grateful that he goes on to analyze Chalfin’s brilliant interiors, “sometimes not real but never fake” (91), that create “what Aline Saarinen perceptively termed ‘periodicity,’” a layered meditation that, Chalfin said, became “a partial evocation of the city of Tiepolo” (91).

The heart of the book is the longest chapter, Olin’s “Imagination, Design, and Construction.” Olin defines the three ecological communities of the site, and then traces how formidable natural obstacles and major design and construction problems, most of which involved the surrounding waters of lagoon and bay, were transformed into assets. There are great pages on making summer out of Florida’s winter (a problem vacationing Florida continues to create for itself) and fighting the salt spray while visions of Tuscany danced in the builders’ heads. Deering comes off as a model client—visionary, opinionated, yet flexible, always yielding on costs and delays—and as an experienced industrialist who solved logistical problems by vertically integrating resources and production: buying properties for topsoil and boats for transport, opening quarries, building a railroad spur. A long section deals with the unique breakwater on the bay, the stone Venetian “barge” freighted with trees and sculpture, which became entwined with Deering and Chalfin’s concept of the project. After assembling Vizcaya’s cadre of skilled craftsmen and artists (many of whom, such as ironworker Samuel Yellin, moved from estate to estate in the period), and with a deep bow to George Sitwell’s On the Making of Gardens (1909), Olin concludes the chapter with a search for Vizcaya’s precedents, displaying his knowledge of the Italian villa in all its forms.

Howett presents Reynolda through Reynolds’s aspirations as a progressive woman, fueled by Christianity and social conscience, who earnestly disavowed grandeur in favor of an idealized family and community life. Even though Reynolds was one of the few southern women able to carry out her philanthropic ideas on a grand scale, the freedoms that Deering and Chalfin and their male associates enjoyed in the same years form a painful contrast to Reynolds’s progress in her “job” as a client and civic powerhouse, burdened as she was by the births of four children in six years and her own desires to move beyond a woman’s proper sphere. While the story of women coming into the workforce and balancing the demands of career and home is by now well-traversed material, Howett makes it fresh. She interestingly underlines how modern health, convenience, and new technology were easily as important to Reynolds as aesthetics. “‘Light’ was as important a metaphor in these decades for many Americans as it had been during . . . the Enlightenment,” Howett writes, “synonymous . . . with rationality. . . . For her [Reynolds] the roar of generators, the hum of refrigerators, the pulsing of pumps, the lively ringing and buzzing that would soon fill the air were as reassuring and as beautiful as the sound of water cascading over the stone-faced spillway from her lake” (144).

On landscape and garden design influences Howett excels, perceptively linking Reynolds’s ideas and Sears’s Reynolda landscapes to figures as disparate as Edwin Lutyens and Jens Jensen; she offers a wide-ranging survey of English and American landscape theory and practice, from John Claudius Loudon and Frederick Law Olmsted and Charles Eliot onward, and of the dozens of professional and popular publications in Reynolds’s library. (Here especially, a standard bibliography to augment the ample, interesting notes seems wanting, while a chronology would have guided readers throughout the book.) Howett’s astute assessment, as a Southerner, of the South’s historic struggle with postbellum rage, a new identity, and segregation during Reconstruction and its aftermath nonetheless barely prepares the reader for Reynolds’s decision to house black estate workers outside the staff village, without the indoor plumbing, electricity, or heat with which white workers’ cottages were equipped.

Despite differences in approach, these extensive monographs on surviving great estates occupy the same spot on the continuum of scholarship about the country place era, which has moved from blanket disapproval to appreciative analysis and on to monographic study of single estates and the professionals who built them. The difficulties of architectural preservation and adaptive reuse—as well as the fragility of gardens and their ever-changing nature, climate change (especially in regard to Vizcaya), and encroaching development (again, especially Vizcaya, threatened by apartment towers)—increase the importance of the written and photographic records of such projects, as envisioned and built. Cast in widely differing styles (Beaux-Arts baroque and American Arts and Crafts), the two projects exemplify philosophic extremes and idiosyncrasies of the great estate period. These two beautiful and accessible works, read together, are exceptionally valuable to practitioners and historians as well as a general readership.

MAC KEITH GRISWOLD
Sylvester Manor Project
Shelter Island, New York

Note

A. K. Sandoval-Strausz
Hotel: An American History

This is an excellent book whose depth and range of research and encompassing power of argument allow it to supersede earlier literature on its topic. Before this study appeared, the historiography of American hotels was largely limited to accounts of the more palatial examples. But surprisingly, given the importance of the building type, there was little to be found about hotels in architectural or social history that connected to current scholarly trends in these fields. This book elegantly fills this large gap in the earlier literature, whose shortcomings become evident as we read this author’s chapters. Sandoval-Strausz is looking at the totality of the hotel’s history in American life, from the republic’s beginnings in the 1790s through the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. As he announces in his introduction and reiterates in his conclusion,
his guiding theme is the concept of hospitality and its relation to the larger history of modernity, wherein the movement of people as travelers was as essential to regional and national economic and political life as the movement of the goods and capital that those travelers enabled.

The ten intervening chapters are divided into three groups, each of which condenses myriad sources and observations to create a composite, multifaceted view of how hotels as institutions came to be and how they have served a wide variety of purposes. The first four chapters trace the history of investment in and building of hotels, from the earliest enterprises in northeastern cities in the 1790s through the creation of a national network of hotels, increasingly linked to rail transportation, in time for the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia in 1876, and then into the age of the automobile, beginning about 1908 with the introduction of the Ford Model T. Perhaps what is most innovative about the structure of these chapters is that they are not limited to accounts of the famous, larger, more architecturally elaborate and socially prominent examples. We learn a great deal about the changing approaches to financing the broad range of hotel types, which by the late nineteenth century was a central constituent of the national system of transportation that accommodated travelers of different social classes and with different purposes. The author thus approaches the hotel as a family of related vernacular building types, such as commercial hotels for traveling salesmen and settlement hotels as catalysts for the establishment of new frontier towns. The focus is on neither prominent architects nor buildings of high stylistic aspiration, although individual examples of both are discussed in passing.

These foundational chapters set the stage for the book’s second part, whose three chapters treat hotels as sites of social protest from the legal issues that pertain to building and development of large transient populations with the maintenance of the high standards of hospitality needed to keep a hotel more attractive than its competition.

If the vernacular emphasis of the first section calls to mind Dell Upton’s field-shaping work, then the behavioral theme of Sandoval-Strausz’s second part continues the tradition of scholarship on architecture as socially controlled space anchored in the work of Michel Foucault. A recent, methodologically similar study is Carla Yanni’s Architecture of Madness (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), which treats nineteenth-century American asylums in the context of evolving medical and societal views of insanity and its treatment.

Hotel’s final, third section comprises three chapters that broadly expand on the argument of the first two. The eighth chapter deals with the American hotel’s enabling role in national life as the preferred site for all manner of political events, business meetings, and conventions of private organizations devoted to varied social and religious causes. The ninth chapter argues that hotels were a key influence on the development of the apartment house as a socially acceptable setting for middle- and upper-class domesticity. Here the closest link in existing literature is to Paul Groth’s recent monograph on residential hotels, an important building type that had been all but totally neglected. The culminating chapter, on hotels as sites of social protest from the Civil Rights Act of 1875 to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, integrates the book’s earlier themes, especially the legal issues that governed public space and that became a focus for efforts at political change. This last chapter reinforces the centrality of hotels in American national social history, which established their high profile in the renegotiation of the question of race in public places. This chapter also underscores how, in general, the historiography of American architecture has failed in its efforts to integrate race into its discourse. We now have pioneering studies of African American architects, the vernacular building types and landscapes of ante-bellum plantations, and the role of racial politics in both the modern development and historical memory of individual cities. But by and large we do not yet have histories that critically examine whiteness as an implicit assumption in the creation of American built environments. One notable recent exception is Martin Berger, Sight Unseen: Whiteness and American Visual Culture (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

Overall, the intellectual structure of Hotel is extremely well thought out and admirably clear in its thinking and writing. It is also a well-edited and produced book that is reasonably priced.

This book suggests several especially fruitful questions for future study. One is the relationship between American and European hotels. The author states (p. 9): “While I do not embrace American exceptionalism, I do agree with historical observers that the hotel as it was invented and developed in the United States was a unique institution.” We need to fill out the picture with comparable literature on European hotels. There are studies of palatial hotels.1 Yet to test the basic thesis of the special nature of the type in the United States, we need more thorough comparative work like Sandoval-Strausz’s that goes beyond the large palatial hotels and digs deeply into social history.

A second important issue that this book suggests is in need of restudy is the careers of major hotel architects, such as Morris Lapidus and John Portman. It would help if such studies, while focused primarily on architecture, engaged with the range of social issues that Hotel navigates so deftly by considering these buildings as a vernacular category. Helpful recent essays along these
lines appear in *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts 25: The American Hotel*, edited by Molly W. Berger in 2005. Also, hotel networks in major individual cities might bevaluably studied, as in Robert Stern’s and his co-authors’ volumes on New York City’s architecture. Perhaps an ideal historiography would link specifically architectural analysis with consideration of the mix of theoretical, political, and social-historical issues found in *Hotel*.

Another large, open question that this book asks concerns the transformation of the hotel as a type in the postwar eras of modernist and more recent architecture. This book’s center of gravity chronologically is the nineteenth century, yet its methods of analysis could shed light on a wide range of more recent variations in the world’s hotels on issues of travel, behavior, and public space. The global political role of post-war buildings is helpfully treated in such works as Annabel Jane Wharton’s *Building the Cold War: Hilton International* (New York: The Architectural League of New York, 1998). Another large, open question that this book asks concerns the transformation of the hotel as a type in the postwar eras of modernist and more recent architecture.

The triangular pediment, derived from the late second century BC on, arches marked the finished product as monumental. The repetition of Roman models—sometimes despite local opposition—testified to the patron’s familiarity with the latest architectural innovations in the capital and expressed his loyalty to the empire. Architects designed buildings and directed their construction, but there was no organized architectural profession. In the Greek East, an architect was at times a local magistrate, a cult member, a military man, or even, occasionally, a professional architect. In the West, architects were normally professionals, but they came from various classes. Some were slaves or freedmen. Others, freeborn, but perhaps of lower social standing, were called only “builders” and had local careers. Yet, as Vitruvius indicates, many architects were well-educated professionals. Viewing design as a path to social advancement, they probably traveled widely and were acquainted with the most famous designs of their day. Some were as well known as the great architects of the Hellenistic age whose names appeared in Roman architectural treatises of the first century BC.

Thomas’s part two, “Monuments of City and Empire,” begins with an examination of the character of the Antonine city. Walls established its boundaries; they expressed its form; they established and symbolized its identity. Gates—such as the Gate of Hadrian at Antalya (Attalia), Turkey and the Porta Nigra in Trier—were major public monuments. Inside the walls, the enormous crowds and vast

**Edmund Thomas**

**Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age**


In his introduction, Edmund Thomas defines architectural “monumentality” (1–14). While moderns take the term to mean “either that the building is physically imposing or that it is a memorial of the past” (4), for the Romans of the age of the Antonines (AD 98–193) a *monumentum* had other important qualities. It was durable; it perpetuated the name of a builder or patron; its character exceeded ordinary utility; it recalled and inculcated social norms; it represented and advanced the social ambitions of subjects and emperors. The large scale, rare and expensive foreign colored marbles, and gilding and gilded bronze of such buildings embodied the wealth and success of Antonine society. Amazing and visually edifying their visitors, these monuments, with their rational and elevated character, at once sacred and profane, were, for their builders, connected with the gods and with the very structure of the universe. Thomas’s characterizations of these Antonine structures, particularly those in Asia Minor, attempt to demonstrate how their designers attained these lofty goals in three dimensions.

Part one, “Monumental Form,” considers the way in which Romans conceived a structure. Design and building were a form of intellectual play, but particular features marked the finished product as monumental. Long connected in the Greek world with temples, the columnar orders stood for divinity and later, since their materials and construction were expensive, for the power of the state. Used for honorary monuments from the late second century BC on, arches were associated with military achievement. The triangular pediment, derived from temples, sanctified other buildings (the house of Julius Caesar, for example). Size and height demanded attention, marking a building as exceptional. In the hands of a Roman builder, *aedificatio*, or the combination and use of such potent symbols, was ludic, a “game”—and a social competition.

For the wealthy private patron, domestic architecture symbolized social standing. The signs of high social rank—colonnades, mosaics, and foreign marbles—reflected the decor of state buildings, and their beauty—like the physical beauty of an individual—indicated moral excellence. In public buildings—temples, theaters, basilicas, and baths—size, complexity, fine workmanship, imported marbles, and statues of the gods and emperors embellished richly decorated spaces. Incorporating arresting views, these structures promoted the social advancement of their patrons, serving as visual proofs of personal worth, taste, vast wealth, social position, and imperial connections. And the repetition of Roman models—sometimes despite local opposition—testified to the patron’s familiarity with the latest architectural innovations in the capital and expressed his loyalty to the empire.

Architects designed buildings and directed their construction, but there was no organized architectural profession. In the Greek East, an architect was at times a local magistrate, a cult member, a military man, or even, occasionally, a professional architect. In the West, architects were normally professionals, but they came from various classes. Some were slaves or freedmen. Others, freeborn, but perhaps of lower social standing, were called only “builders” and had local careers. Yet, as Vitruvius indicates, many architects were well-educated professionals. Viewing design as a path to social advancement, they probably traveled widely and were acquainted with the most famous designs of their day. Some were as well known as the great architects of the Hellenistic age whose names appeared in Roman architectural treatises of the first century BC.

Thomas’s part two, “Monuments of City and Empire,” begins with an examination of the character of the Antonine city. Walls established its boundaries; they expressed its form; they established and symbolized its identity. Gates—such as the Gate of Hadrian at Antalya (Attalia), Turkey and the Porta Nigra in Trier—were major public monuments. Inside the walls, the enormous crowds and vast
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**Note**