Anglican), and monographic, centering on a handful of acknowledged master figures. Noting this state of affairs, the authors point out that more research might be done on such topics as the medieval architecture of non-Anglican patrons and groups, restoration theory and practice, non-Gothic medieval building, and architects outside the orbit of the High Victorian Gothicism. Pivotal periods considered somewhat dry, such as that between 1760 and 1830, might be given greater attention, and questions pertinent to our own times, such as the 19th century’s reconsideration of history, might be asked of the well-studied figures who continue to hold our fascination and respect.

Turning to North America, it is clear that the contours of medievalism on this continent have been slower to be charted. The situation is due in various degrees to the melting pot nature of our architectural heritage, to the lack of a theoretical tradition, and to the relative immaturity of neo-medievalist scholarship in this country. Consequently, the authors do not imply an 1840 watershed, as in England, but simply organize monographically. The histories here, too, have tended to focus on individuals and locations and are generally anglocentric, echoing British historical models. But categories that evolved to describe British materials clearly fail in the face of the vastness and intricacy of the American situation even before 1870, when British influence was important, but German Romanesque or Rundbogenstil influence was also marked.

The unevenness of American medievalism as compared to the British is revealed when one considers the careers of the architects, critics, and patrons listed in the authors’ bibliography. To list some examples: the one American figure looming as large as Ruskin or Morris is Henry Hobson Richardson, who may have preferred English tailors, but looked primarily to France for his Romanesque derived style and theorized less than his British contemporaries. The influence of Viollet-le-Duc would seem paramount in late 19th-century American medievalism, but there is only one entry under the architect and theorist’s name. Omissions such as this may at times be the fault of the compilers but as often reflect a void in the scholarship to date. It is somewhat puzzling to find listed architects like Richard Morris Hunt and John Wellborn Root, whom we are less likely to identify as part-time medievalists than as progressive and systematic designers. In sum, it seems that medievalism in America involves many cultural influences and native attitudes that have little to do with the British experience. Furthermore, medievalism was not the point of departure for American architects to the same extent that it was for English designers. Might one suggest as a reason for this knotted thread the old argument that our relative lack of history, in this case a medieval one, left architects and their critics without a single tradition on which to rely? If so, then the kind of coherent synthesis possible with the British development may be more difficult, if not impossible, to achieve in a far less homogeneous culture.

A word about text and format: the annotations are short, helpful, and sufficiently descriptive; the introductory essays are excellent, and the index facilitates quick research. The book would be a highly useful aid in teaching a 19th- and early 20th-century survey course, but it is a must for specialists or anyone interested in the survival and revival of medievalist tendencies in modern culture.

KATHLEEN CURRAN
Brown University


To architectural historians, Ludwig Hilberseimer (1885–1967) is probably best known for the single-family house he designed for the Weisenhofsiedlung, Stuttgart (1927), and for his monograph (1956) on his long-time friend and collaborator, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. But, as this volume attests, the significance of the author of Grossstadtdarktikur (1928), The New City (1944), issued in an expanded edition as The Nature of Cities (1955), and The New Regional Pattern (1949) lies in the field of urban planning rather than architecture.

Although in the 1920s Hilberseimer’s architectural and urbanistic projects for the archetypal 20th-century city were sterile, even minatory, they were also astonishingly seductive to his professional audience, for his stripped, rigidly organized high- and low-rise Zeilenbau were representative of the modernist vision. In the 1930s, he himself rejected this vision in favor of a less didactic approach that was more humane and pragmatic, and he subordinated the practice of architecture to that of comprehensive city planning. He tried to reincorporate nature into the urban matrix, but his schemes remained undeniably rationalistic. The chief executed example of Hilberseimer’s ideal urban unit is Lafayette Park, Detroit, built in concert with Mies in the later 1950s, but he also had an impact on several redevelopment schemes for Chicago.

This book, occasioned by the absorption of the Hilberseimer Collection of papers into the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries of the Art Institute of Chicago, consists of reminiscences by George E. Danforth, who studied with Hilberseimer in Chicago, and critical essays by Richard Pommer, David Spaeth, and Kevin Harrington. In addition, it includes four brief articles—“Cities and Defense” (1945), “The Art of Architecture” (1949), “Labor and Education” (1959), and “City Architecture: The Trend toward Openness” (1960)—by Hilberseimer, as well as a portfolio of his work.

Hilberseimer shared a first name, and institutional affiliations—the Bauhaus, and the Armour Institute (later Illinois Institute of Technology)—with the man in whose shadow he labored, and this publication seeks to bring him into the light. But that light at times is a harsh one. Furthermore, the format of the book lends itself to fragmentation and a certain redundacy, and does not do for Hilberseimer what Franz Schulze’s magisterial biography did for Mies van der Rohe. Indeed, the cumulative effect of the essays is to suggest that the life and the accomplishments of this man would probably not reward such sustained examination.

Danforth’s reminiscences, based on interviews with colleagues, students, and friends of the Karlsruhe-born architect and planner who emigrated to the U.S. in 1938, present an affectionate picture of a reserved and unaggressive yet uncompromising man who was a dedicated teacher. Danforth’s positive assessment is reinforced by David Spaeth, who devotes himself to “Ludwig Hilberseimer’s Settlement Unit: Origins and Applications.” Nevertheless, Spaeth, who produced the definitive bibliography on Hilberseimer (New York, 1981), acknowledges that his subject “lacked the ability to make an architecture that
articulate, coherent theory of city (and later regional planning)"; instead, Hilberseimer focused “his energies on the development of an articulate, coherent theory of city (and later regional planning)” (p. 58).

Spaeth begins with a survey of Hilberseimer’s historical study of cities. Although in this essay it is at times difficult to know where Hilberseimer’s descriptions leave off and Spaeth’s commence, the original arguments can be checked in “City Architecture: The Trend toward Openness” (pp. 102–113). Spaeth recognizes that it is necessary to understand the assumptions that Hilberseimer made about typical cities of different periods, inasmuch as these shaped his prescriptions for the contemporary city. Apparently, Hilberseimer was most attracted to the medieval city, which he found “organic” because of its vertical integration of dwelling and workplace; yet ultimately his own proposals, which sought to take into account the impact of industrialization, seem worlds away from his admired model.

Spaeth shows the influence on Hilberseimer of Arturo Soria y Mata, Ebenezer Howard, and Tony Garnier, but finds the German’s solutions distinguished from theirs by the concept of the “settlement unit,” a carefully structured neighborhood consisting of housing, commerce, recreation and employment, where size is determined by convenient walking distance and an appropriate size for an elementary school” (p. 60), by the renewed emphasis on the pedestrian, and by the uncompromising clarity of the scheme. However, Spaeth’s conclusions, or rather assertions, about the superiority of Hilberseimer’s proposals over more traditional approaches, will not convince everyone.

“Ideas in Action: Hilberseimer and the Redevelopment of the South Side of Chicago,” by Kevin Harrington, also concentrates on Hilberseimer’s American career as a planner. Harrington summarizes Hilberseimer’s contribution as “the integration in America of the rationalist methods he had developed in Germany and the ecological or environmental concerns of the Garden City movement...” and notes that his “planning—in the classroom, in his publications, and in his practice—reflects an effort to derive a new language of urban/regional design from the imperatives of the technological age” (p. 69).

Harrington has mastered the intricate details of the lengthy attempts to redevelop a site on Chicago’s deteriorating South Side (which included the campus of IIT and the Michael Reese Hospital, important institutions that had decided to remain there and help rehabilitate the area). The vicissitudes that accompanied these efforts after the formation in 1946 of the South Side Planning Board are ably and amply documented. From late 1950 to May 1952, the board conducted an invited competition involving teams of planners from Harvard’s Graduate School of Design, IIT, and the University of Chicago; these teams were led, respectively, by Walter Gropius and Reginald Isaacs, by Hilberseimer, and by Martin Meyerson. Their findings were integrated into a community appraisal study that engaged professionals from both private and public agencies, and demographers and urban geographers. Nevertheless, as Harrington demonstrates, most of these participants, including Hilberseimer, were tragically insensitive to questions of race, which were of critical importance to the success of any scheme.

While Harrington believes that Hilberseimer’s team was the only one of the three to attempt a fresh point of view, not merely to tamper mildly with the existing models— influenced by Le Corbusier—he nonetheless faults the proposal for its generality and avoidance of dealing with the particular problems and character of the South Side. Certainly the current view of the city as a complex palimpsest of cultural memories that are obliterated at our peril would ind as ineffeetual if not inhumane Hilberseimer’s totally new patterns of settlement.

Richard Pommer’s contribution, “More a Necropolis than a Metropolis: Ludwig Hilberseimer’s Highrise City and Modern City Planning” was for this reader the richest and most rewarding of the essays. The quotation in the title, incidentally, is from Hilberseimer’s own judgment, pronounced in 1967, on his schemes for the Groszstadt. Pommer opines, however, that his later attempts to remedy this funerary image by introducing elements of nature and smaller-scale units, are no more successful because his solutions remain outside the realm of human culture.

Pommer presents a wonderfully synthetic survey of German city planning ideas and practices in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. His command of the archival documents, of the language, and of the architectural, urbanistic, philosophical, and social issues current at the time, provides the reader with a splendid background for understanding Hilberseimer’s approach in particular, and the modernist vision of the city in general. He places Hilberseimer’s work in an international context of urban design, tellingly comparing his schemes with those by Le Corbusier, Otto Haesler, Gropius, Mies, J. J. P. Oud, Clarence Stein, and Frank Lloyd Wright. Pommer also analyzes the influence of Gottfried Semper and Alois Reigl. Hilberseimer’s attempt to combine their antithetical theories created a conflict “that he never resolved: he believed the modern metropolis was objectively determined by its economic and material conditions, but that its form was dictated by the artistic intentions of the architect” (p. 27).

Pommer’s judgment is the most negative in the book; unlike the other essays he charges Hilberseimer with ultimately achieving only a formal construct, despite his intention to base his proposals on social, technical, and typological givens. He points out Hilberseimer’s willful ignoring of entire urban functions in favor of a primary focus on residential buildings, although, after settling in the United States, the planner became rather obsessed with the school as a central element.

In the Shadow of Mies is a refreshingly candid book, which, while it seeks to bring to Hilberseimer the attention from posterity that he deserves, does not canonize him. One of the values of a volume such as this—even if it risks the aforementioned fragmentation—is that it offers differing appraisals of its subject, and this aspect, together with the inclusion of Hilberseimer’s own writings (besides his articles, generous chunks are included in the commentators’ texts), means that readers can judge for themselves the value of Hilberseimer’s contribution. And grasping the very shortcomings of some of his ideas and assumptions may aid in understanding why so much has gone awry with the modern city, and perhaps suggest, if not how to put it right, how not to do it wrong.

HELEN SEARING
Smith College