whom, then, was he in dialogue? One possible answer comes from Pearlman’s book, in which she outlines in great detail the debate over urban planning that took place between Hudnut and Gropius. Gropius was in favor of satellite developments; Hudnut favored high density in an urban sphere and stressed the need for monumental structures.

Was Gropius at the Pan Am building contributing a built rejoinder to his dialogue with Hudnut? Mies? Breuer’s emphasis on shadowed surfaces echoes in many of Gropius’s defenses of Pan Am. Maybe Gropius was responding to his exclusion from the design team for the United Nations Building. But perhaps he was also just designing for a particular site, trying to appease challenging bottom-line clients. One wonders if, in fact, his celebrity worked against him. Had the original Roth plan been built, would the blander building have been visually absorbed?

The current reincarnation of modernism makes these books all the more pertinent—whether it be new buildings in Manhattan, modernistic furniture show rooms, or the numerous Bauhaus exhibitions slated for New York and Berlin in 2009. Why is Mad Men—the quirky, Grammy-winning cable series, based on a New York advertising firm in the early 1960s—all the rage? Its success has been attributed to its historical details: the glass and steel skyscrapers, the elaborate period sets, and the stunning costumes, which I see as fashion homesickness, nostalgia for a time whose debates over America and modernism can now be viewed in simplified terms. How will this current mood effect architectural history and criticism? Will future art historical examinations of Gropius continue past generations’ harshness? Will reception of the Pan Am building ever mellow? Will missteps at the World Trade Center site make the Pan Am debacle look humble by comparison?

In any event, it is surely time now to forgo historiographical dependence on any so-called Bauhaus legacy, as these two books implicitly demonstrate, to debunk the use of the term “Bauhaus” as indicative of a normative modernist style, to move beyond “Bauhaus” as a generic label for postwar modernistic architecture. Let us accept the fact that in postwar America the real Bauhaus was not at play—at either Harvard or in the design of the Pan Am building. Despite Gropius’s rhetorical claims, historians need to clarify the differences and cease equating Harvard’s basic design course with its Bauhaus ancestor. What Albers taught at Yale and Gropius’s course at Harvard was quite a bit different than what Itten, Moholy-Nagy, Klee, Kandinsky, Albers, or others taught in their foundations courses at the Bauhaus. This matters because the notion of a “Harvard Bauhaus” contributes to, and even justifies, a confusion of what were, in fact, distinct moments within twentieth-century modernism. What Gropius designed for Park Avenue or for the Harvard campus was a different kind of architecture for a different time and—in the case of Pan Am—an extremely different kind of client, as Clausen so clearly and persuasively explains.

Both of these books are convincing and important contributions to the trajectory of mid-twentieth-century modernist scholarship. What emerges throughout is a sense of real people engaged in real power struggles over serious concerns, with buildings as major performers. Pearlman and Clausen have advanced our understanding of postwar architectural culture. The revelations in these books should have an impact on the way in which this chapter of American history is told from here on out.

KAREN KOEHLER
Hampshire College

Dmitry Shvidkovsky

**Russian Architecture and the West**


Russian art and architecture have long loitered at the edges of the history and historiography of European art, making cameo appearances now and then, most often in discussions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Even surveys of Central European art tend not to include Russia, or to discuss it only in passing. Thus Eberhard Hempel’s 1965 *Baroque Art and Architecture in Central Europe*, part of the Pelican History of Art series, does not take up Russia at all, leaving it to George Heard Hamilton’s 1954 contribution to the same series. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann’s *Court, Cloister and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe 1450–1800* (1993) treats Russia in the first chapter, dealing briefly with Moscow in the fifteenth century, and in an excursus on St. Petersburg in the early eighteenth century. It is especially the latter moment in Russian history—the eighteenth century, framed by the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great—that is most familiar to Western readers and has been made accessible through books like James Cracraft’s *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture* (1988) and its companion volume on the figurate arts.

A volume addressing the long history of Russian architecture, and giving a more sustained discussion of its relation to Western Europe, is both much needed and immensely useful for an English readership more than fifty years after the appearance of Hamilton’s text. It is a significant virtue of Dmitry Shvidkovsky’s book that it is both accessible and scholarly enough to serve as a general introduction to Russian architecture. It moves chronologically through the material, starting with the rise in the tenth century of Kievan Rus’, the first Russian centralized state, and with it, the first brick and stone architecture in the region. This parallel introduces a basic premise of the book: that the major developments in Russian architecture were fundamentally tied to major developments in the form or ideology of the state. The first episode involves the adoption of Byzantine forms along with the Orthodox faith in the eighty-year period between about 990 and 1070, but in limited ways, as only the cross-in-square plan—and not other Byzantine building types—became standard in Russian ecclesiastical architecture. This in turn establishes nicely two further themes that recur throughout the book: Russia as a second Byzantium and Russia as a third Rome, thus pulling together both a religious inheritance and an imperial one, which took different forms over the ensuing millennium.
The basic form of the Orthodox church survived until the October Revolution of 1917, though reworked in different ways. In the late twelfth century, apparently for the first time in Russian history, craftsmen were brought in from elsewhere. These men seem to have been sent by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, but Shvidkovsky perceptively identifies as well northern Italian elements in their work. Northern Italy would be a point of future contact, most notably in the Bolognese Aristotile Fioravanti, who was responsible for the design of the Church of the Dormition in Moscow. This project was intimately bound up with the marriage in 1472 of Ivan III and Zoe Paleologa, the niece of the last Byzantine emperor, providing a tangible transfer of the Byzantine imperial claim to the Muscovite state after the fall of Constantinople. Much of the impetus for this view of the Russian state seems in fact to have come from her circle, and Shvidkovsky points out that probably connections to Italy through her retinue brought Fioravanti to Moscow. The Italian and imperial elements in this episode are taken as justification enough to speak of a “Moscow Renaissance.”

Throughout, the book traces developments in Russian architecture that more or less mirror those in Western Europe. The parallel grows increasingly close until the Soviet Union attempts to shut out the West in the first decades of the twentieth century, although the continuing interplay between Soviet architects and Western developments is the subject of the fascinating last chapter. At times this structure is certainly appropriate, particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when architects born or trained in Italy, France, and elsewhere received many of Russia’s major commissions. It has limitations, however, and in places the author is forced to stretch to show a correlation. There is, for instance, no Gothic in the development of Russian architecture, whereas the style can be found in virtually every corner of Europe. Indeed, brick as a building material was probably introduced to Russia via Novgorod from the Baltic region, where it was used to build enormous Gothic churches. Shvidkovsky skirts the problem by arguing that in the later fifteenth century Italian architects viewed the Gothic with great suspicion, even as they happily employed Romanesque elements. But the reader’s belief is strained by statements such as “these features [grand scale, penetrating light, and exact proportions] can be traced to the great Italian cathedrals of the late Middle Ages, up to Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence; neither they nor Fioravanti’s cathedral of the Dormition bear any trace of Gothic. . . The handling of space here seems Renaissance avant la lettre” (86). Likewise, the term “Mannerism”—problematic at best even in discussions of Western or Italian arts—is used so broadly to describe irrational or seemingly discordant elements that it loses its specificity and thus its usefulness in relating Russian and Italian or Western architecture; Tsar Ivan IV (“the Terrible”) is called a “Mannerist” monarch (146).

Shvidkovsky states his goal with some hesitation: “I am by no means sure that my approach is a legitimate one. Nevertheless, the temptation to try to break free from the traditional separation of Russian architectural history from the mainstream of Europe was too great to resist” (2). However, it is clear that for Shvidkovsky architecture in Russia remains outside of the Western tradition. It interacts with developments in Italy, Germany, France, and England (the regions of Europe mentioned most often), sometimes more openly, sometimes with more reserve, but Shvidkovsky is never quite willing to make the leap and argue that architecture in Russia is an integral part of the history of European architecture; it remains apart, separated by a yawning chasm.

This impression is exaggerated, in my opinion, by the almost total absence of Eastern Europe from his discussion. Already in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries there were excellent artists and architects from Italy and elsewhere working in Hungary and Poland producing early and refined examples of Italianate architecture. Although it would have enlarged an already long book, some discussion of these and similar developments would have enhanced the argument and helped to fill an apparent gulf between Russia and the West. We hear only very rarely of architects moving between Russia and the broader Eastern European region. For instance, the Italian Alevisio da Carcano worked in Moscow around 1500, but then moved to Lublin in Poland, where he died. The better-known sculptor and architect Andreas Schlüter, born in Danzig, worked in Warsaw before moving to Berlin, and from there to St. Petersburg in 1713, but we hear only of the German background.

These quibbles aside, Shvidkovsky has written a marvellous book. It surveys over a thousand years of Russian architectural history, and in the process synthesizes a huge literature, much of which is inaccessible to most European and American readers. He is able simultaneously to look back to the Soviet period and give it relevance within his overall framework. The book is engaging to read, full of outstanding photos by Yekaterina Shorban, and produced with the high standards we expect of Yale University Press. It will be very useful for a long time.

Kristoffer Neville
University of California, Riverside

Gary A. Van Zante
New Orleans 1867: Photographs by Theodore Lilienthal

The history of New Orleans is tinged by disasters, both man-made and natural. How the city responded to the vicissitudes of the Civil War is the underlying theme of New Orleans 1867: The Photographs of Theodore Lilienthal. As the premier city of the South in the first half of the nineteenth century, New Orleans had the good fortune to survive the Civil War almost completely unscathed, at least in terms of damage caused by Union forces. However, its economy was devastated by the collapse of the slave plantation system, which produced huge crops of sugar and cotton for export. In an effort to draw attention to the city’s potential, the city council, along with the state commission charged with sending exhibits to the Paris