ernism. The author apparently advocates the idea that modernism in Belgrade had loose and unstable boundaries. This could have been a powerful point had it not been compromised by her attempts to distinguish between the “real” modernism and its “unauthentic” versions. It is surprising that a book dealing with such a diversity of formal approaches would characterize “authentic” modernism in ways that do not seem to allow for anything but the most canonical definitions by Sigfried Giedion or Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson. Blagojević is probably correct when she compares the situation in Belgrade to acceptance of European modernism in the United States without the accompanying “social, political, and ethical content” (182). But she fails to emancipate her own subject from the dictates of the modernist canon in ways that American modernism has freed itself in recent years. This is especially true in the treatment of Dragiša Brašovan, the great “style master,” as Blagojević calls him, whose work is comparable both in form and in social background to American Modern architecture of the late 1920s and early 1930s. For example, intent on deconstructing the mythical status that Brašovan's Pavilion of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes at the 1929 International Exposition in Barcelona enjoys in the history of Serbian modern architecture, the author only perpetuates another myth, the scathing characterization of Brašovan, launched by his radical rival Dobrović, as an “incomplete modernist.” In a comparison with one of the greatest icons of modern architecture, Mies van der Rohe’s German Pavilion at the same exposition, Brašovan’s multifaceted expressionist building is seen as a “contrived . . . formal exercise” with no “transparency or simultaneity of spatial experiences”—criteria of modernism taken directly from Giedion (96).

Apart from the fact that few of the buildings Blagojević praises as “authentically modern” could stand up to judgment by the canonical criteria, the author fails to point out what could be the most interesting conclusion to draw from her research: unlike the more homogenized modernisms in rival cities like Zagreb, with its functionalist school, and Ljubljana, dominated by Plečnik, Belgrade offered a great variety of approaches compressed within a small physical and social space. Almost all the different modernisms of the prewar period simultaneously found a place there, from Loosian architecture and “naked” functionalism, to Italian rationalism, Constructivist-influenced work, and many variants of the Moderne. Except in very broad surveys, the radical and the mainstream rarely appear side by side in the same book, and the very fact that Blagojević discusses Brašovan’s monumental state commissions—no matter how “incompletely” modern—alongside Dobrović’s radical proposals testifies to this compression of the range of architectural production in Belgrade.

Still, Modernism in Serbia offers valuable insights into a body of work that is almost totally unknown outside its own country and the abundant photographs and excellent new drawings will help readers draw conclusions of their own. Equally important, Blagojević’s engaging writing holds the potential to spark new discussions in Serbia itself, whose architectural discourse has greatly suffered from the past decade of isolation.

Vladimir Kulić
University of Texas at Austin

Notes
2. Quoted in Dušan Grabrijan, Plečnik in njegova Sola (Maribor, 1968), 70.
3. In the early 1970s, Zoran Manević founded research on Serbian architectural modernism with his doctoral dissertation, followed by many subsequent publications. A number of younger art historians have taken up the task, the most prolific among them Aleksandar Kadijević. The most comprehensive, though rather controversial, study is the recent book by Milorad R. Perović, Srpska arhitektura XX veka/Serbian Architecture of the 20th Century (Belgrade, 2004).

Vincent Scully
Modern Architecture and Other Essays
Selected and with introductions by Neil Levine

How many historians have read Vincent Scully’s splendid essay “The Nature of the Classical in Art”? According to Neil Levine, who has been posing the question for forty years, the answer is none. This is hardly surprising, since the essay appeared in 1958 in Yale French Studies, but other Scully essays are equally elusive. Such is the justification for this overdue and welcome anthology.

Scully owes his reputation to an authorial voice that is as arresting in the classroom as on the printed page. In lecture, it is the elegant literary and formal precision that startles; on the printed page, the intimate spoken quality. This eloquence was honed in the classrooms of Yale University, where he began teaching in 1949, and his most celebrated works, such as The Shingle Style (1955; rev. ed. New Haven, 1971) and American Architecture and Urbanism (New York, 1961), have the sense of urgency of the well-paced slide lecture. But as spirited as these formal set pieces are, Scully’s topical criticism, which comprises much of this volume, is even more pungent.

In Modern Architecture and Other Essays, Levine has gathered twenty pieces from over five decades, choosing those least accessible and most important in showing Scully’s evolving thought about modernism. They form a kind of critical history of American postwar modernism—a history in which Scully was participant as well as commentator. The anthology is a model of editorial probity. Each essay is headed by a generous introduction that describes its genesis, historical context, and critical reception. The essays are printed without revisions, apart from certain minor corrections such as dates or spelling. Rather than reprinting the original pho-
Architecture of Democracy (New York, 1961), in the end a sequel to Hitchcock and Johnson after all.

During the course of the 1950s, Scully sought an alternative to doctrinaire modernism. While Wright remained important as a historical figure, Scully looked elsewhere for inspiration. For a time, he was encouraged by late Le Corbusier, whose mighty concrete vessels combined “the Italic tradition of interior space with the Hellenic one of the articulated sculptural integument” (99). He praised the essentially classical nature of Le Corbusier’s architecture, not a classicism of codified proportions but one in which concepts of “active violence and struggle” were given tangible physical form, as in the parallel work of Pablo Picasso (101). At a time when Scully was constantly reading and quoting Albert Camus, he could not help but see Le Corbusier’s classicism in existentialist terms: “I would like to define the classic as that art which is concerned with a total exploration and grasping of the large meanings which are involved in the inner and outer life of man—in his individual life and in his group life—and which deals with such meanings in terms both intellectual and physical embodied in forms at once abstract and organic, tactile and optical, and compacting the real and the ideal into a dynamic but stable whole” (90). While Scully can be a maddeningly fickle critic, here is the fixed and unvarying program that underlies all his criticism. If he shifted his allegiance from Wright to Le Corbusier to Louis Kahn to Robert Venturi, it was only because he invariably aligned himself with what he felt represented the most humanist direction of architecture at a given moment. His regretful turn from Le Corbusier, and from such works as the Unité d’Habitation, was not because of their aesthetic merits but because of their unintended urbanistic consequences. The Le Corbusier–influenced Brutalism of the early 1960s, particularly as manifested in Yale’s Art and Architecture Building, had a decisive effect on Scully’s thinking, diverting him from a single-minded focus on the building

Although sometimes maddeningly mercurial, Scully’s critical instincts are often uncannily prescient, as this volume
proves again and again. His essay “Archetype and Order in Recent American Architecture” (1954) was one of the first to see Kahn as a crucial figure in the reinvigoration of modernism, although he had scarcely anything at the time to show for himself other than the Yale Art Gallery. Nonetheless, Scully perceived “a desire for intrinsic order in which Kahn is transposing the researches of engineers like Samuel, Le Corbusier, and Buckminster Fuller into the terms of human experience which makes architecture” (70). This is a wonderfully succinct formulation of the central theme in Kahn’s career, although the belief in “intrinsic order” would not be fully consummated until Kahn shed his belief in what Scully termed the “reproductive principle inherent in the structural unit.”

Only occasionally does Scully slip up, as in one example of pardonable wishful thinking. A poignant Kahn drawing of 1951 is identified as Mussolini’s Foro Italico in Rome, as reconfigured by the architect who added “a building to the right to cast an ominous shadow” (302). In fact, that building was “added” not by Kahn but by Gian-lorenzo Bernini, for it is nothing less than the piazza of St. Peter’s, as Eugene Soloni’s Foro Italico in Rome, as reconstructed for the writing of the history of twentieth-century architecture. David Leatherbarrow and Mohsen Mostafavi aim to theorize “a manner of building in which the claims of appearance would be met by the opportunities of production—exactly what had been proposed, although never realized, in modernism” (129). To make good modernism’s promise to represent production, the book’s six main chapters investigate the modern architectural surface as a “site of contest” between structure and skin, modernity and tradition, business and art, and technology and representation. The authors review, through exemplary cases from the late nineteenth century to the present, innovative façade treatments of cladding and material, windows and framing, texture and scale, prefabrication and prototypes, pattern and image, and site and structure. Close formal readings of a series of landmarks, from Adolf Loos’s Goldman & Salatch store in Vienna (1911) to Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron’s Senior Technical School library in Eberswalde, Germany (1996), lead the reader to appreciate an architecture in which “the processes and procedures of production become the key components of a work’s imagibility” (211). The slim, square volume’s most trenchant, quotable passages for a reader of practitioners are its definitions of “construction . . . as a struggle to integrate and to reconcile materials of different origins” (175), and of architecture as “an artifice whose phenomenal attributes are its primary means of engaging and activating its connections with its users” (209).

Considered as a historical work, Surface Architecture has limitations. A conventional starting point (the Chicago frame) leads to a litany of heroic great names (Gerrit Rietveld, Loos, Gottfried Semper, Hendrik Berlage, Richard Neutra, Jean Prouvé, Alison and Peter Smithson, James Stirling, Herzog and de Meuron). The absence of a theory of history explaining change, and a fetishized idea of “the real that mere representations neglect” (185) are not compensated for by the superfluous philosophical postscript invoking Martin Heidegger, Plato, and Prometheus. Several examples discussed extensively in the text are, jarringly, unillustrated (Henri Matisse’s Red Interior: Still Life on a Blue Table, Neutra’s Rush City Reformed project, the Smithson’s Hunstanton School corner detail), somewhat undermining the persuasiveness of the authors’ argument.

Yet Surface Architecture has some value for architectural historians, particularly those looking to connect architecture to culture. Chapter three, “Window/Wall,” offers a persuasive critique of Le Corbusier’s antiurban, denaturalized, frontal fenestration. The authors favor instead Rietveld’s Schröder House in Utrecht (1924), where the window “serves as the prop for discovering new and unexpected relationships between the inside and outsides” (56). Outward-swinging windows negate the living room’s corner, offer oblique outlooks onto the landscape, and, by virtue of opening perpendicular to the façade, suggest “sectional views, extending and destabilizing the virtual limits of the house.” The authors theorize with feeling the window’s “situational performance” as an “instrument of adjustment: not only an ‘eye’ but a ‘hand’ altering ‘lighting, temperature, noise, and other qualities that characterize and define the setting’ (62). “The performance of a window wall has as its most basic task the