capitalism and consumer culture in modern Turkish society. The same can be said of a short essay interpreting the propaganda film Modern Migrants, which was screened in 1953 by the United States Information Service in Turkey. A close reading of the film forms the basis for a critique of the fetishization and popularization of technology and an exposition of the alienating effects of universal, rather than local, solutions to such problems as migration and the control of nature. A more nuanced text focuses on the new concept of architectural decoration in the 1950s, which applied industrialized and standardized building materials and façade elements to a number of fixed apartment typologies. Citing a 1952 article by Frederick Gibberd, “Expression in Modern Architecture,” and illustrating the point with examples from housing blocks in Turkey, Cengizkan argues that once the dwelling became a standardized commodity rather than the individualized expression of particular lifestyles and personalities, all that was left to architectural invention were small variations on the vocabulary of modern decoration, such as façade compositions, perforated screens, and balcony design.

The last two essays, concerning the neglect, loss, destruction, or simple oblivion of specific architectural artworks, urban fragments, inscriptions, and green areas, are powerful indictments of insensitivity to Turkey’s collective past, implicating politicians, bureaucrats, academics, and the general public. They underscore the author’s primary message, that the preservation of traces that give historicity, uniqueness, and comprehensiveness to cities and transfer these values to future generations is an urgent task. With solid scholarship supporting each text, and the well-written prose of an author who is also a published poet, the book is itself an important step in that direction. Extensively illustrated and thoroughly footnoted, it makes a major contribution to the study of modern architecture in Turkey—and by example, to studies of other modernisms elsewhere. Methodologically, the publication raises standards of scholarship through rigorous archival work and the use of interviews as historical documentation. In terms of theory, it brings a new level of complexity to studies of Turkish modernity, especially in the way the discussion moves beyond official top-down accounts of modernity toward its less visible manifestation in everyday life through lesser-known figures—a kind of bottom-up viewpoint. Above all, through the example of Turkey, the volume captures the two overlapping feelings that accompany the study of modernity in general: “the joy of discovery” as well as a “profound sense of loss and melancholy” (9). Let us hope that Modernin Saati will appear in English soon for the benefit of an international audience.

Sibel Bozdogan
Brookline, Massachusetts

Notes
1. Ankara is the primary focus of the author’s scholarly work. His new book on Carl Christoph Lörcher’s 1924–25 urban plan of the city is in press.
3. A recent exhibition and symposium on the life and work of Clemens Holzmeister took place in Ankara and Istanbul with support from the Turkish and Austrian governments. The proceedings of the symposium are in press. For a review of the show, see JSAH 62 (Dec. 2003), 512–13.
4. These propaganda films were extensions of the so-called modernization theory, an academic rationalization of American economic, political, and military interests across the globe during the cold war. The theory departed from a basic dichotomy between modernity and tradition, presenting the former as an unambiguous blessing and the latter as an obstacle to its realization. Turkey was heralded as one of the most successful models of a universally defined process of modernization, especially in Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East (New York, 1962). Although modernization theory has been extensively and convincingly criticized, now that all its institutional and intellectual premises have been dismantled globally, there is a certain amount of nostalgia for the constructive energy and optimism it provided for the emerging nations of the postcolonial world in the aftermath of World War II.
title, the portrait on the front cover, and the bust on the frontispiece indicate that this is a biography. Though the author assures us on page one that “this is not a biography,” Francis Smith triumphs as its hero, if not its subject. Moreover, this is a biography. Though the author the bust on the frontispiece indicate that title, the portrait on the front cover, and the extraneous number of illustrations, length of text, and density of material are unmatched by the catalogue raisonné in the appendix. The appendix also contains archival evidence for the business of building but lacks two critical pieces of information: a family tree and a detailed chronology.

Neither the thematic arrangement of the volume as a whole nor the alphabetical listing of the catalogue reveals a clear chronology or an easily comprehensible evolution. Although the text emphasizes the second Francis Smith as its subject, the table of contents, and therefore the structure of the book, focuses on the buildings. The chapters broadest in scope and narrative in style are the best: the first one deals with craftsmen-architects and is useful to any architectural historian; the second describes the Smith family members and their professional affiliations, revealing credible reputations for honesty and economy, as well as burgeoning affluence; the third traces stylistic influences, with a particularly engaging section titled “With and Without Pattern Books”; and the ninth surveys the Smith's rebuilding of Warwick after the disastrous fire of 1694. The remaining eight chapters, however fascinating, are fragmentary, loosely structured, often heavy on description and light on analysis. They range in scope from the specific, like chapter five, “Square Tops and Orders,” to the vague, as in chapter seven, “Country Houses: Planning and Craftsmanship.” The chapter “The Gentry House and the Plain Style” and a section called “Plain Houses of the Lesser Gentry” work the same ground, although in a project of this scale such redundancies are excusable. The greatest disappointment, however, is that chapter eight, containing six excellent case studies, provides little analysis to link these particular buildings and no criteria for their selection. Its discussion would benefit from an introduction and conclusion. The successful chapters share one characteristic—a clue perhaps to what is lacking in the rest: the builders are primary and their buildings secondary. These parts of the book balance social and architectural history, presenting a more vivid picture of the cultural conditions, the clientele, the building profession, and the hero. In the chapters that are architecturally based, however, description of individual structures (mostly domestic) dominates, with weaker contextual references.

That said, Gomme has an impressive ability to read façades carefully for original dates and elements, alterations and enlargements, signature styles, possible correlations, probable attributions, and so on. His descriptive passages expand on the Buildings of England tradition, shedding light on a full range of projects, modest to pretentious, domestic to ecclesiastical, exterior and interior, with equal aplomb and great dexterity. Collectively, the Smiths' oeuvre illustrates the final wave of buildings in England designed by craftsmen-architects. Francis and both Williams were among the last to construct their own designs. By the nineteenth century, the profession had split. Although Francis Smith joined the two endeavors in a single career, Gomme convincingly argues that his abilities were unequal: “as a builder Smith, even if not quite in a class of his own, had in his time no superior in England” and “as an architect he was equally clearly not in the first rank” (500). While lacking genius, Smith had a distinguished and prosperous career, spreading his talents throughout a large geographical area and influencing others even farther afield. He may not have been a “Hawksmoor, an Archer or even a Wood” (500), but that makes him no less worthy of a biography. He was no “metropolitan spearhead” (265), yet he developed a “grapevine of contented customers” (45) within the rather conservative gentry. He ran his business with acumen, honesty, economy, and dedication, and hired the most skilled individuals to provide “superlative decorative craftsmanship” (274). He designed consistently enough that 250 years later one can argue an attribution, but not so predictably that his signature is ever obvious.

Gomme has managed to piece together a tantalizing story of social and architectural history regarding a lesser breed of designer and clientele than that to which most historians are accustomed. This vantage point provides insight into the more mainstream life of building in the eighteenth century and begins to address the shifting tides that caused the demise of the builder-architect and the rise of the architect. Gomme comes so close to producing a biography that this reader wishes he had taken the risk, for the end of the hero's story coincides with the conclusion of a significant building tradition in England. This book—glamorous in size, illustrations, and cost—bears no resemblance to the more modest subject within, except that its details, like those by Francis Smith, are arresting.

NINA JAMES
Smith College

Jeffrey W. Cody

The American architect Henry K. Murphy (1877–1954) is largely unknown among historians of American architecture. Yet no serious historian would deny his significance, given the prominence of his work abroad and the importance of some of his American employees. He was the planner and architect of several important Chinese universities, including Tsinghua and Beijing (originally Yenching), the two leading schools in...