fragments. Christian antiquity was after all inseparable from classical antiquity, at least in its ornament; and medieval architecture became, among other things, the often better than awkward result of an attempt to smooth out the juxtapositions. For example, du Prey leads us to understand how the Roman altar tower finials at Saint George-in-the-East, “steeple flambe” in Nairn’s words, are not just classical units put together—visually—in the medieval fashion, as Downes first showed us in 1959, but also classical units put together—literally—in the primitive fashion. Less convincing is one extension of this argument, that the difference between the use of the Roman altars in Stepney and that of the entire Mausoleum of Halicarnassus in the West End (the steeple of Saint George Bloomsbury) was directed by the differences between working-class and educated worshippers, respectively. It is an enjoyable explanation, but very eighteenth-century in nature.

In future, ecclesiastical historians must contend with Hawksmoor’s London Churches in any study of the passionate religious politics of Queen Anne’s and King George I’s reigns. Du Prey’s comprehensive demonstration of the way in which Christian primitivism informed the buildings should also encourage other architectural historians to reexamine the New Churches as a group. This book has little to say about other architects, including the Roman Catholic James Gibbs. Were these men less receptive than Hawksmoor to the myth of the English Church’s direct continuity with that of the first centuries, and if so, did anyone mind? Du Prey offers a wealth of references and quotations showing some theologians’ eagerness to replace spatial distinctions in the churches (based on social status) with other segregations (based on spiritual fitness for Communion, and on gender). Perhaps taking its cue from primitivist anxieties, in 1711 The Spectator ran a hilarious series of mock letters of complaint, from men, about female leers in church. Such preoccupations should be related to what had actually been happening in English churches since long before the Reformation, and to early modern conceptions of built space and its division. We might, for example, ask whether solid masonry, wooden partitions, or custom alone were expected to demarcate the progressive “stations” for converts and penitents, which patristic scholars regularly proposed should be reintroduced into Anglican practice after an unfortunate lapse of 1,300 years or so. Finally, we might consider the disproportionate violence of the antipathy that the New Churches aroused among the Palladians. Robert Morris’s and James Ralph’s criticisms of the supposed incoherent ostentation of Gibbs’s Saint Mary-le-Strand and Hawksmoor’s Christchurch Spitalfields echo the strictures of such churchmen as William Beveridge, who in 1681 warned that we must “avoid novelty and singularity in all things pertaining to the worship of God” (35), and Hicks, who in his reply to Vanburgh’s letter complained about architects using churches to get a name for themselves and to show off their skill (142). Ecclesiastical historians like Eamon Duffy have argued that appeals to primitive Christianity, which in England had been the touchstone in arguments about everything from church music to women’s cosmetics, began to seem a little eccentric, even cranky, after George I’s accession. This may be worth considering in relation to the ultimate failure of the 1711 program, in terms of the number of churches built. Church architecture could, however, continue to serve as an anvil upon which to hammer out the most fundamental question of all: that of the human being’s place, as a willful individual, in the divinely ordered cosmos.

CHRISTINE STEVENSON
University of Reading

Notes

Michael J. Lewis
Frank Furness: Architecture and the Violent Mind

Someone once observed that Philadelphia architecture in the late nineteenth century operated under some mysterious influence that led in directions unparalleled by other American cities. Ever since, scholars have grappled with explaining and explaining that phenomenon. In Frank Furness: Architecture and the Violent Mind, Michael J. Lewis offers a thorough biography of the one Philadelphia architect (1838–1912) from whose drafting pen this influence largely flowed.

The first of nine chapters sets the biographical stage. Frank’s father, the Reverend William Henry Furness, was a prominent divine in abolitionist Philadelphia before the Civil War. His eldest son would become a painter, the middle son, a noted Shakespearean scholar, and the youngest, Frank, after casting about for a life’s calling, finally found it in architecture. Furness began his design career in 1856 as an apprentice to Philadelphia architect John Fraser, whose polychromy Furness would embrace, if not the Scotsman’s Italianate fussiness of surface detail.

After three years with Fraser, Furness moved in 1858 to the just-opened New York atelier of Richard Morris Hunt, America’s first École-trained architect. Hunt was far more cosmopolitan than Fraser, and Furness was exposed to French Renaissance and medieval forms as well as the most up-to-date Parisian classicism. (Hunt was also an advocate for the professionalization of the discipline; it is no surprise that Furness would take the lead in establishing the American Institute of Architects’
Philadelphia chapter in 1869.) Furness continued working for Hunt until the outbreak of the Civil War in the spring of 1861, when, as Lewis observes, “Furness realized that the business of building was about to give way to the business of destroying” (28).

Lewis devotes considerable prominence to Furness’s military experience. It would influence how Furness would organize his office staff, and it would have a considerable effect on his patronage. Serving in the Union Army from 1861 to 1864 with “sons of wealthy and socially prominent families” (30), Furness would go on to design houses and funerary monuments for several of his Philadelphian comrades-in-arms, and from their positions in academia, business, and industry, they would direct many commissions to his office. However, the primary lesson of the Civil War for Furness was that “the bold and unexpected act was likely to meet with success” (51). Just such an approach had led Captain Furness to risk enemy fire to relieve a stranded outpost of his unit in 1864, and much of what follows in Lewis’s account interprets the “bold and unexpected” in Furness’s dealings with clients and other architects, and in the design process itself.

Back in Philadelphia after the war, Furness joined with another young man, George Hewitt, and Furness’s former employer, John Fraser, in 1866 to create a firm that could depend on commissions coming in from each partner’s social connections. For the next five years, Fraser, Furness & Hewitt designed churches, civic buildings, and residences in town and in the suburbs of Philadelphia. When a really plum job came along—the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts—the junior partners dumped Fraser and struck out on their own. The period of Furness’s architectural maturity had begun.

Lewis’s careful research shows in his tracing the lines of patronage for Furness’s glory years. Manufacturers and railroad moguls shared the architect’s taste for “industrial realism,” the unashamed use of exposed iron and the planning effects that followed on from skeletal construction. When classicism reared its head after the Chicago World’s Columbian Exposition in 1893, older, established architects either bent to the winds of fashion or, as Lewis puts it, “retreated to the safety of their account books” (196) and attempted to hold their clientele through the old-boy network. Furness stuck to what he knew best, and the businesslike way in which he operated was appreciated by his clients, particularly the Pennsylvania Railroad’s A. J. Cassatt. But as the winds of fashion gathered force, Furness’s career would pay a price for his strongly personal approach to the practice of architecture. His last few years were spent looking back to his Civil War days, arranging reunions, and successfully petitioning to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The strength of the biographical approach is best seen where Lewis discusses the roots of Furness’s style. Furness’s mentor, Richard Morris Hunt, “knew the Gothic and néo-Grec as separate systems” (98) from his Paris education, and treated them as independent formal languages to be applied as appropriate. Lewis argues that because Furness’s exposure to these systems came secondhand, he was more open to combining them in uncanonical ways. Also, the influence of the École (via Hunt) is described in terms of a tradition “where architects thought like sculptors rather than painters,” approaching form as mass to be carved rather than as “colored surface” (120). Between these two qualities—strong lithic presence and a willingness to blur stylistic syntax—Furness would create a very powerful, and very personal, architecture.

One task of the “architectural biographer” is to illuminate the designs of the architect through reference to life experience. Although Lewis makes these links in the main by referring back to Furness’s Civil War service, my own reading of the Furness material suggests that caricature as a design strategy played the greater role in how Furness’s buildings look. Graphic caricature focuses on physiognomy. While the variety of facial types seems infinite, experience tells us when a representation has ranged beyond the bounds of normal physiology into caricature. Caricature in architecture works differently. Architectural rules (e.g., the orders) establish a much more finite “physiognomy” for buildings, based on traditional usage and notions of decorum. Recognition that a given building adheres to these rules largely depends on specialized knowledge. The caricaturing architect departs from these rules knowing that much of the distortion will go unnoticed by all but a few—and that a truly bold gesture is needed to alert the man on the street that something is up. So it was with Furness’s National Bank of the Republic, the Provident Trust, and a handful of his larger railroad stations. Yet, like its physiognomic counterpart, architectural caricature also depends on retaining some underlying truth to the original, even identifies the original in the act of deforming it. Connecting Furness to the “scientific realism” of Thomas Eakins and Eadweard Muybridge, Lewis speaks of a technologically inspired art that “aspired to truth as much as beauty” (102). A more succinct definition of caricature would be hard to find, although Lewis does not make the connection.

Instead, caricature comes into play for Lewis primarily as the vehicle through which to introduce the concept of the “violent mind” of the title. He anchors this notion in a cartoon Furness drew of his army unit impaling Confederate soldiers (32). Whether through lack of documents, or consideration for Furness’s living descendants (whose opening of their collections of family letters made this study possible), Lewis skirts around the issue of what was the basis of this “violent mind.” He does a balanced job of probing Furness’s personal life, but none of the possible problems—melancholy (14), drinking (177), egotism (231), nor the results: agitation, infidelity, cruelty (173)—offer much aid in understanding how Furness came to design as he did. Such psychological probing add little to our understanding
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of Furness's design sensibility, any more than a knowledge of Frank Lloyd Wright's miserable persona lessens our appreciation for, or diminishes the influence of, his designs. Furness's clients shared few of the designer's personality traits, but they warmly supported his architecture. As a designer, Furness “sought the flower in the machine,” and celebrated the creative potential of the industrial age (254). Like his father's friend Ralph Waldo Emerson, Furness sought a life force in the power of machinery. Lewis's emphasis on natural forms comes at the expense of other interpretations, such as the idea that Furness used exaggeration and expressive distortion of mechanism to animate the machine and abstract it into his art. Lewis's great strength is his eye. His readings of plans (particularly the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad station at Wilmington, Delaware, and the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia) are thoughtful and clarify a major reason that Furness received the commissions he did. His buildings worked, and were often built on time and within budget. Relying on military metaphors—“aggressive imagery as a weapon for commercial competition” (3), or “architectural warfare” (91)—Lewis links Furness's Civil War experiences to his professional life, but there is little support for the idea that Furness's architecture reflects a warrior mentality. His buildings were visually powerful, certainly, but by no means militaristic. Perhaps it is only a reviewer who senses a book's title hovering over the reading experience and tests the contents against the presumed theme, but with close reading of this story, it seems clear it was Furness's great ego, not his “violent mind,” that functioned as the bridge between personality and architecture.  

PRESTON THAYER  
Mary Washington College

Mark Alan Hewitt  
Gustav Stickley's Craftsman Farms: The Quest for an Arts and Crafts Utopia  

Mark Alan Hewitt's study of Gustav Stickley's country seat is a comprehensive, thematic examination, rich in sociocultural analysis. The "complex parable" (199) Hewitt relates spans the period from 1908 to 1913 when Stickley tried to demonstrate his theories of good design in a group of log structures built near Morris Plains, New Jersey. Less about the particulars of the Craftsman Farms and more about its enigmatic founder, Hewitt's study asks the question, Did Stickley achieve what he intended here, or if not, why not?

In the first chapter, "Prologue and Method," Hewitt provides a summary of the international context of design reform and introduces his key organizational themes, asserting that Stickley's quest to create Craftsman Farms is a story about "an idea, a text, a landscape, and a group of extraordinary American artifacts" (7). Whatever positivism that may imply, this is not a story with a happy ending. A theme of failure casts a pall over the subsequent narrative, making it very different in tone from the optimistic writing of the movement's founders and from many of its previous chroniclers.

Some readers might find this theme of failure disheartening. But the study is well worth reading, especially for its methodology. Hewitt weaves together "biography with art history, material culture with literary themes, social history with the analysis of technology and craft" (13). He does so skillfully in the four chapters that follow, and through it all, his professional architectural training is also subtly apparent in tone and approach.

In "Persona," Hewitt explores the various influences that helped shape Stickley's concept of himself and his relationship to the world. The discussion of generations of Stickley ancestors may seem to be more detailed than necessary at first, but the relevance becomes clear at the book's end, when Hewitt ties together the seemingly disparate parts of the narrative in an impressive conclusion. The biographical material demonstrates how Stickley reinvented himself through a series of identity shifts: "the German American immigrant, the farm boy, the businessman, the wood craftsman, and the visionary intellectual" (17) and his eventual apotheosis into cultural leader.

In "Utopias," Hewitt outlines Stickley's plans for Craftsman Farms, stressing that the complex was a continuation of an established tradition, and demonstrates this by exploring relevant communitarian precedents and educational philosophies that influenced Stickley's vision. Among these were the "paper utopias" described in English and American literature, existing communities abroad, and American enclaves. In addition, Hewitt discusses entrepreneurs who served as models for Stickley the businessman. With this as background, Stickley envisioned Craftsman Farms as "frontier settlement, a farm, an estate, a school, a workshop, country house, and a monastic commune" (97–98). Inspired by the educational theories of John Dewey, Jane Addams, Oscar Lovell Triggs, and Irene Sargeant, Stickley hoped that Craftsman Farms might become a "craft-work commune" (92) for the education of young men. Sadly, his dwindling income disallowed the realization of this ambitious dream.

The siting, plan, construction, and furnishing of Craftsman Farms are the focus of "Artifact and Place." The twelve-building retreat was built at a time when Stickley's income from his various enterprises was at its height, but his residence, called The Clubhouse, was little more than an overgrown log cabin. Hewitt relates Stickley's choice of this building type to his early self-identification with the rugged wood craftsman, but he ponders the cabin's construction techniques, which seem "eccentric," "deviant," and "flawed." Hewitt con-