Unfortunately, this means some detail is sacrificed; for instance, even the discussion of the Tokyo Metropolitan Festival Hall (1957–61), which Reynolds argues is “in some ways the culmination of all of Maekawa’s previous work” (191), occupies only about three pages of text and is focused tightly on the building’s formal and aesthetic qualities.

In comparison with Reynolds’s coverage of some of Maekawa’s prewar designs, the treatment of this building’s context is rather cursory. The Festival Hall’s massive yet often exuberant forms demand comparison with contemporary work elsewhere—for instance, with that of Le Corbusier in the 1950s (including Chandigarh) and of Tange in Japan. The political and cultural context, too, deserves greater attention: in noting that “the Festival Hall was inaugurated in April 1961 with a special concert by the New York Philharmonic, conducted by Leonard Bernstein” (191), Reynolds begins to hint at the importance of the project to Japan’s international standing in the arts, but he goes no further.

Ultimately, these criticisms of Reynolds’s approach should perhaps be taken as comments on the state of the field rather than as an indictment of his project. If Reynolds has at points sacrificed depth of analysis in favor of breadth of material, this appears a viable strategy given the need to introduce Maekawa’s work as a whole to an English-reading audience. No one monograph, however well researched and illustrated, can treat the manifold aspects of Japanese modernism. Reynolds’s book, which boasts clear prose and excellent illustrations throughout (including the cover photo by the author), is a major step forward in the study of modern architecture in Japan.

DON CHOI
University of California, Berkeley
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There were dozens of talented, well-trained African American architects working throughout the age of segregation in ways we do not yet understand. We can be grateful, then, that David Vassar Taylor and Paul Clifford Larson have written an exemplary monograph about one of them, Clarence W. “Cap” Wigington (1883–1967). While Wigington’s oeuvre would command respectful local attention if he were white, it merits much wider notice as we try to learn who these early black architects were and how they managed to practice at all when systematic discrimination limited most of them to underfunded projects within the impecunious black community.

To understand the virulence of the discrimination, it is worth taking a moment to review one sorry episode in the career of another early black practitioner, William H. Moses, Jr. (1901–1991). Mailing his entry from his home, not from Hampton Institute, the black school in Hampton, Virginia, where he taught, and urging a colleague not to ask an official if an African American could enter, William H. Moses, Jr., won the 1938 competition to design Virginia’s space at the New York World’s Fair. After announcing the winner, the state committee discovered his race, reversed itself, diverted the assignment to a white non-entrant and, along with Associated Press bulletins and newspaper stories, removed “Mister” from the front of his name. According to the black journal *Phylon*, a Norfolk newspaper apologized to its readers for inadvertently putting a story about a black man on its front page when the man was not a criminal. Moses did receive the prize money, but his drawings were turned over to his white successor, who used some of his ideas and then was allowed twice the construction budget the competition had allocated even though Moses’s design was faulted for its pre-
sumed expense. Richard Guy Wilson, summarizing the tale, has softened the racist indictment only slightly by noting that the competition rules did permit nullification. Wilson also published Moses's drawings from the Phylon article, which should be reprinted in its entirety in more than one current journal or anthology as the nadir of American architectural discrimination.

Black architects of the age of segregation tended toward quiet forbearance; perhaps, expecting prejudice, they chose to defang it by pretending not to feel its sting. What we know about the remarkably successful Paul R. Williams (1894–1980), the more modestly accomplished Robert R. Taylor (1868–1942), and now Clarence W. Wigington suggests that a dignified silence was the preferred response to the racial insults that must have come their way. But until more close research on the many eligible talents has been completed—and discrimination is only one of the issues demanding careful biographical investigation—we can only surmise its true effects. Several valuable studies are now available: Karen E. Hudson's on Paul R. Williams; Wilson's essays in The Making of Virginia Architecture on Moses, Harvey N. Johnson, Amaza Lee Meredith, and Hilyard R. Robinson; and Richard Dozier's and Harrison Ethridge's dissertations on, respectively, Tuskegee Institute as an early venture in architectural education, and Washington, D.C., as a center for study and practice.  

Dozier, who pioneered research on black designers in the 1970s, wrote in the foreword of the volume under review that Clarence Wigington was only a name in a place—St. Paul—when he was doing his work. Wigington's accomplishments escaped the purview of the essays on African Americans in architecture in a 1940 issue of Negro History Bulletin, which suggests that he was unknown even to those chroniclers who were doing their best to promote the race's abilities. Generally, the black press was well informed about architectural talent nationwide, so perhaps Wigington chose to avoid the attention. Working from 1915 through 1947 as the indispensable professional—but never the chief—in St. Paul's municipal architectural office, and thus protected by civil service procedures as well as his own abilities, Wigington possessed a clear architectural voice, as Larson's formal analyses and Don Wong's photographs show. He tended to emphasize central motifs in symmetrical, tightly bound masses and punctuated rooftiles. His powerfully plain walls with small, nearly square windows cut sharply into the masonry and dramatize the surface, weight, and texture of the materials.

Wigington was the style leader of the City Architect's Office during its halcyon days in the 1920s and its continuation through the 1930s with WPA projects. He took the office from Collegiate Gothic through Craftsman, a faceted brick Deco, and a stripped-down Moderne, while maintaining his own voice. He also accumulated a wealth of pragmatic planning experience with the city's primary assignments: fire stations, airport buildings, schools (for which he devised planning strategies new to St. Paul), and various recreational and park structures, including a monumental masonry water tower featured in a Gordon Parks photograph on the dust jacket of Taylor and Larson's book. And then there were the ice palaces. From 1937 to 1947, Wigington designed six of these short-lived winter carnival fantasies. Simultaneously modernist and castellated, they were constructed of monumental ice-block walls (no roofs) with buttresses ending in stepped-Deco or crenellated skylines, festive with flags, that "met the sky with a dancing line," to quote Larson; "the rhythm of the dance jumped from surface to surface on their undulating sides" (97). The publication includes four colored presentation drawings of these palaces, whose sheer novelty may earn their author a slot in a survey course that might not otherwise accrue to his finely crafted but more normative structures.

With around ninety attributable public buildings and another thirteen for which he signed as draftsman, plus assorted independent projects interspersed within or bracketing his decades with the city, Wigington joins Los Angeles's Paul R. Williams and Philadelphia's Julian F. Abele (1881–1950), who stayed behind the scenes in the Horace Trumbauer office, as the three early-twentieth-century African American figures with significant work beyond the black community. Others may emerge. Taylor and Larson have also located Wigington's earliest buildings in Omaha, where he apprenticed with the MIT-trained white architect Thomas R. Kimball (1862–1934), whose smooth Tudor-style church appears to be a source for some of the St. Paul schools, and a handful of late projects, mostly unbuilt, that were intended for southern California. The list of works in the appendix mentions his Omaha projects but does not locate designs for the National Religious Training School, a black foundation in Durham, North Carolina, which also had buildings from 1910 (the year of Wigington's involvement) by the better known William S. Pittman (1875–1958), Booker T. Washington's son-in-law.

Taylor, whose biographical chapters place Wigington within St. Paul's racial structure, does not claim that his subject suffered overt discrimination except by suggesting that had he been white he would have been City Architect. Wigington's ongoing second-level slot could not be due to weak political and administrative skills. These he had in abundance. The "Cap" (for Captain) sobriquet honors more than his leadership of a home guard company during World War I. Wigington had to petition Minnesota's governor to inaugurate an African American battalion, not an easy task at a time when local employment practices were set to discourage black migration from the South and when armed African Americans were assumed to be dangerous. Wigington was active in the National Technical Association, a professional organization for black engineers and architects; the biracial NAACP; and the biracial Urban League, which worked for improved employment opportunities, housing, and social
services for the poor. He helped form and then led the St. Paul chapter and, through board membership, served on city commissions on race relations and fair employment practices. Taylor notes that if Wigionton did more with the Urban League than with the NAACP, perhaps it was because the latter, with its agenda of legal challenges to discrimination and segregation, would have been perceived as radical. As Wigionton was a successful professional, he and his family were members of the city’s black elite and were involved in a dizzying array of religious, social, and fraternal organizations. His Urban League work stands as a refreshing contradiction to the widespread notion that successful African Americans insulated themselves from the less fortunate, hiding out in a high bourgeois social whirl. Cap Wigionton did it all.

ELLEN WEISS
Tulane University
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Pier Luigi Tucci
Laurentius Manlius. La riscoperta dell’antica Roma. La nuova Roma di Sisto IV
Quaderni di Eutopia. Commentari novi de antiquitabus totius Europae, 3

The complexity of the reuse and interpretation of antiquity in the Italian Renaissance can be read on the walls of Rome’s domestic architecture. Upheavals in the city’s urban fabric, as they intersected with humanist revival of ancient texts, launched fundamental changes in the discovery, preservation, and recontextualization of antique objects. In the process, amassing antiquities posed the question of who would care for and display them, and how they would be claimed as cultural patrimony. Private individuals responded in their own homes: by the end of the fifteenth century, almost every noble home preserved antiquities in a court or garden accessible to guests, or exhibited ancient objects immersed in courtyards and exterior walls.

Throughout these decades of urban transformation by popes and private individuals, ancient Rome’s grandeur remained a perennial, if ungraspable, image and ideal. Especially during the renovatio Romae of Pope Sixtus IV, the restoration of ancient sculpture to public settings and the revival of ancient epigraphy fit in with a larger resuscitation of Rome’s ancient glory. It was in the midst of the Sistine renovatio that the druggist Lorenzo Manlio immersed ancient inscriptions and relics in the façade of his house on the Piazza Giudea, brandishing the entire length of the building with a proclamation that the Renaissance in Rome had begun. For Manlio, a “new man” who earned his own fortune, the reuse of ancient Roman inscriptions and relics—coupled with an immense antica inscription—would herald his own personal rebirth as he staked out claims to Roman ancestry and to the legacy of the ancient city.

Over the past two decades, a wealth of literature has broadened and deepened our understanding of the reuse of antiquity in Italy. A series edited by Salvatore Settis largely incited this surge, while the most recent contributions have effectively challenged the assumptions of past methodologies. The main body of literature on the use of antiquities in the private sphere continues to lag behind, both in scope and in method, with most studies attempting either to retrieve a “program” or to produce a catalogue for a family collection. However, some exceptions to this trend have refined our understanding of spolia and collections during the era of Sixtus IV and beyond. In all these discussions, however, even the basic facts about the house of Lorenzo Manlio have been misunderstood. Famously, historians have never been able to resolve the question of the date, recorded in the inscription in years “ab Urbe condita” (after the founding of the city). Pier Luigi Tucci’s book offers a satisfying solution to this problem, fixing the date to 1476–78, and draws upon newly unearthed documents to rewrite the biography of Manlio (whose name was not, as has been assumed, Manilio). The house of Manlio is a core monument in the Roman revival of the antique, and in the light of these new discoveries, it should shake off its persistent status as a curiosity in the history of Roman architecture.

Many of the new findings about Manlio are critical for an interpretation of the house. For example, in the years 1476–78, Manlio first earned the title nobilis vir and obtained a brand-new ancestor, Marcus Manlius Capitolinus. Manlio’s appointment as syndicus (legal representative) of Santa Maria in Ara coercei was also important in this process of self-formation. Surely, as the author concludes, this guardian of the Aracoeli (the new Arx) deliberately forged connections to the guardian of the ancient Arx, the general who saved Rome from the Gauls.