shared by archaeologists about what constitutes a palace have been misleading. By importing a foreign term for a building type, we are blind to the local ways of using and defining space. In terms of palaces, he suggests we look first at the local material culture rather than predetermined definitions to begin to define a Moche royal residence. After carefully examining both the monumental architecture at Moche Site as well as the dense residential structures, Chapdelaine argues that the Moche did not have what we consider a palace. However, in the process of looking for one, he highlights the different ways the Moche defined space and form, and provides a useful analysis of the layout of an important Andean site.

Many other contributors echo Chapdelaine’s argument, that we must look first to local architectural precedents. For example, William Isbell in “Landscapes of Power: A Network of Palaces in Middle Horizon Peru” explores the possibilities of regional traditions that may have crossed cultural borders. To discover what a Wari palace may have looked like, Isbell looks to another Andean example: the Inca. Along with their neighbors the Tiwanaku, the Wari were the last regional powers to control significant parts of the Andes until the rise of the Incas several centuries later. Hence, Isbell argues that the Incas and their elaborate royal residences serve as the closest cultural comparisons with which to construct a prior central Andean idea of a palace. While acknowledging the limitations of such an approach (using the architectural characteristics of one culture to define another’s built environment), his insightful discussion of how imperial Inca residences may have been constituted is compelling. He highlights not only Inca definitions of royal residences but also critical questions of how form and spatial practices may or may not have spread across time and space. In addition, he problematizes traditional archaeological approaches toward indigenous architecture, namely a practice in which monumental form is seen primarily as a religious expression, rather than as having mainly political or elite residential functions.}

Several other essays illuminate spatial and naming practices by assuming a regional perspective. Susan Toby Evans’s chapter, “Antecedents of the Aztec Palace: Palaces and Political Power in Classic and Post Classic Mexico,” focuses on the importance of performance and theater in royal residences across time and cultural groups, as well as other aspects of lived practice often overlooked in studies focusing primarily on form. Evans notes that the Aztecs called their royal residences a Tecpan-calli, a “Lord-place house,” that its form was easily recognizable (with three key elements: a dais room, courtyard, and plaza), and that its construction was highly regulated (a ruler had his son executed for building one without official permission). Because of the rich surviving evidence (a named building type along with written descriptions and archaeological remains), Evans is able to discuss the subtleties of Tecpan history and its relationship to the earlier architecture complexes of Teoti-huacán and Tula as well as to the later open chapels of the Spanish colonial era. Having a local definition of a building type provides critical insights not afforded most scholars investigating architecture made before the sixteenth century in the Americas. However, Evans’s use of the Tecpan examples reminds us of the specific details that would be lost if we thought of the Tecpan in terms of a general palace. In doing so, the author highlights the questions that thread through most essays in this book: namely, what is a palace and should scholars even use the term?

Carolyn Dean’s essay “What is Wrong with (the term) Art?” cogently outlines the problems in trying to shape the discourse of Native American artistic production according to Western scholarly (and naming) practices. While recognizing that using the vocabulary of one culture (in this case, the term “art”) to discuss the objects of another could bring much needed attention to a neglected corpus of material (as well as highlight problematic scholarly paradoxes), Dean points out that once that goal is accomplished, we must deal with the often serious misunderstandings that have been created by bringing a foreign word into a new context.

While the present book does not provide a clear solution to this quandary, it does effectively announce the importance of Native American architecture while revealing that an examination of elite architectural complexes in the Americas can produce remarkable insights. It also allows us to begin to understand the rich diversity of Native American architectural production and the limitations and benefits of architectural terminology. Christie and Sarro should be applauded for bringing together such a diverse, thought-provoking, and data-rich collection of essays on key monuments of Native American architecture. This book should be read not only by architectural historians interested in the history of architecture in the Americas, but also by anyone who wishes to engage in the key questions of architecture across cultures.

STELLA NAIR
University of California, Riverside

Notes

Carla Yanni
The Architecture of Madness: Insane Asylums in the United States

The history and development of asylum architecture has been neglected, treated as a distant cousin to baseline trends in the history of architecture and health. Carla Yanni reverses this unfortunate pattern in her recent book on the history of asylums from 1770 to 1900. The book is an extremely important and extensively researched addition to the literature on a much maligned, overlooked building type in the history of architecture and health.

The narrative is presented in four parts. The introduction considers the pro-
fessionalization of psychiatry in the asylum and the concept of environmental determinism, and offers a brief history of madness in Western culture. Chapter one begins with the architecture of Bethlem Asylum in London in the late eighteenth century and other precursors, including Bentham’s panoptical configurations, the Royal Naval Hospital at Plymouth, England, and a number of early American asylums. Yanni examines moral management, diversionary therapies, community with nature, and the writing and work of Dr. Thomas S. Kirkbride (1809–1885), who presided over the private Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane. When the hospital relocated to a new facility in 1841, Kirkbride was able to introduce many new theories to the treatment regimen as well as the architectural milieu.

Prisons and asylums had become virtually indistinguishable from one another by this time and Kirkbride’s work, together with the humanitarian efforts of Dorothea Dix (1802–1887), represented a radical alternative. Dix was the leading crusader for the establishment of state supported mental asylums, where the patient was to be treated with dignity and respect, and not as a creature possessed by demonic forces, as had been the popular stereotype. Through her efforts the first state asylums were built. Dix fought for individualized care for all social classes and races.

Chapter two examines in detail the development of the Kirkbride Plan hospitals, architecturally and in a broad societal context. Patients were placed in a rural botanical setting away from the ills of the city. He separated patients by severity of illness, for ease of treatment and surveillance, and advocated the virtues of sunlight and natural ventilation. Patients partook in normalized lifestyles by exercising, working, and undergoing classroom and religious instruction. The superintendent lived on the grounds, as did many key staff persons, and the public was often invited to attend special events. Kirkbride and his principal architects developed what would become known as the 250-bed linear plan, a stepped series of long, single- or double-loaded corridors that housed males and females in separate wings, on multiple floors, and isolated the most severe cases in detached structures, removed from the central administration. These state asylums, notably the facilities in Alabama, South Carolina, New Jersey, and Illinois—all featured as part of case studies—grew into large, imposing Victorian-era institutions with extensive grounds, typically encompassing farmland, far from urban centers.

Chapter three examines the rise of the cottage campus concept as an early residential alternative to the linearity of the long, narrow wings in the manner of the Kirkbride-inspired hospitals. However, buildings that now appeared as manor houses on the exterior sometimes housed as many as twenty beds per room on their upper floors. The medical profession was also evolving in its view of psychiatric care, and scatter-site cottages undermined the efficacy of medical treatment. Moreover, cottages were often added indiscriminately, overwhelming medical care and related support. These developments had undermined the standards set by the Association of Medical Superintendents of American Institutions for the Insane (AMSAII, founded in 1844).

Chapter four discusses the expansion of asylums, both in number and in size, during the second half of the nineteenth century. The AMSAII-sanctioned allowable number of patients was increased to six hundred in 1866. Architects responded by designing in an ever-broader range of styles, including H. H. Richardson’s Romanesque hospital at Buffalo. Gothic edifices and picturesque villages soon appeared. A number of private institutions founded during these boom years allowed the wealthy to buy privacy and a higher quality of care. By 1888, Kirkbride’s construction standards for asylums no longer prevailed; politicians had imposed cost-cutting reforms and doctors deemed the Kirkbride asylum archaic and out of touch with advancements in evidence-based psychiatric care.

In the concluding section, Yanni examines the aftermath of the Kirkbride system and various alternatives that were being tested by 1900. The appendices contain interesting background data on asylum operational costs, patient census profiles, and the comparative growth of asylums in the period of 1770 through 1872.

It is true that history repeats itself. Architects, planners, interior designers, engineers, and other players in the current movement toward the design of sustainable (in other words, green) hospitals and related healthcare environments can learn much from this book. Many of the major architectural and site planning principles espoused by Kirkbride and his contemporaries, including Florence Nightingale, have been built into the Leadership through Energy Efficient Environmental Design (LEED) program operated since 2001 by the United States Green Building Council, based in Washington, D.C.

One wishes that Yanni had devoted more attention to the plight of African Americans in the history and development of the American asylum movement. Instances are cited on the mistreatment of black patients, but more case studies would have been welcomed. This is one facet of Yanni’s research that opens the door for others to pursue in far greater detail.

Yanni’s work is neither about great monuments nor necessarily heroic architects, but instead is about the social and cultural significance of buildings, their creators’ idiosyncratic impulses, and their users’ perceptions of the completed artifact. She is therefore primarily concerned with societal values and meanings as expressed through architecture, with the forms themselves seeming at times to be almost of secondary concern. Regardless, there is much room for additional research of this type within the realm of architecture and health, with the core thesis centered on the link between science, medicine, and built form.

This book is highly recommended for anyone interested in the history and evolution of this important architectural type. If what is built is the mirror of a society and that which it values, then this book is an indispensable source for everyone engaged in shaping—in humane and environmentally sustainable ways—the future of architecture for mental health.

STEVEN VERDERBER
Clemson University