sial is his contention that the three-dimensional image per se “astonished its naive native audience” (138), evoking a powerful sense of the numinous or “divine presence,” to quote Hans Belting.2 Leaving aside the culturally determined nature of vision (as Edgerton notes), there is no documentary evidence to support the idea that Renaissance stylistic elements were the primary agent in communicating the power and divinity of the new Christian holy figures. More important, these were representations of the victors’ “gods” and they were often located in sanctuaries over or close to sacralized spaces formerly inhabited by pre-Christian supernaturals, suggesting that affiliation and place had as much, if not more, to do with the transference of potency and “divine presence” than style. Although realistic plastic effects may be enhanced in black-and-white murals, there are other more practical considerations to account for their ubiquity. Black paint (carbonate) bonds more easily, and was cheaper and more efficient; black-and-white murals do have Spanish precedents (La Concepción, Toledo); and finally, most wall paintings relied on graphic prototypes.

To counter what Edgerton views as a harsh indictment of mendicant policies, he cautious against imposing contemporary notions of human rights onto what was an essentially medieval view of “natural law.” In so doing, he adopts a more utopic outlook, comparing the friars to members of a Peace Corps who “benevolently cared for” (6, 13) their Indian charges. Throughout the book, the tensions and asymmetries of power that existed among various colonial constituencies are downplayed to foreground a harmonious, seamless working relationship between friar and Indian. In keeping with his role as booster, Edgerton’s text is enthusiastic in tone and always intelligent, lucid, and well supported with primary sources. Readers will come away not only more appreciative of this monumental building program, but also enlightened by the insightful analysis of an artistic enterprise that advanced the goals of both parties in the friar-Indian partnership.

JEANETTE FAVROT PETERSON
University of California, Santa Barbara

Notes

Veronika Hofer, editor
Gabriel von Seidl. Architekt und Naturschützer

Ingolf Bauer, editor
Das Bayerische Nationalmuseum. Der Neubau an der Prinzregentenstrasse 1892–1900
Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2000, 342 pp., 162 illus. €51, ISBN 3-7774-8740-6

The architecture of the last two centuries in Munich seems to fall into two distinct categories, endorsing either stylistic advancement or traditionalism, that is, adhering to internationalism or “localism,” respectively. Architects belonging to the first group are Leo von Klenze, Friedrich Gärtnert, Richard Riemerschmid, and Frei Otto, while the main protagonist of the second was Gabriel von Seidl, the architect of the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum (1893–1900). Understandably, the former have received almost all the attention from architectural historians. It is the chief merit of the books under review here that they try to reverse this trend by suggesting that Seidl’s approach, too, can be seen as innovative. Veronika Hofer’s volume is a monograph, composed of eight short chapters by Munich historians and art historians that focus on Seidl’s architecture and his contributions to the preservation of historic monuments and landscapes. The book edited by Ingolf Bauer on the Bavarian National Museum is much weightier, though it deals with a single edifice. This was, however, one of the most important museum buildings of its period, and it raises important architectural and museological issues. Articles cover Bavarian cultural politics, the iconography of the sculptural decorations, the museum’s gardens, the opening festivities, and even the museum wards’ revolt of 1901 (to obtain better conditions and schedules, etc.). The main contributor to both publications is the architectural historian Gabriele Schickel; thus, as regards Seidl’s buildings, the two works operate in tandem. Although a monograph, Hofer’s volume does not seek to be exhaustive. A comprehensive image of Seidl remains somewhat elusive, especially as few documents on his buildings other than the museum have survived. Paralleling the situation that applies to the English Vernacular and Domestic Revivals, nobody in Germany ever provided a text that set out the aims of the Bavarian architectural movement in the later nineteenth century, least of all Seidl, who wrote very little. Georg Hirth’s book Das deutsche Zimmer der Renaissance (Munich, 1880) greatly contributed to discussions about “vernacularized” interior design and illustrated many works of the young Seidl, but it contained very little about the new trends in architecture. Still, Hofer’s book can be complemented with Hans Bößl’s monograph on Seidl (Gabriel v. Seidl [Historischer Verein von Oberbayern, ed., Oberbayrisches Archiv, vol. 88, Munich, 1966]) and the full set of periodical references from the indispensable bibliographies by Stefan Waetzoldt and Verena Haas (Bibliographie zur Architektur im 19. Jahrhundert [Nendeln, 1977]). What Hofer’s book offers is essentially a narrative about Seidl’s buildings, arranged geographically: Munich, Bavaria, and the rest of Germany. As the latter two are not clearly separated, the crucial question regarding to what extent Seidl differentiated between the genius loci of southern
Bavaria and that of the other regions of Germany could not be properly addressed. Lastly, since few of Seidl's buildings have survived intact, the authors in Hofer's book rely on archival images that lack precision (nor are the origins of the images usefully identified for readers in the captions). Bauer's book on the museum building, however, is based on ample documentation throughout and contains lavish photographs.

As both books make clear, Seidl was an architect—of which there were many in his generation—whose outlook may be described as fundamentalist or "essentialist." Seen from the vantage point of contemporary theory, terms such as "tradition," "local," and "volkstümlich" (suitable for or corresponding to the people) that often occur in discussions of his work are not innocent of meaning. Yet most of the authors in the volumes under review take these terms for granted.

A closer look at the concept of traditionalism, however, would have meant that a severe antimodernist Munich fault line had to be crossed: Gabriel von Seidl vehemently rejected the Jugendstil from the start in favor of a vernacular revival architecture, and this raises a critical question: Does his posthumous influence (that is, after 1913) lead straight to some of the architectural preferences of the almost-Bavarian Adolf Hitler, who included much of that region's folklore paraphernalia in his propaganda and adopted the Alpine chalet style for some types of buildings? The attempt to extricate Seidl from these retrospective links may never succeed entirely, but a closer analysis of some of the issues could have taken the discussion a long way and proven most fruitful.

A starting point for such an investigation might have been the collusion, even the confusion, reigning between "Bavarian" and "German," sown partly by the Bavarians themselves (see, for instance, Seidl's Bavarian–South German Medieval and Renaissance styles used for the [All]-German Pavilion at the 1893 Chicago World's Fair). Yet, at the time, Bavarianism was often seen in opposition to pan-Germanism and to Prussianism in particular (Bavaria just having been incorporated into the new German empire under the Prussian emperor), and, above all, the Bavarians were seen as the antithesis of the upstart, loudmouthed, and humorless Berliners. They, in turn, loved the Bavarians all the more for it, and Bavarian "ordinariness," combined with the Alpine idyll, became the North Germans' touristic other. Such an image made the Bavarians ever more confident in cultivating their identity, which on the whole they did aggressively. In time, this touristic other did come to stand in for a missing pan-German folklore image that could apply to Bavarians and non-Bavarians alike—before, during Hitler's years, and even after Hitler (when it could turn out rather more boisterous)—North Americans, in particular, have tended to identify German folklore with Bavarian folklore.

However, within the broader conception of a Bavarian identity there was also a specific Munich identity. For its locus classicus was the Biergarten, Bierkeller, or Bierpalast, which required the planning of a generation of highly efficient venues, usually for hundreds of revelers—in one case, six thousand. The new plan type was combined with a new conception of "traditional" Bavarian Gemütlichkeit, the Stimmung—or mood—depending upon a carefully calculated simplicity adorned with coarsened Renaissance motifs outside and the use of much natural-colored wood inside. Seidl's first and arguably most significant building, the small Bierpalast "Zum deutschen Haus" of 1880 (destroyed), pioneered these elements. Adding to the complexity of the Bavarian image is the fact that in strong contrast to the new folklorism, Munich also sported the image of Germany's Kunststadt, the city with the greatest concentration of artists. Seidl kept a very close association with that world, too, designing the lavish (and largely preserved) villa for the prince of Munich's painters, Franz Lenbach.

Given this background, Hofer's definition of Seidl as "the most Munich of all Munich architects" (Hofer, 113) and as representative of design for Gemütlichkeit begs the basic question: How exactly can one define "Münchenness" in architecture? For an incisive analysis of Seidl's work we must turn to Schickel's essay, "Die Münchner
Bauten.” Schickel first of all wants to avoid clichés such as *Heimatliebe* (Hofer, 113). She begins by citing the styles Seidl employed in his buildings, the then so-called deutsche Renaissance and later the Baroque. But from about 1900 such a characterization seems insufficient and may even miss the point. Could one not simply state that in a city that cherished artistic individuality, Seidl’s architecture was above all Seidl’s? Schickel does not go down this road, confining her principal explanations to the sociopolitical realm. She makes much of Seidl’s background—a family of art-loving bakers and powerful brewers—and concludes that his world was a thoroughly bürgerlich one (a term that is only partially covered by “bourgeois” or “middle-class”). Clearly, patronage was no longer predominantly aristocratic, and the younger Munich artists were opposed to the ostentatious work done for their reclusive King Ludwig II. Yet the term bürgerlich raises further issues. First, Seidl increasing served the new German plutocracy as well as the old nobility. Second, as Schickel emphasizes, the way in which jobs in Munich were handed out through a small network of artists hardly conformed to the new values of modern middle-class professionalism. Third, the emerging key sociopolitical and artistic-political terms were Volk and volkstümlich. Indeed, there were those in the Munich art world who claimed that more than elsewhere the general populace in Bavaria was taking part in its artistic life, not just the narrowly defined strata of the Bürger and above. If anywhere, it is in this rhetoric of the Volk and of art suited to the Volk that one might trace the origins of later Fascist art policies.

The true test of how appropriate Schickel’s emphasis on bürgerlich and Seidl’s “Munichness” is comes with the analysis of the Bayerische Nationalmuseum in Munich. Seidl’s “unusually individual and new kind of design [of 1893] completely lacked any kind of monumentality” (Bauer, 48). It boasted neither height, symmetry, nor an imposing building profile; it had no massed columns, pilasters, or gables, but only a sprinkling of Renaissance and Baroque details, with a main entrance block even lower than the rest and a massive, plain, tiled roof that dominated the whole.

From the late 1890s, the Germans began to use the term Heimatsstil, referring to local modes of “folk” buildings, which in practice were scaled-down versions of high-style architecture such as the museum and rural housing. Indeed, this interest in Heimatsstil may be seen as part of the pan-European Vernacular Revival movement, or Primitivism. Schickel’s main descriptor for Seidl’s buildings is malertisch (“picturesque” when commonly applied to architecture), but that quality applies to a great many other later-nineteenth-century buildings, whether in a vernacular style or not. Surely, a major characteristic of the schools of vernacular revival was the way in which they focused on the visual and textural attractiveness of selected local materials. It was Seidl who reintroduced into Munich architecture Muschelkalk (calcareous tufa), a gray, coarse but light-looking limestone similar to travertine, and he also used older methods of rendering and roughcasting. These practices may be seen as analogous to the use of rough granite by the Scandinavian vernacular revivalists, or Hendrik Berlage’s use of Dutch hard brick. Indeed, it could be argued that Seidl’s greatest design contribution was his preference for smooth surfaces and soft contours for most decorative elements.

How could this new Primitivism find such rapid acceptance? One explanation has already been hinted at—the architect’s close proximity, at least until the mid-1890s, to the high-art sphere, with its power circles and its claims to artistic independence, which meant that Seidl’s work could be seen as both volkstümlich and individualistic. There were parallels in cultural arenas, for example, in the ways in which new political definitions and valorizations (such as Volk) intended for “all” were created by intensely individualistic political writers (see Julius Langbehn, *Rembrandt als Erzieher* [Leipzig, 1890]).

When turning from the exterior of Seidl’s great museum to the building’s function and the design of the interior, it has to be stressed that the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum is mainly devoted to high art—sculpture, painting, and the more elaborate kinds of applied arts produced in Bavaria. Seidl and his chief interior designer, Rudolf Seitz, joined a new movement in museology: the multistyle concept, as manifested in the recent Schweizer Landesmuseum in Zurich (1890–98), by Gustav Gull. The rooms had highly individualized shapes, their styles ranging from Romanesque to Rococo in accordance with the artifacts they contained. But, as Sigrid Sang concludes, the Munich designers did not want “to present a pretend-concrete image of a historical situation,” as the rooms merely attempted to create a mood (Stimmung) that helped foreground the exhibited objects (Bauer, 127). Externally, the Munich museum shows such diversity only to an extent. It thus holds a middle position between two contemporary structures, the Agricultural Museum in Budapest (1896, Ignác Alpár), which presents an extreme randomness, and the Darmstadt Museum (1897–1902, Alfred Messel), where the period-room sections cannot be detected at all behind the unified classical façade.

The National Museum’s main purpose as a high-art museum notwithstanding, the authors in Bauer’s book return repeatedly to the issue of volkstümlich. The historicizing interiors were explicitly aimed at the “man of the people and the layman” (an evaluation from 1900 quoted in Michael Koch’s analysis of the debates, Bauer, 216). Bauer is the museum’s folklorist, and in his contribution (“Das Bayerische Nationalmuseum und die Heimatkunst”), he joins recent German and Austrian deliberations on the history of the discipline and the problem of the continued use of old key terms such as Volk, tradition, and so on. While aware of the ideological pitfalls, in the end Bauer still wants to declare, if very cautiously and somewhat opaquely, that the Bavarian revival is a more convincingly “local possession” than others (Bauer, 249). What appears to distinguish Bavarianism and
Munichism from other such vernacular revivals is the way their identities were self-defined rather than imposed by external agencies—although the Bavarians’ role as the touristic other for all North Germans must always be remembered.

Modest, quiet Seidl was a force behind much of this process of definition. His service to old Bavaria extended beyond design to the collection of folklore objects and to the restoration and preservation of old townscapes and landscape, as is briefly described by the authors in Hofer’s volume. From 1893, he was active in ridding the main street of the small town of Bad Tölz of all mundane nineteenth-century additions.

In 1902, he put pen to paper and organized a pressure group that demanded, and secured, protection of the Isar valley, south of Munich, from speculative villa development, and other stretches of the river from the disturbance of power stations and alignments. Finally, he helped with the protection of Bavaria’s cherished lakes. The arguments for and against river alignment continue to this day, and as Hofer stresses in her foreword, Seidl’s message was a “thoroughly modern” one (Hofer, 7).

In the end, the question of Seidl’s place with respect to architectural internationalism versus “localism” remains open. Given his important contribution to the field of museology, one might argue for the former. Yet in terms of his architectural style, Seidl seems to be classified primarily as a localist, particularly in Hofer’s book. However, this is an oversimplification, for the situation presents an inescapable circularity. Bavarianism thrived on its opposition to Prussianism, but at the same time it belonged to a new trend in Western thought that identified an infinite number of nationalisms, regionalisms, and localisms. It is the aggressive kinds of nationalistic movements that have received the greatest attention from historians in recent years, while the quieter ones, such as Bavarianess/Munichness, are still taken for granted.

**Stefan Muthesius**

University of East Anglia, Norwich

Jacinto Quirarte

**The Art and Architecture of the Texas Missions**


Elisabeth K. Gordon, foreword by Janet Snyder Matthews

**Florida’s Colonial Architectural Heritage**

The Florida Architectural Heritage Series


The relative ease of travel across the Gulf of Mexico and along the navigable rivers flowing into it has had profound consequences for the history of architecture in the region. Seemingly simple building types of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such as the Creole cottages and shotgun houses still common along the Gulf Coast of the United States, are the products of complex overlays of Caribbean, European, and African cultures. More imposing structures often were the work of highly mobile specialists. The Italian-born Bautista Antonelli (1550–1610), for example, built Spanish colonial fortresses in what are now Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, and Puerto Rico, and his influence can be seen in the Castillo de San Marcos (begun 1671) in St. Augustine, Florida. Unfortunately, study of the Gulf region has been impeded by political, economic, and ideological factionalization in which dominant cultures have ignored or marginalized the contributions of others and refused to look beyond national and state boundaries. But the architectural history of Florida cannot be understood without consideration of Cuba, and similar links bind New Orleans to Haiti and South Texas to Mexico. Elisabeth K. Gordon and Jacinto Quirarte address this challenge in their books on colonial architecture in Florida and Texas, respectively.

Gordon’s lucid and engaging survey is the first of seven projected volumes examining architecture in Florida from the colonial era through the 1930s. Claimed in 1513, La Florida was a Spanish colony until 1763, when the Treaty of Paris ceded it to England. Twenty years later, the colony reverted to Spain and remained under Spanish rule until 1821, when it became a territory of the United States. Gordon presents the architecture of colonial Florida in nine chapters organized variously by building types and construction materials (wood and stone). Four chapters cover St. Augustine, which was founded in 1565 and has been continuously occupied since. The others address Native American architecture, the Spanish missions, British Pensacola, and plantations (the latter the subject of two chapters, one of which is devoted to a unique surviving property from the end of the eighteenth century, Kingsley Plantation, located north of Jacksonville). The book includes a glossary and an appendix describing the relative value of the English pound sterling in eighteenth-century Florida.

Gordon has approached her subject with a strong sense of purpose. She wants her readers to understand that there was significant architecture—native and European—in colonial Florida and that much of its history can be recovered despite the material losses occasioned by centuries of hurricanes, wars, and changing economic fortunes. She believes this knowledge is important because it offers points of departure for creating modern buildings with a distinct sense of place.

To this end, she stresses two themes. The first is responsiveness to local materials and climate. Gordon greatly admires the achievements of the indigenous peoples adapting to Florida’s hot, humid climate and devotes considerable attention to the degree to which Spanish and English settlers did likewise. She describes, for instance, how in 1768 English military officials insisting on standardization ordered prefabricated components from New York for the upper floors of a new barracks in St. Augustine (the Pile of Barracks). Five