gather people’s attention. Hence as mentioned, the first wall with characteristics as *objet* can be found in Mies’s works collaborated with Lilly Reich. However, these walls have limitations, since Mies couldn’t design the whole space because they were the installation pieces in exhibitions. In spite of these limits, it is probable that these exhibitions influenced Mies on his concept of the wall as *objet* in the limited space.  

This type of the wall as *objet* appears full-fledgedly in the whole building setting, such as German Pavilion (Barcelona, 1929) and Tugendhat House (Bruno, 1930). In German Pavilion, Mies made the wall an object of appreciation using such various materials as onyx, transparent and opaque glass, colored glass, marble, and travertine.

![Fig.4. German Pavilion, Barcelona (1929)](image3)

The onyx wall is especially an important *objet* in itself. Its visual role as an *objet* is more important than its functional role in the space. This onyx wall is often considered as an element to evoke the sense of flow in the space. However, there seems an evident limitation for the onyx wall to create the sense of flow actually, if the wall is supposed to guide the visual perception and the circulation. The wall is perceived only as a self-complete object at such an important moment as one enters through the main entrance. The wall’s characteristic to point directions can be perceived only from behind the wall, in a cornered spot, while the wall is perceived as a self-complete object in the other main spots of the space including that of the wall itself. In this light, the onyx wall has the most visually intense characteristic of an self-complete object. This is also true to the onyx wall found in Tugendhat House.

This characteristic is also found in other works of the same period. In the case of the curved wall in ebony macassar in Tugendhat House, the wall with the characteristic to guide the directions is absent. However, the wall becomes an self-complete visual object due to the texture of ebony macassar, its curved form, and its contrast with onyx. This ebony macassar wall reappears in 1931 in House at the Berlin Exposition in similar form as shown in the onyx walls in two projects just mentioned. In Hubbe House (Magdebrug) in 1935, the wall with a stone-finished fireplace performs the same role.

In this period, Mies’s walls as *objets* have the following important characteristics. First, they are self-complete, independent objects in space. Second, the walls become visual objects by showing their visual identities through their materialities.

Further developed characteristics of the wall as *objet* can be found in Resor House, Mies’s first work done in
the United States although not realized. Mies showed the possibility of a new concept of the wall in Resor House in America (1938), by introducing not only a method to show the characteristics of the wall as *objet* with the properties of materials, but also integrating into the new concept of the wall as *objet*, which is the wall as a pure image. (Fig. 5)

In the United States, Mies had different building condition compared to Germany. It results in the changes in utilizing the materials, for example, it seems clear that Mies was fascinated by cypress wood while designing Resor House. The early sketches of Resor House show walls made of cypress wood and a fireplace of natural stones. He had already used texture of woods actively in Tugendhat House and Berlin Building Exposition. However, with abundant wood supplies in the United States, Mies used woods more deliberately than in Europe. He also seemed to be enthusiastic about uncarved and rough natural stones. Furthermore, since the use of wider and resistant glass was possible in America, he was able to create more open view in his work than in Germany. However, in the course of the design, the cypress walls were replaced by walls, partitions, and furnitures, which are short enough not to block the view.

The most notable thing in Resor House is the wall of abstract painting by Paul Klee, “Colorful Meal.” The characteristic of the wall here shifts from what is expressed solely by properties of its material to a visually abstract painting. In other words, materialities such as its heaviness disappear in this process of dematerialization, while its scenographic quality of the image is emphasized. Meanwhile, the self-complete quality of the wall also weakens, whereas the wall becomes a component of the whole composition.

An attempt to transform the wall into a painting, in its earlier form, had already been tried in Ulrich Lange House project in 1935 and in a series of Court House (Fig. 9) done between 1931 and 1940. Mies is regarded to identify those walls as artistic *objets* by making a wall a painting. As a result, the wall remains as a pure image rather than architectural material.

This aspect is also found in Picasso’s painting, “Guernica” in Project for a Museum for a Small city in 1943. (Fig. 6) The mural expresses each view differently according to the different levels, and “Guernica” by Picasso becomes an *objet* just like Maillol’s sculpture pieces. The most important thing in this Museum for a Small City is that the wall becomes a pure *objet* by renouncing not just the structural aspect to sustain the roof but also its frontal disclose from floor to ceiling. Here the distinction between a wall and a pure *objet* becomes vanishes eventually.

The walls in one of Mies’s last works, New National Gallery (Berlin, 1968), are replaced by hanging partitions. Even if there are no walls except two marble core walls in the space, these partitions not only play the functional role to hang the displayed objects but also their traditional roles such as directing eyes, setting up boundaries, and dividing the space. These partitions are composed in the space, as also shown in a three-dimensionalized Mondrian painting. These partitions are hanging off the floor becoming almost free objects themselves. (Fig. 7)

Similar method was precedently applied by Mies in 1959 for the installation in the addition to the Houston Museum of Fine Arts, Cullinan Hall. However, more original form of this was found in the Collage of Concert Hall project in 1942, which looks more like a three-dimensionalized composition piece rather than a building, walls as well as the ceilings are hanging off the floor to constitute the spatial composition. (Fig. 8) By using the properties of the materials and colors, the walls create a harmonious whole being contrast to the sculptures in front of them.

With the walls floating in the air, the spatial void is more accentuated. Here the space as a background, which is “empty” or “void,” makes contrast with the *objets*, which “exists” in them.

This chapter has studied the evolution of Mies’s wall as *objet* so far. In short, the wall as *objet* means a visual object in a void space. In the early stage of its evolution,
the wall as objet functions as an independent factor in self-complete form. However, it gradually becomes a component of the whole rather than that in the self-complete form. In its early stage, the walls acquire their identities through materialities. However, the qualities of objet rather than the materialities increase gradually, and the walls develop their characteristics of objets until they become eventually pure images excluding materialities.

3. Changes in the Spatial Characteristics of the Wall as Objet

3.1. Space as Continuum

As widely known, the interior space of Mies’s architecture shows the contrast between the boxlike space created by joining solid walls and the visually continuous space using glass walls and open plan. While early Mies’s buildings are composed of enclosed boxes, after 1923 his projects show both space as enclosed box constituted from combining traditional walls and space as continuum appearing often with open plan.

In fact, the reason that the wall as objet appears distinctively in this space as continuum is because it also gives a functional solution to the space by providing a necessary method to constitute the walls without interrupting the open plan. In other words, in order to gain an open view, it is better to have independent free standing walls than combined walls.

However, it is hard to explain the identity of the wall as objet with this functional purpose for two reasons. First, if the major concern was only the functions, it might have been a plausible solution to eliminate the walls or replace them with other elements at least in a few of the buildings. However, in Mies’s drawings and sketches of many projects, the walls were evidently considered as important elements of composition. (Fig. 9) That is, Mies emphasizes the significance of the walls intentionally with surplus visual value. Second and more importantly, the walls do not divert our eyes passively, but lead them actively by emphasizing their innate properties. That is, although the transparent glass wall opens the space and brings the outside view inside, our eyes go toward the objet, not outward, and as a result, the outside remains substantially as a background. Thus, Mies’s wall as objet is an intentional device to constitute the specific spatial identity, beyond its functional purpose.

The concept of regarding the space not as an enclosed box but as a continuum is similar to the spatial concept pursued by the De Stijl artists such as Theodo van Doesburg and Gerrit Rietveld. De Stijl artists eliminate borders between the exterior and interior by opening the walls. They also eliminate a spatial border in the interior by dividing the space and using movable walls. In “Counter-construction Based on the Private House project” (1923) by van Doesburg, the spatial boundaries disappear, while the composition of walls and floors remains. (Fig. 10)

However, the spatial concept of De Stijl in which spaces as continuum of interior and exterior are common properties, is different from Mies’s spatial concept. As Padovan indicates, De Stijl starts basically with a box and fragments the walls for the construction of plastic form. In other words, in the case of De Stijl, a building itself is an objet, and the spatial continuum in it becomes a base to make the objet abstract and fragmented. For them the innate properties of such elements as walls and floors are less important than the plastic whole created by integrating those elements. As in Schroeder House, the walls are represented as planes of various colors, but each color is more significant in the whole composition than individually as an element.

In addition, changeable interior walls maximize the flexibility of the space. Thus, it is evident that what continuum of interior space of Schroeder House pursues is flexibility basically. Comparing with this, its relationship with exterior space is not too farfetched from the in traditional sense using walls and windows. It only suggests the possibility for mutual communication.

On the contrary, Mies brings in outside more actively, with more emphasis on creating continuity of space than giving plastic configuration. Mies does not use spatial continuum to create plastic configuration. This can be found in Mies’s method of fenestration. Instead of
making windows in the wall, he makes the entire wall transparent by using a glass curtain wall so that the view from outside should not be controlled by the wall. It seems that, for Mies, the characteristic of spatial continuum means to establish the relationship between interior and exterior spaces by leading our eyes to the background that looks open vastly outside. From this concept, Mies creates unique relationship between interior and exterior spaces, which distinguishes him from other architects. As Kepes states, the characteristic of transparency establishes a spatial order, which is beyond visual, by synchronous recognition of different locations in other spaces. For Mies, the exterior becomes an extended and expanded interior rather than an object to be looked at through an opening. Spatial interpenetration is accentuated as the exterior comprises a part of interior environment.

3.2 Space as a Background and the Wall as Objet

This strong continuum of interior and exterior produces difficulties in creating an identity of the interior space itself. For example, in Brick Country House Project, our eyes are diverted from the exterior, because the interior view should be occupied by the exterior environment as background.

To give the interior space an identity, an object is required to keep the view in the interior before shifting toward the exterior. In this sense, Mies uses various architectural elements such as walls, columns, and furniture as visual objects. His collaborative works with Lilly Reich for exhibitions show that the architectural elements, especially the wall can be used as an excellent objet in the interior space excluding the exterior. Furthermore, Mies makes columns, furniture and sculptures objets in space. The walls here are objets with area, columns as objets with lines, furniture and sculptures as objets plastiques. Thus, even though walls have different properties than other objets, they play the same roles with others basically. While these exhibition projects have architectural limitations as interior installations, the German Pavilion and Tugendhat House show the incorporation of architectural elements as objets into the exterior space, which was brought inside visually and becomes a background.

In German Pavilion and Tugendhat House, the wall as objet, which is represented by onyx wall, and the outside view are perceived in terms of independent and equal relationship between them. In these two buildings, the exterior space and the wall as objet do not form a comprehensive view by being perceived simultaneously. Instead, the nature extending vastly to the outside and heavy artificial walls inside make a strong contrast and create a self-complete and mutually independent juxtaposition of an outside environment and an interior objet. The Exhibition House for a Bachelor at Berlin Building Exposition shows the similar effect. Mies uses an ebony macassar wall to divide front and rear of the house in the imaginary site. Both directions from the wall are open, but the space is divided being unable to see through. Thus, in this space the exterior vista and the interior walls create independent views respectively, as in German Pavilion and Tugendhat House. (Fig. 11)

However, in Resor House, the background and the wall as objet appear to form a unified view. This is illustrated in an extreme form in Mies’s drawing of Resor House. (Fig. 5) Here the exterior vista seen through the frame created by the ceiling and floor, the wall made with Klee’s painting, and wooden furniture constitute a composition. An exterior view can look easily like a flat image, but Mies suggests that it is not a flat image, but a spatial background seen over the building through the ceiling and floor planes extended over the window frame. That is, for Mies, the wall constituted of Klee’s painting expresses the relationship between architectural objets as background in the whole space.

Mies produces more open views with the help of vast natural environment of Wyoming and by using more improved large sheets of glass than in works done in Germany. This creates more active relationship between the interior and the exterior. For this reason, while German Pavilion and Tugendhat House only have one-direction openness, Resor House has two-direction openness. Furthermore, in works after Farnsworth House on, Mies creates space with all-direction openness.


Fig.11. 1-Directional Perspective Drawing: German Pavilion, Tugendhat House

The one-directional perspective as shown in German Pavilion or Tugendhat House and the two-directional perspective shown in Resor House have very different spatial contexts. One-directional perspectives have important context when both sides of a building have different hierarchies, for example, considering the relationship to a street in urban space or to the


Fig.12. 2-Directional Perspective Drawing: Resor House
topographical levels of the building. On the contrary, two-directional or all-directional perspectives are significant, when the exterior spaces are all equal or similar basically. Thus, it can be most effective, when the building is constructed in a rural setting, as Resor House or Farnsworth House were.

An important characteristic produced by two-directional perspective is the fact that one can look at the exterior from the exterior through the building. In this case, the visual properties of interior space dissolve, whereas the objets in the space exist as images. In other words, the interior space is a part of a greater whole, and basically both of these do not exist independently.14 (Fig. 12)

In other words, the boundary set by glass walls does not divide the space neither as an object nor as a dematerialized boundary. In this case, the space is identified with a nature as a whole. In this environment, the wall, as is the case of the wall made of Klee’s painting in Resor House, is more accentuated in the background of nature. This effect is also found in photomontage of Picasso’s “Guernica” in Project for a Museum for a Small City in 1943. Mies considers it as an object in the space against a changing background.15

In this, all the elements make up the whole composition. Thus, the meaning of the wall is that it remains as a pure visual image that is a component of a whole composition. The effect of this increases, as the transparency level increases. In the New National Gallery, the object in the space, which is open to all directions through completely transparent exterior walls, loses its innate materialities to create a spatial composition as a pure image. (Fig. 13) That is, increasing “emptiness” or “void” of the background accentuates the “existence” of the object. Here Mies’s wall as objet acquires a distinct identity as an existing object against the empty background.

In this regard, for Mies, it might be said that the stronger the spatial continuum is, the weaker its materialities is. In fact, in these examples of Mies architecture, the interior space in itself is no more a recognizable object. Thus, the space here, as Mies states, is “beinache nichts (almost nothing).” Here the wall acquires a meaning of “existing objet” against the space.

4. Conclusion

This paper studied the evolution and spatial characteristics of the wall as objet that distinguishes Mies’s buildings. In the course of the study, the following conclusion could be drawn about the Mies’s interior wall as objet.

Mies’s objet wall evolved gradually throughout his architectural career. In its early stage, the wall as objet becomes a visual object, while it functions as an independent element in its self-complete form. However, it gradually changes to become a component of the whole rather than self-complete element. As for its physical properties, while the earlier wall keeps its identity through materialities, characteristics of the objet rather than the materialities gradually increase as a pure visual image. This evolution process of dematerialization of the wall as objet is also accompanied by transparency of boundary between interior and exterior which gives the characteristics of space more sense of continuities and emptiness.

The conception of space has played a very important role in architecture since the 20th century. To be expressed in other words, space is understood as an object to be recognized by a subject. An object needs the external to be perceived. The external enables the subject to distinguish the object from other things in the background and recognize it.

However, it is hard to find in Mies the concept of space that a subject can recognize as an object. In the space made by glass walls as Mies created, the external is not evident in view of the interior space. Especially, the space around the wall as objet is hard to be recognized as an object to contemplate. This space is simply empty, and it is a background to other objects, not the object itself. On the contrary, architectural elements including walls become standing objects providing the background a specific order. Whereas the space loses characteristics of an objet and gains stronger characteristics of “emptiness” or “void,” the wall as objet, which becomes “an existing objet”, changes into a pure image eventually.
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Notes
2 The term, the wall as objet, has not been generally used, but coined by the author specifically for this study. The purpose of the term is to be served as a tool to analyze characteristics of the specific spaces in Mies’s work, rather than to introduce a new concept. Therefore, the term “the wall as objet” used in this paper is value-neutral, and is used as a term which doesn’t include any esotericism in it.
3 The Structural aspects of the walls are excluded in this study since most of the walls mentioned here does not perform structural role.
Mies stated about these exhibition works as ‘...the relationship between the various display elements was as important as their individual design; visitors could enter his exhibition environments as they would his built architecture and have a complex but coherent spatial experience.’” quoted in Miller, W. (2001) Mies and Exhibitions, in Riley et al. ed. *Mies in Berlin*, The Museum of Modern Art, New York, p.340


5 The notions of “space as continuum” used in this paper refer to the three concepts of space by Adrian Forty. Forty differentiates the senses in which ‘space’ was used by architects and critics during the 1920s: (1) Space as Enclosure, (2) Space as continuum, (3) Space as extension of the body. Forty, A. (2000) *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture*, Thames & Hudson, p. 267


10 As a matter of fact, for these reasons, it seems that Brick Country House and exhibition works with Lilly Reich, are representative works in spatial sense. In Brick Country House, the visual perception expands outward, on the contrary these Exhibition remains on the objects in display.

11 Another example to notice is Mies’s Electric Utilities Pavillion in Barcelona, 1929. In this project, integrates the parts in quite opposite way compared to German Pavillion. A huge scale photograph is located in the large exhibition hall to give the impression of being in outside. In other words, the outside seems to enter toward inside by giving similar effects in both sides. Neumeyer, F., The Artless Word, p.226

12 It would be useful to refer to Mies’ statement about Farnsworth House here. ‘...Yet we should attempt to bring nature, houses and human beings together into a higher unity. If you view nature through the glass walls of the Farnsworth House it gains a more profound significance than if viewed from outside. This way more is said about nature—it becomes part of a larger whole.’” quoted in Noberg-Schulz, C., (1958) *Talks with Mies van der Rohe*, in Neumeyer, F., (1991) *Artless Word*, trans. by Jarzombek, M., The MIT Press, p339.

13 Mies stated about ‘Guernica’ in a Museum for a Small City Project as “A work such as Picasso’s ‘Guernica’... can be shown to greatest advantage, and become an element in space against a changing background”, Lambert, P. (2001) Mies Immersion: Space and Structure, in Lambert, P. ed. Op. cit., p.428
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