colonial architects. For instance, "this district [in Casablanca] was a Western stage-setting for Moroccon life, a Disneyland world" (158); "Hebrant's concept of a complex cultural milieu [in Indochina] had been reduced to a fairy-tale evocation of peaceful French provincial life" (232–33). This verbal style sometimes detracts from the scholarly mien of her otherwise excellent work. It suggests, however, that real alternatives were possible and within the grasp of those in power at each stage during colonial planning. From our privileged historical position, we might permit ourselves the luxury of belief that other historical courses were possible. Such evaluations, however, display less than complete sympathy for the complex historical context and the kinds of political actions that were possible within it.

Despite the nakedness of the author's opinions, this is not a humanistic study in the modern anthropological sense of that term. Almost nowhere do the natives speak for themselves. The complexities of traditional societies and the principles of indigenous architectures, while alluded to, are not revealed in detail. This omission points to a deficiency in Wright's analysis: she fails to follow through on a complete description of the initial urban and colonial attitudes, the construction of plans and policies, the formulation and reformulation of local cultures and landscapes, and finally the nativist reactions against such pressures. She does an excellent job discussing the intellectual formation of urban plans and the initial construction of them, but what about their reconstructions and reactions? One wishes to know more about what the articulate members of the local populations thought about the new architectures and the new cities being imposed upon them. The majority of responses cited are those of Europeans.

Similarly, Wright's conclusion to the outside-in-as-urban-laboratory argument does not quite fulfill its promise. As an example of the ineffectiveness of the colonial experience in influencing French culture at home, she focuses upon the Colonial Exposition of 1931—a world's-fair-like event that she criticizes for its ephemeral and peripheral location on the outskirts of Paris. In a temporary Museum of the Colonies, which was only to stand six months (the duration of the exposition), "[t]he key images of colonialism had been reduced to fleeting impression and a mere collection of objects, both indigenous arts and raw materials for production" (306). Wright fails to place this event into its own historical context. By 1930, most exhibitions of this kind were staged on peripheral urban sites, where ample space was available. Moreover, it has been argued by contemporary commentators and historians such as Henry Adams and William Cronon that the very power of these events rested in their ephemeral nature. Not until the 1960s were such international expositions intended to leave a lasting mark on the urban landscape. Her argument might have been better served by returning to the problems of French urban planning, architecture, and public administration introduced in the first chapter, and addressing the extent to which planners and architects working in Paris were touched by the colonial experience. While she does mention public lack of interest in, and objection to, colonial solutions, an in-depth discussion would have brought this argument full circle. If the French did not pay attention to the solutions explored in the colonies, what did they do instead? Did they learn anything from their outside-in laboratory?

Perhaps the single most glaring failure in this book, from the standpoint of utility, is its lack of a bibliography. Extensive chapter notes are appended at the end of the volume, but in several cases we found them difficult to use. Anyone wishing to know how to find Tran Van T'us memoirs, for example, has a frustrating search through many pages of notes (363). The volume is accompanied by figures, photographs, plans, maps, and sketches, mostly drawn from French library and archival sources. The quality of photographic reproduction is acceptable, but not excellent, and many plans and maps are at so small a scale that they are difficult to read. These are, no doubt, attributable to the financial limitations involved in publishing books of this type.

Wright's book is commendable for the template it provides for the study of urban plans and places. Her approach underscores the idea that there is more to a plan or architectural rendering than design canons and semiotics. They are negotiated products of a highly contested political process. The book will be enjoyed by city planners, architectural historians, social and urban historians, historians of the colonial experience, historical geographers, anthropologists, Francophiles, and those interested in the history of Madagascar, Viet Nam, Cambodia, and Morocco. We also recommend this study to anyone intrigued by the complex processes of acculturation and cultural change in the developing world.

JAY EDWARDS
Anne E. Mosher
Louisiana State University


The international Gothic Revival of the nineteenth century has been fortunate in its historians, and this latest study by Michael J. Lewis on the revival in Germany continues the run. It catches up the ongoing tradition of research concerned with nineteenth-century medievalism and, as well, adds to the swell of new scholarship in English on nineteenth-century German architecture. Lewis's book must be reviewed in both contexts.

It is no secret that the English Gothic Revival has received the lion's share of scholarly attention. As early as 1872, Charles Locke Eastlake recognized the major shifts within the English movement and, despite a lull at the turn of the century, some of the best minds in the field—Kenneth Clark, John Summerson, Nikolaus Pevsner—continued the cause in the form of books or seminal essays. By the mid-to-late twentieth century such scholars as Phoebe Stanton, Stefan Muthesius, Michael McCarthy, George Hersey, Paul Thompson, and David Brownlee, among others, wrote important monographs on individual architects, pivotal buildings, or accepted phases within the movement. Not only was the Gothic Revival considered a critical (perhaps the most critical) aspect of nineteenth-century historicism, it has attracted some of this century's most searching historical talents. The scholarship on Ruskin alone is mind-boggling.

It is probably fair to say that the Gothic Revival did not have the heyday in other lands that it did in England and, if it did, England was always the role model. For instance, the American movement, chiefly chronicled by Phoebe Stanton and William H.
Pierson, Jr., was not dissimilar in its development to that of England. Only a few historians have tackled the continental Gothic Revival, and fewer still in the English language. In 1965, W. D. Robson-Scott called attention to the rich nature of the movement in Germany, beginning in the eighteenth century and extending through the Sturm und Drang and romantic periods, enlivening our knowledge of the roles played by the Boisserée brothers, Friedrich Schlegel, Georg Moller, the young Goethe, and a not yet fully classicized Karl Friedrich Schinkel (The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival in Germany [Oxford, 1965]). In 1972, the German historian, Georg Germann, offered an ambitious study of the nineteenth-century Gothic Revival, which included Britain and the Continent, drawing from literature, antiquarian research, and architectural history (The Gothic Revival in Europe and Britain: Sources, Influences and Ideas, trans. Gerald Omn [Cambridge, Mass., 1972]), which opened our eyes to the revival in France and offered new insights on England and Germany.

Lewis’s fine study both conforms to and deviates from this rich tradition: it is centered on nineteenth-century Germany, and it takes as its focus the role played by August Reichensperger, a figure briefly discussed by Germann. As such, it is more in the monographic tradition and, at first pass, one may deem it a highly specialized account. As Lewis himself admits, August Reichensperger rarely appears in the indices of Germany history books, but this is more the fault of the Prussocentric nature of most histories of Germany, for Reichensperger was Catholic and Rhenish. But far from providing a parochial study, Lewis ingeniously crafts his biography of Reichensperger in such a way that it spins out from the man to include political, social, and architectural issues. Reichensperger becomes a leitmotif that takes us through one of the most complex and misunderstood periods of German history; at the same time, this is very much a book about August Reichensperger.

Reichensperger was the central figure of the German Gothic Revival from the mid-1840s until his death in 1895. His activities were centered in the Catholic Rhineland which, following the Treaty of Vienna of 1815, became Prussian territory. Reichensperger—lawyer, politician, architectural critic, restorationist, social commentator, and Anglophile—was one of a rare breed of nineteenth-century German intellectuals (Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen, the Prussian representative to the Holy See and later ambassador to London, was another) vehemently engaged with their cultural milieu on a national and international level. Not only did Reichensperger, Bunsen, and the others influence political events of the day, they also had a deep and abiding love of architecture and, more significantly, held views as to how architecture interacted with society and the state. They also had intense periods of activity from ca. 1840 to 1871, the period historian Walter Bussmann has dubbed “between Prussia and Germany” (“zwischen Preussen und Deutschland”), when national was a muddy notion, religious particularism was rampant, and tempers ran high as to whether a unified Germany would or would not include Austria (Grossdeutschland vs. Kleinddeutschland). Their causes were individual but revolved around the simple fact that Prussia was a large and powerful state—highly bureaucratic and highly Protestant—well on its way to becoming Deutschland.

There sits the source of contention. The German Gothic Revival, according to Lewis, was rooted in the Rhenish-Catholic-Prussian-Protestant conflict and was profoundly political in character. Reichensperger was responsible for the political cast of the movement, which roughly began with the laying of the cornerstone of Cologne Cathedral on 4 September 1842, and ended with its completed restoration in 1880. Throughout all the phases and twists and turns of the revival during that time, Reichensperger was, in Lewis’s words, its “medieval conscience,” clothing it in “muscle and sinew.”

Lewis structures his book chronologically: the 1840s are taken up with the major building campaigns, such as the completion of Cologne, where Reichensperger glimpsed the possibilities of artisanal cooperation on the model of the medieval building lodges. This model, so far removed from the bureaucratic Prussian Oberbaudeputation which, with the Prussian ministries, regulated building throughout the state, eventually became Reichensperger’s vision of what a united Germany might be: regional, decentralized, perfectly suited for a Germany with multiple religions and cultural centers. Not an architect, Reichensperger nevertheless wrote about architecture; in Lewis’s view, his Die christlich-germanische Baukunst und ihr Verhältnis zur Gegenwart (1844–45), was the central statement of neo-Gothic theory. Furthermore, the critic assembled around him an impressive circle of architects—Vincenz Statz, Friedrich von Schmidt, Georg Ungewitter, and Conrad Hase—who shared his convictions. Many of the early projects were ecclesiastical and, not surprisingly, of English inspiration, especially as that was transmitted in the neo-Catholicizing writings and works of Pugin and the Ecclesiologists, and that most cosmopolitan of Gothic Revivalists, George Gilbert Scott, whom Reichensperger supported on the occasion of the competition for the Nikolaikirche in Hamburg (1842–45). The German architects did not mimic, however, but solidly contextualized their Gothic style to conform to German tradition.

By the 1850s and 1860s, when the revival was at high tide, building types included residences, especially those by the important Hanover School, hospitals, and buildings and projects for Rathhäuser. Throughout this time, Reichensperger became more and more politically involved, participating in the Frankfurth Parliament, the Prussian Parliament and, after unification, the Reichstag. The revival, no longer able to claim exclusive German pedigree for the Gothic style, moved from a nationalist phase to a more socially linked one, a symbol of Reichensperger’s particular vision of life and society. In brief, we are moved between political history, architectural theory, and architectural history, richly interwoven by eloquent prose. (In this, Lewis upholds the standards of Kenneth Clark and John Summerson.)

If the German Gothic Revival was anti-Prussian and Protestant, it was also anti-Rundbogenstil (round-arched style; Romanesque or Early Christian), and Lewis contrasts the Gothic Revival’s regional and craftmanly approach with the Rundbogenstil’s progressive and materialist one, officially sanctioned by the architectural academies and polytechnical schools, especially those of Berlin, Munich, and Karlsruhe. Certainly there is truth to this statement, but the Rundbogenstil in fact was hardly monolithic, and had a similarly graduated degree of concerns and approaches in the way architecture was taught, and in the monarchs who commissioned buildings in that style. Indeed, it is perhaps an irony that Reichensperger’s hope for a reconfiguration of a modern German society based on the Gothic exactly mirrored that of his persecuting Prussian monarch, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, who wrote in 1840 to Christian Carl Bunsen, Prussian ambassador to London, of his...
hope to debureaucratize his father's Hegelian state and rebuild it on an Early Christian model. This was Friedrich Wilhelm IV's Sommermenehraum.

Friedrich Wilhelm hoped to introduce into Germany a politics of harmony (Versöhnungspolitik), and his participation in Cologne's Cathedral's building festival (Dombaufest) on 4 September 1842 was part of that hope. Political events brought out the defensive oppressor in him, not to mention that no one else shared his peculiar vision, especially his Untertanen (citizens) who were more concerned with being fed. Both Reichenasperger and Friedrich Wilhelm IV were nostalgic and modernist (not antithetical notions in the nineteenth century) in their world view. Lewis has given us a poignant and lively portrait of this fascinating and understudied figure.

KATHLEEN CURRAN
Trinity College, Hartford


In this Cambridge Human Geography volume, James S. Duncan hopes to convince cultural geographers and scholars in other fields that "as a pervasive and surprisingly disingenuous cultural production, landscape is a signifying system of great but unappreciated social and political importance, and that it offers enormous promise as an object of study" (3). In demonstrating the enormous promise of such study, he also reveals the difficulties of conducting it.

Duncan locates himself among scholars whose goal is to elucidate cultural process through the study of landscapes as "texts" that may be read because they encode information transformed from other kinds of texts. Here arises a fundamental question posed by this thoroughly documented study: How well do we understand the written texts that we use to interpret landscape "texts"? Duncan does not ask that question, wisely I think, otherwise the book would not have been finished. He assumes that established interpreters of texts were correct in their detailed analyses and uses literature skillfully and judiciously, yet inevitably grounds some of his discussion on interpretations that call for reexamination.

Duncan draws on a rich array of South Asian literature and of literary studies to "demonstrate the tropes by which narratives are encoded in the landscape," and uses as his case study the royal capital of Kandy in the highlands of Sri Lanka during the early nineteenth century. Founded in 1312, it fell to the British in 1815. As the last Sinhalese capital on the island it makes a good case study, he notes, because both the literate and illiterate members of the kingdom assumed that authority lay in written texts, primarily those of the Buddhists as supplemented by the Tamil and Sankrit lore of the Hindus.

Duncan identifies two "distinct discourses" on kingship that, according to centuries of Kandy landscape records, were present simultaneously. One is the "Asokan," based upon the Buddhist story of king Asoka of the third century B.C.E., which defined the proper king as "pious, righteous, and devoted to the fostering of the Buddhist religion and to the welfare of the people" (5). The landscape it produced favored religious structures and public works. The other is the "Sakran," based on the Buddhist and Hindu stories of Sakra (Indra), the king of the gods (deva). By imitating Indra, the proper king became a "divine ruler, a god-king" (5). The Sakran discourse produced a landscape that favored palaces and cities modeled on that of Sakra's realm in heaven. We note that Duncan appears to interpret the term deva-raja (god-king) found in Cambodian inscriptions as meaning "the king is a god" rather than, in my opinion, the more likely "king of the gods," a title that refers to the Supreme Lord who rules the gods, including their ruler Sakra or Indra, whom the king imitates.

Duncan argues that Kandy's kings drew upon both discourses to varying degrees, but that the last ruler, Sri Vikrama, largely abandoned the Asokan in favor of the Sakran in his efforts to win a political struggle within his kingdom produced by the effects of Dutch and British aggrandizement of their presence on the island. He rightly notes that Sri Vikrama was not "cynical about the magical power of parallelism" (157) and yet convincingly shows that Sri Vikrama's downfall came when his own populace lost faith in the parallelism of his massive Sakran rebuilding of Kandy, including an Ocean of Milk to the south, because he viciously exceeded the customary limits on corvée or rājakariya (statutory service; 162–63).

Following a summary introduction, the book consists of two parts. The first four chapters provide an interpretive frame for the case study—the royal capital—and end with a discussion of the Kandyan landscape, 1312–1815. Duncan has drawn together an impressive set of historical materials for these chapters, and by themselves they serve as a stimulating survey of twenty-two centuries of Suri Lankan history from the point of view of the king and his building plans.

Duncan makes a major analytic effort here to distinguish two narratives about landscape within the Sakran discourse: one about the landscape of the gods and the other about the glorious emperors (akravarti) of earlier Lankan cities who imitated those gods. He argues that both narratives "are encoded simultaneously within a given element in the urban landscape" and that such "doubling" enhanced the charismatic quality of the capital.

Within the narrative of the gods' landscape he gives detailed attention to two motifs, the churning of the Milk Ocean and the axis mundi, Mount Meru. The first is seen as "primarily an allegory of creation and fertility" (44) and the second as "an allegory of natural and social stability" (47).

It is here that flaws in Duncan's analysis begin to suggest themselves, though not to the detriment of his work—they only reveal the necessary "creative guessing" that must take place in such readings, because our understandings of the mythic motifs in Hindu and Buddhist texts is more inexact than we assume. Duncan, for example, often considers a given body of water to be the Milk Ocean when it is not clear that it is, and he does not always let the reader know whether his identification is explicitly stated in the text he cites, or a judgment made by the reference work he has used, or derives from his own assumptions. The point is important for his later analysis of Kandy in which bodies of water are significant. Different bodies of water mean different things. Among the Vaisnavas in Kanchipuram, for example, the Ganges water that falls from heaven and fills the ocean is used for the purifying unction (abhiṣeka) that turns a man into an Indra of men (narendra) or a god of men (naradeva) or a lord of men