The material aesthetics of luxury: marble, glass, and golden light as technologies of soft exclusion

Xavier Reinaldo-Virgili 0000-0002-9039-6779

1. INTRODUCTION

Beyond its ornamental dimension, the aesthetics of contemporary luxury can be interpreted as a form of social architecture. In spaces linked to economic power—five-star hotels, high-end stores, premium residences, casinos, mega-yacht marinas—the choice of materials, textures, lighting, and spatial compositions is not merely decorative. It is, to a large extent, a language. A language that organizes hierarchies, delimits belonging, and produces forms of exclusion softened by beauty.

In this sense, the material aesthetics of luxury function as a symbolic indicator of restricted access, as the atmosphere itself communicates who belongs and who does not. It is a mechanism of what Richard Sennett calls “soft control” (Sennett, 1990), where the design of the environment acts as an invisible form of social regulation. Rather than imposing, it persuades; rather than prohibiting, it discourages.

2. MARBLE AS A MATERIAL OF LEGITIMATION

Marble, due to its historical association with classical temples, imperial courts, and aristocratic palaces, has acquired an aura of permanence and solemnity. According to Pierre Bourdieu (1984), objects are not neutral: they embody historical dispositions of taste and function as signs of symbolic capital. Marble does not “look” expensive; it represents a social order where power is expressed precisely through the durable, the polished, the imposing.

In contemporary luxury spaces, marble fulfills three essential functions:

- Monumentalization of the present.

It transforms the common into the exclusive. A restaurant bar or staircase is endowed with the solidity of marble, which luxury aspires to last, even when subjected to rapid consumption.

- Design of atmospheres.

As Lefebvre (1991) points out, space is not only occupied, it is lived. Marble generates a unique sensory perception based on its touch, shine, and reflection of light. This triggers slower and quieter behaviors.

- Habitus as selection.

Marble excludes based on symbolic barriers. Those who move naturally in these spaces reveal a habitus (Bourdieu) adjusted to the world of luxury. Those who do not feel the weight of the space.

It is the material par excellence of restricted access: not by prohibition, but by cultural reverberation. In the words of Sharon Zukin (1995), it is part of a "symbolic landscape" where power becomes visible while appearing simply aesthetic.

3. GLASS AS AN AESTHETIC OF CONTROLLED TRANSPARENCY

Unlike marble, which suggests permanence, glass communicates visibility. But an asymmetrical visibility. Luxury spaces use glass to produce selective transparencies, that is, they allow the dazzling interiors to be observed without implying ease of access.

In this way, glass has two dimensions:

- The visitor observing from the outside

Perceives the interior as a "scenario of exclusivity," a world to which they may aspire, but which they do not yet inhabit.

- The guest observing from the inside.

Looks out with the confidence of having crossed the symbolic border. Glass turns the interior into a privileged viewpoint.

Lash and Urry (1994) have described this phenomenon as part of the "economy of images," where consumption is not based on possession, but on participation in aesthetic landscapes. Glass reinforces this idea: it is no longer just what one has that matters, but where one's body is located, what view one is granted, what panorama one inhabits.

4. GOLDEN LIGHT AS AN EMOTIONAL ATMOSPHERE

If marble is the grammar of luxury and glass is its point of view, golden light is undoubtedly its emotional state. Warm lighting, used in high-end hotels or luxury restaurants, serves a psychological function as it transforms the physical space into a sensory refuge where the passage of time is slowed down.

Authors such as Pine & Gilmore (1999) have explained that luxury spaces must transport visitors to a different emotional state. Golden light operates under three mechanisms:

- Aesthetic homogenization.

It softens shadows, hides imperfections, and creates visual continuity.

- A feeling of enhanced intimacy.

It suggests privacy even in public spaces, favoring soft exclusion.

- Suspended temporality.

Golden light does not belong to day or night: it is a temporality unique to luxury.

5. MONUMENTAL DECORATION: SPACE AS DISCOURSE

Monumentality in luxury spaces is a form of symbolic status projection. Columns, staircases, or lamps generate a symbolic reduction of the visitor, inducing certain behaviors of regulation and emotional sobriety.

As Sennett (1977) points out, monumental architecture produces a form of “civic theatricality”: individuals adapt their physical presence to match the space. This phenomenon is evident in hotels such as the Hôtel de Paris in Monte Carlo, where the mere act of entering the lobby triggers a different posture, one that is more upright, more relaxed, almost ceremonial.

Monumentality does not exclude by force; it excludes by scale. It suggests that only certain bodies—certain ways of being—fit adequately into the frame.

6. INTERIOR DESIGN AS A MARKER OF RESTRICTED ACCESS

The material aesthetics of luxury act as an implicit social filter. Interior design functions as a technology of symbolic selection by generating spaces that are: too quiet, too neat, too expensive, too stylized, for those who do not possess the appropriate habitus.

Bourdieu and Sennett agree that social space is reproduced in the way bodies occupy places. In luxury interiors, this is continually verified. From the design of the seats to the distribution of the tables, to the volume of the ambient sound, everything is calibrated so that the "suitable" visitor feels comfortable and the "unsure" visitor perceives their mismatch.

Exclusion is not noticeable at the doors: it is noticeable in the atmosphere. It is not formulated: it is felt.

Zukin (2010) sums it up accurately when she states that aesthetic capital has become a contemporary form of urban control. The aesthetics of luxury are not only beautiful; they are ideological.

7. MATERIALITIES OF LUXURY AS SPATIAL TECHNOLOGIES

If we bring all these dimensions together—marble, glass, golden light, monumentality, interior design—we see that the material aesthetics of luxury act as spatial technology. They produce: hierarchies, social roles, modes of circulation, performances of the self, rituals, and symbolic boundaries.

Lefebvre already warned that space is not a container, but a social product. Luxury spaces are perhaps the most obvious proof of this assertion. They are designed so that certain bodies immediately feel "at home" and others not so much; so that certain experiences seem natural and others improbable.

In destinations such as Monte Carlo—where luxury is not an attribute but a cultural infrastructure—these materialities form an aesthetic ecosystem that defines how one looks, how one walks, how one interacts, and how one desires.

8. CONCLUSION: AESTHETICS AS AN ELEGANT FRONTIER

The material aesthetics of luxury are not neutral. They are not design whims or visual excess. They are a codified way of organizing the world.

Materials, lights, reflections, and scales produce soft exclusion, legitimize hierarchies, induce behaviors, and shape identities. They do so without the need for visible barriers, strict controls, or explicit orders. They do so precisely through beauty.

They are symbolic devices that structure experience and order access.

They play out—with delicacy, with impeccable aesthetics—the contemporary politics of luxury.

References

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

Harvey, D. (2013). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.

Kapferer, J.-N., & Bastien, V. (2012). *The luxury strategy: Break the rules of marketing to build luxury brands* (2nd ed.). Kogan Page.

Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space*. Sage Publications.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell.

Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theater and every business a stage*. Harvard Business School Press.

Sennett, R. (1977). *The fall of public man*. Knopf.

Sennett, R. (1990). *The conscience of the eye: The design and social life of cities*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The cultures of cities*. Blackwell.

Zukin, S. (2010). *Naked city: The death and life of authentic urban places*. Oxford University Press.