**Inlaid‑Linoleum Thesis — English Translation (Part 3)**

**3.1 Production methods and variants**

Close inspection of surviving floors shows they were made with the scatter method, as used at Giubiasco. This method is no longer viable at scale due to hand‑labour demands. Today only related types are produced. Straight‑Line‑Inlaid (cut/rejoined sheets) and Intarsia survive in modified forms; Printed linoleum and Granite/Jaspé/Marmoleum remain common.

**3.1.1 Straight‑Line‑Inlaid and Intarsia**

Patented by Frederick Walton in 1882, this method cut and reassembled differently coloured sheets, yielding sharp, durable patterns. It imitated tiles or parquet effectively. Intarsia persisted, evolving with style eras: Jugendstil florals, later modernist geometry, mid‑century pastels. Designers and architects were often commissioned. Today, CNC water‑jet cutters replace metal dies, but fine detail raises costs. Most contemporary Intarsia are simple large‑scale patterns for signage or accents.

**3.1.2 Printed linoleum**

This consists of a plain linoleum sheet printed with patterns. Designs are limitless, but wear affects the thin printed surface. Historically, companies offered both Inlaid and cheaper printed versions. Today, annual style collections echo fashion cycles. Economical for reproducing carpet‑like motifs, but only superficial similarity to true Inlaid.

**3.1.3 Granite, Jaspé and Marmoleum**

These feature multicoloured, amorphous patterns mixed into the mass, producing marbled or stone‑like effects through the thickness. They disguise dirt well and remain popular, especially imitating stone. However, they cannot reproduce defined carpet motifs.

**3.2 Conservation and reconstruction**

For decades, linoleum was often removed as a ‘cheap imitation’. This destroyed many historic floors. Recently, recognition of its heritage value has grown. Some prominent examples have been restored or reconstructed, especially where linked to famous designers.

**3.2.1 Peter Behrens — Rathaus Bremen**

The new Bremen Rathaus (early 20th c.) used Inlaid linoleum with a Behrens tile pattern. In the 1970s it was carpeted over, damaging the original. Later, conservator Peter Hahn oversaw reconstruction: patterns were cut with CNC knives from plain sheets and assembled by hand. Effective for select projects but not scalable. The original granular scatter texture was lost.

**3.2.2 Atelier Zürich — Beausite Zermatt**

For the Belle‑Époque Beausite Hotel (1907), renovated 2007, Atelier Zürich collaborated with Forbo to create custom printed linoleum to match room colours. Large panels (150×210 cm) could yield a seamless impression. Each colour file was sent to Forbo for faithful printing. Feasible above 500 m² project size. Ultimately not installed due to client doubts.

**4 The Schatzalp**

**4.1 Classification of surviving Inlaid‑Linoleum**

Archival evidence confirms Schatzalp’s original rooms and corridors used Inlaid‑Linoleum. Installed by 1901, predating Giubiasco’s presses (1908), it was likely imported from Milan or England. Some designs match English Staines catalogues (1902). Exact provenance remains unknown.

To assess conservation value, one must ask: why was this material chosen? Linoleum’s role at the time combined hygienic, comfort, economic and decorative qualities. Its graphics blurred imitation and originality, often imitating oriental carpets. Inlaid’s granular texture, though less sharp than printed types, suited such motifs and conveyed luxury.

**4.1.2 Functionality**

Linoleum offered durability (patterns through the full thickness), cleanliness (bactericidal belief from linseed oil), water‑repellence, ease of cleaning, slip resistance, and comfort (sound and thermal insulation, with felt underlay at Schatzalp). These matched the Sanatorium’s needs. When converted to a hotel, carpets replaced linoleum—reflecting changing priorities.

**4.1.3 Economy**

Inlaid was costly but still cheaper than true carpets or marble. Schatzalp’s luxury context meant cost was secondary, though savings may have influenced choices.

**4.1.4 Modernity and democracy**

Linoleum, mass‑produced from global raw materials, symbolised industrial progress and wider access to ornament. Once seen as lower‑class substitute, it came to embody modern, hygienic living and democratic design. Schatzalp’s architects embraced new materials, making Inlaid fitting.

**4.2 Handling remnants at Schatzalp**

Future handling requires prioritising preservation of intact areas. Small repairs may be possible but costly. Decisions should weigh which original characteristics (graphic, hygienic, comfort, economic, symbolic) matter most. Reproduction could consider Intarsia or printing, but each departs from the original scatter texture.

**4.3 Reproduction strategies**

Options include: (1) conservation of fragments, (2) creating historically inspired new patterns using modern methods (cut, print), (3) collaborating with manufacturers for bespoke runs. Costs and authenticity vary.

**4.4 Reproduction of Inlaid patterns**

Reproducing carpet‑like designs with today’s techniques is challenging. Intarsia allows sharp patterns but is expensive. Printing is economical but superficial. Granite/Marmoleum cannot reproduce defined motifs. Any reproduction would involve compromise.

**4.5 Conclusion**

The Inlaid‑Linoleum floors of Schatzalp embody a unique convergence of hygiene, comfort, ornament and modernity in early sanatorium design. Though original production is lost, recognition of their heritage value is essential. Conservation of surviving fragments and careful selection of reproduction strategies can honour this legacy.

**5 Appendix**

5.1 Bibliography — [Omitted in translation: full reference list of sources].

5.2 List of figures — [Omitted in translation: figure captions remain unchanged].