access could not have been easy, and the difficulties of carrying out the survey are hinted at in a footnote thanking the fort’s commander for his help with the team’s Dardanelles crossings in a small fishing boat in inclement weather. This survey combined with Thys-Senocak’s archival research and her insightful arguments about the Yeni Valide complex amounts to an impressive volume, despite several lacunae.

While the Dardanelles fortresses and the Eminönü complex are covered thoroughly, the other constructions of Turhan Sultan are not. The mosques in Crete and the palace near Edirne are not illustrated or described in detail, and the reader is left unsure as to whether this is due to their current condition or to the selective focus of this project. Additional constructions in the Balkans and along the route to Mecca are mentioned in chapter one but are not referred to again, whereas other buildings along the Black Sea possibly attributable to Turhan Sultan are not mentioned in the beginning of the book but are alluded to in the conclusion. A clearer exposition of the evidence for the entire corpus of Turhan Sultan’s patronage is needed.

Another gap is the lack of any contextualization of the case of Turhan Sultan in the Islamic world beyond the Ottoman Empire. Thys-Senocak claims this is due to a lack of research on female patronage of the Ottoman contemporaries, the Safavids and Mughals, whereas I would argue that a comparison with the imperial women of earlier dynasties would definitely enhance our understanding of Turhan Sultan and other Ottoman female imperial patrons. Several features of Turhan Sultan’s patronage stand out in comparison with her European contemporaries: her ability to build castles, her independent wealth, and her use of her imperial son rather than her deceased imperial husband or her own lineage as a means of legitimation. But by comparing the Ottoman women to their Seljuk, Ayubid, and Timurid predecessors, we would have seen that the patronage of architecture by a queen mother, with paramount importance placed on her link to the living, ruling son rather than the dead husband, was a long-standing practice in the Islamic world. The earlier women did, however, often emphasize their own exalted lineages as well in their foundation inscriptions; this is characteristic especially of those who engaged in architectural patronage while their husbands were still alive, but it is also seen in the constructions of queen mothers. All of these were wives rather than concubines, and this difference between Ottoman royal practice and that of earlier dynasties accounts for the sole Ottoman focus on the son: Turhan Sultan and the other royal Ottoman concubines were removed from their own non-Muslim families at a young age and would scarcely wish to emphasize their origin as slaves. Even those exceptional women who were made legal wives, such as Hürrem Sultan, the consort of Suleyman the Magnificent, started out as concubines (although the difference between Ottoman concubines and wives was not well-elicited by Thys-Senocak and could be an interesting avenue for future research). The ability of Ottoman women to hold independent wealth, although distinct from contemporary Western European practice, was also a long-standing custom enjoyed by their Islamic predecessors. However, the construction of castles was really unusual: earlier imperial women constructed a wide range of buildings but not actual military fortifications. Hence putting these typological distinctions into a historical Islamic context would serve to emphasize that Turhan Sultan was a truly outstanding patron.

MELANIE MICHALIDIS
Carleton College

Note

Daniel M. Abramson


The Bank of England, and specifically Sir John Soane’s design (which began in the 1790s and continued into the late 1820s), is a mainstay in the history of architecture. Images of Soane’s abstracted classicism can be found in almost every survey book and any architectural history of the nineteenth century. Discussion of the antecedents of modern architecture would be unthinkable without its inclusion. However, the existing building is very different, since it was largely reconstructed in the years between the two world wars. Nikolaus Pevsner’s thunderous condemnation of the reconstruction has colored our views, for as he wrote in the London volume of the Buildings of England: “The virtual rebuilding of the Bank of England in 1921–37 is—in spite of the Second World War—the worst individual loss suffered by London architecture in the first half of the C20.” The London Blitz
The success from the 1700s to the 1900s in England were central to Great Britain's abilities of those who ran the Bank of England, and the oddities that populated the image: should the rebuilt Bank possess a large expanse of glass at its base and thus personify modern commercialism? The alternative was to retain its antiquity to contemporary examples is treated along with the symbolic elements. Iconographically, the various iterations of the Bank over the years carried messages about its role. The author makes the point that the Bank's most vibrant years as a national institution were the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. It then fell into a "protracted Victorian architectural slumber," and its influence waned or "decelerated" (241, 197). Part of the problem lay with the Bank Charter Act of 1833—passed over the Bank of England's protests—that sanctioned rival joint stock banks such as Lloyds, Barclays, and

The Bank of England has occupied essentially five quarters after its initial founding in Mercers' Hall in 1694 and immediate move into Grocers' Hall, where it remained until 1734. Its second building, designed in 1731–34 by George Sampson, marked a major shift from a tentative and questionable experiment to the premier institution of English banking, located on Threadneedle Street, which it still resides. Robert Taylor's design dating from 1764 onward provided its third incarnation. Both Sampson's and Taylor's structures, while different in size, used the classical language common in England in those years. They were designed to be landmarks and project an image. The fourth building is the most famous one, Sir John Soane's design, which was begun in 1788, and then revised and altered during a building campaign that took thirty years. After its completion a hiatus set in, and although some interior changes were made, Soane's building lasted until the 1920s when Baker's work commenced. Some perimeter walls of Soane's building remain, but most of the interior and the superstructure that we see today are of Baker's design.

Baker was faced with a problem; with the surrounding skyline of London moving upward, how could the Bank maintain its presence? The problem lay with image: should the rebuilt Bank possess a large expanse of glass at its base and thus personify modern commercialism? The alternative was to retain its classical stone demeanor, signifying "the historical continuity and associations of the bank" (212). Baker's solution lay with a series of towering porticos that overwhelmed the lower walls of Soane's original. He explained to the directors: "The present home of the bank is eloquent of so much in the national life that it might be a national misfortune if the higher architectural expression of this sentiment were made too subservient to the acquisition from the side of the utter maximum accommodation and material efficiency" (212). Classicism, or more appropriately a robust Edwardian baroque, won out and made the structure appear to many people to be too heavy. The Soane base seemed thin next to mountains of highly charged pediments, columns, and figures piled on top.

Although the Bank passed through these many incarnations over the years in its different buildings, and its functions changed in many ways, consistencies remained, as the author points out. A visitor in the year 2000 described the experience of finding "open French doors leading to an impeccable English lawn: a secret country garden between Threadneedle Street and Lothbury" (239). The internal garden is a feature that stretches all the way back to the original Grocers' Hall in a typical medieval London livery company. This arrangement of Great Hall, parlors, and garden was continued through the Sampson, Taylor, and Soane designs, and represents an elite seclusion, or perhaps traditional English hierarchical insularity.

An especially valuable aspect of Abramson's book involves the development of banks and exchanges, and how their functions were carried out. Their relation to other building types from antiquity to contemporary examples is treated along with the symbolic elements. Iconographically, the various iterations of the Bank over the years carried messages about its role. The author makes the point that the Bank's most vibrant years as a national institution were the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. It then fell into a "protracted Victorian architectural slumber," and its influence waned or "decelerated" (241, 197). Part of the problem lay with the Bank Charter Act of 1833—passed over the Bank of England's protests—that sanctioned rival joint stock banks such as Lloyds, Barclays, and...
Midlands. In time, these competitors amassed greater deposits than the Bank of England. Commerce boomed and although the Bank of England profited, it became outmoded, both functionally and architecturally. Hence, Baker’s rebuild-

of the 1920s and 1930s was a delayed response to what had already occurred. Although Baker’s design contained up-to-date structural, technological, and functional elements, its historicist stance looked to the past. Emblems of British imperialism had been present from the beginning, but Baker’s building contained even more, even as the sun was setting on the empire.

Abramson has written a provocative book that treats a tremendous variety of issues about not just one of architecture’s iconic buildings, but also about architectural meaning, function, and how capitalism portrayed itself. He reads the various incarnations of the Bank with subtlety, and the book is lushly illustrated and handsomely produced. As noted, some of Soane’s work has been restored, and in a sense it is now again a historical monument to an age gone by. As Abramson shows, architecture can teach us history.

RICHARD GUY WILSON
University of Virginia

Note

Miron Mislin
Industriearchitektur in Berlin 1840–1910
Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth Verlag, 2002, 460 pp., 13 color and 542 b/w illus. $157 (cloth), ISBN 3803006171

“Now, what I want is, Facts. . . . Stick to Facts, sir!”1 The opening sentences of Charles Dickens 1854 novel Hard Times describe the dislocations that accompanied the Industrial Revolution. If Mr. Gradgrind, Dickens’s protagonist, had been an architectural historian fascinated by industrial buildings, he might have appreciated Miron Mislin’s monumental study of the industrial architecture of Berlin between 1840 and 1910. With 460 pages of densely written and printed text, over 500 black-and-white images and line drawings, twelve full-page color plates, and ten chapters subdivided according to a decimal system that uses up to three digits to order the paragraphs in each chapter, along with an eleventh chapter that offers an appendix as voluminous as the main text, the size and bulk of this book seem to suggest that barely any fact was left undiscovered.

Yet, it is easy to see that this book, published in 2002, may not find many admirers. It is by no means a “peoples’ history” of industrial architecture. The working classes that earned their living in the factories and workshops studied in the book make no appearances whatsoever. They are glimpsed here and there in photographs, but their interactions with the buildings, their experiences of the spaces, the machinery, the working conditions, and their hopes and disappointments, are not the author’s concern. At the same time, the book is no Thomas Carlyle–like history of individual industrial heroes. The captains of industry who commissioned these structures are also missing. Now and then we read that a Mr. Siemens, a Mr. Borsig, or a Mr. Rathenau—to mention just three names that are most likely already familiar to those with an interest in the industrial history of Berlin and Germany—made this or that decision, but their roles are unusually minimized here.

Instead, Mislin approached his subject matter in a positivist way that looks strictly at buildings and little else. This looking is impressive: the author studied not only buildings but also building files, as they are preserved by the hundreds in the archives of the building departments of the city’s boroughs and in the central archives of the state of Berlin. The bulk of the research was conducted there between 1986 and 1989 with support of both the Historische Kommission zu Berlin and the Deutsche Forschungsge-

mehschaft (7). At that time Mislin had to deal with the fact that East Germany was ruled by a socialist-communist dic-
tatorship so concerned about apparent secrets that might be contained in the ancient building files in the municipal archives of East Berlin that each file could only be viewed once (9). Mislin was thus required to conduct a second period of archival research dedicated to industrial sites in the early 1990s in by then the former East Berlin.

Mislin has published extracts of his research results from both periods in various professional journals, but this book is more than simply a presentation in bound form of his previously printed papers. The real treasure trove here is less the long and somewhat tedious introductory essay, but rather the detailed catalog of industrial sites in Berlin that makes up the bulk of the so-called appendix. Mislin restricted his study to industries that either processed metal or built machinery—two closely related branches, he claims, that have been decisive for the industrialization of Berlin, much more so than chemical industry, industrial food production, and the much-beloved local beer-brewing industry (8).

Even with only these two branches, the potential scope of the study enforced further limits. Thus, in his text, Mislin investigates only the oldest known locations of industry in Berlin, as far as archival material was available at all. He also examines the patterns according to which factories moved, sometime repeatedly, from central sites toward the edges of the city. In addition, he provides an in-depth analysis of the buildings of historically important companies like Siemens & Halske and the AEG, and presents an exemplary investigation of the well-known Kreuzberger Mischung (8), the mixture of working and living typically found in the borough of Kreuzberg as well as other parts of Berlin. This term does not refer to recent New Urbanist ideas about reviving housing over stores, but instead to the fact that buildings in the rear of a deep piece of land accommodated, often in multilevel structures, smaller and larger factories and workshops, while the main buildings along the streets were reserved for rental apartments.