which the neologisms, such as geunchuk (architecture) and hanok, were coined. Jung's book can be read productively alongside rich scholarship on Asian modern architecture, with specific attention to the formulation of their cultural identities in the face of Western colonial expansion, aggressive modernization, postcolonial challenges, and globalization. It would be valuable to learn about the establishment and operation of modern institutions and educational programs in the early stage of Korea's architectural profession within a larger context of modern Asian architecture.

Jung presents a periodized history that is structured less by architecture's formal changes than by Korea's sociopolitical events. This periodization, which considers Korean colonization (pre-1945), the country's rapid development (1961–88), and globalization (after the mid-1990s), is useful in constructing a social history of Korean architecture. Such a strategy, however, is in part impeded by the omission of architectural practices of the two key moments from his account: the years after the liberation and Korean War (1945–60) and the years around South Korea's Democracy Movement (from the late 1980s to early 1990s). Despite the lack of significant building projects, these transitional periods, which the author simply calls "two thick fault lines" (xi), witnessed the profession's active participation in public discourses, such as issues of overcoming colonialism, ideological conflicts, the division of Korea into north and south, and massive political protests. An examination of these critical moments would have expanded our understanding of the relationship between architecture and society at each phase of the country's modernization, making Jung's politicized periodization more convincing.

Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea provides numerous illustrations, including maps, plans, and photographs, although larger images with better quality would have been more advantageous. It also contains a short biographical index of selective Korean architects and urban planners, and a bibliography refers readers to the books and periodicals published in Korean, Japanese, French, and English. This text will be welcomed by the scholars and students who have long waited for a survey text in Korean modern architecture and urban studies. It will also be useful to those interested in the development of modern architecture in non-Western contexts in general.

HYUNJUNG CHO
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST)

Notes
1. Jung himself previously wrote two excellent monographs on Chung-Up Kim and Swoo-Geun Kim, key figures in modern Korean architecture who represented the two competing positions in the debate over tradition. If Chung-Up Kim represented a tendency for reinterpreting the formal elements of traditional architecture, Swoo-Geun Kim represented a tendency for reconfiguring its spatial concepts. Inha Jung, Kim Sung-jae's kǒnch'ŭng mon: Han'guk kǒnch'ŭng üi saceun inpyŏbyŏng [Swoo-Geun Kim: In search of modern ideal types] (Seoul: Migeonsa, 1996); Inha Jung, Kim Chung-op kǒnch'ŏng mon: nich'ŏk ullim üi saceun [Chung-up Kim: World of Poetic Resonance] (Seoul: Sanŏp To 소[email] Ch'ulp'ŏn Kongsa, 2000).


3. For the readers of Korean, see Pong-hui Chŏn and Yong-ch'ŏn Kwŏn, Hanok kwa Han'guk êch'ut'ak üi yŏksa [Hanok and a history of housing] (Kyŏnggido P'aju-si: Tongnyǒk, 2012).

Amanda Reeser Lawrence
James Stirling: Revisionary Modernist
New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2012, 248 pp., 129 b/w illus. $45 (cloth), ISBN 9780300170054

Amanda Reeser Lawrence's book about the architecture of James Stirling deftly explicates the work of a master who belongs in the canon but whose place within it has not yet been found. Stirling (1926–92) was associated with the New Brutalism of the 1950s, but his turn to postmodernism in the 1970s made him difficult to categorize. In James Stirling: Revisionary Modernist, Lawrence frames her study of selected works with the question, was Stirling a modernist or a postmodernist? She argues for him being a “revisionary modernist,” maintaining that Stirling continuously revised or corrected previous modernists’ works and, eventually, even his own in what can be understood as an act comparable to rewriting.

For her interpretation, Lawrence turns to The Anxiety of Influence (1973) by Harold Bloom, whose landmark literary theory complicated the concept of influence by showing that it was a transformative process in which young, weak, ephebic poets overcame the presence of strong masters of the past by rewriting and, in fact, improving or correcting their works (Wordsworth rewrites Milton. Eventually, having become strong poets themselves, they begin to rewrite their own earlier works. Close reading was the basis of Bloom’s method: the text itself, separate from historical or biographical circumstances, becomes all that matters. Such hermeneutics was countered by the New Historicism of Stephen Greenblatt, for example, who turned to history to help explain Shakespeare’s plays as cultural formations.

Lawrence makes a good case for reading selected projects by Stirling using Bloom’s concepts and method. Her purpose is not to be comprehensive or biographical in interpreting Stirling because monographs and a biography already exist. A major exhibition in 2010 revealed new dimensions of Stirling’s work, but analysis is still lacking. Though nearly every significant critic and historian of the late twentieth century commented upon Stirling’s architecture, there are no in-depth explanations much less an overall theory to explain it and why it is noteworthy. Lawrence attempts to provide these things. She claims that Stirling’s understanding of history and employment of established forms and types were unique in architectural history. His “seemingly contradictory notion of a historically dependent modernism defines his singular contribution to twentieth-century architecture” (3). Adhering to modernist principles against explicit borrowing and copying, “he layered
and recombined references, stripping away their specificity and legibility” (4), resulting in a complex abstraction. Stirling never articulated such an explanation but left abundant material (much of it in the Canadian Centre for Architecture Archive) that provides the basis for Lawrence’s interpretation. As though thinking of future scholars, Stirling, from early on in his career, kept a notebook listing his influences for projects.

To support her thesis, Lawrence selects six projects from Stirling’s extensive oeuvre that she identifies as critical turning points in his career, such as the well-known Ham Common and the Leicester Engineering Building. All are from between 1955 and 1978, when his projects began to assume their most full-blown, postmodernist guise. The rigor of her method and research results in six beautifully written and powerfully argued chapters.

Lawrence makes engaging once-acclaimed buildings that are little understood today. Her first chapter examines Ham Common (1958), an apartment complex that seems little more than a puzzling copy of Le Corbusier’s Maisons Jaoul (1956). Lawrence believes that Stirling emulated the Maisons Jaoul in order to understand them. Stirling and his British contemporaries were dismayed and perplexed by Le Corbusier’s seemingly irrational postwar turn from the machine aesthetic to the rough-hewn béton brut with its surreal undercurrents. Showing the true chutzpah of the ephebe, Stirling corrected Le Corbusier’s mistakes, smoothing out the roughness and irrationality and thus pushing Ham Common into closer alignment with Le Corbusier’s own earlier rationalism. Essentially, Ham Common was Stirling’s improvement upon the Maisons Jaoul. To make her case, Lawrence performs a close reading of the elevations of Ham Common, explaining how elements like the clerestories between wall and roof reveal the differences between surfaces and materials. She parses the brickwork down to the pointing between the bricks. Such analysis is rarely found today in theoretically driven works of architectural history. It is, simultaneously, an old-fashioned classic, art historical technique, a Bloomian close reading, and an example of contemporary scholarship’s reengagement with the material object.

The six chapters build a strong case for Stirling as an architect who sought to broaden modernism’s scope by reengaging with historical form. Chapter 2 explains how the monumental but unbuilt Churchill College project (1959) at Cambridge University was an attempt to “interrogate—and update—the core tenets of the courtyard type” (59) that had been the basis of the school’s colleges since medieval times. Stirling, at the same time, drew upon the vernacular buildings he had long admired, especially the warehouses of his native Liverpool. In this way, he reinvigorated fundamental modernist principles, like functionalism, then on the wane. Thinking about the Englishness of university colleges and warehouses also gave Stirling further insights into regionalism, a modernist preoccupation virtually exhausted by the end of the 1950s. It is interesting how Stirling pondered subjects already intensively investigated abroad. This is an example of both his own belatedness and characteristic of the situation for the British, latecomers to modernism who initially struggled after World War II to catch up with international developments.

To show how Stirling caught up, Lawrence ingeniously ties together strands of postwar architectural discourse. She explains how Luigi Moretti’s plaster castings of the internal spaces of important historical buildings influenced Stirling’s Leicester Engineering Building (1963). In what also comes from a close reading of forms and surfaces corroborated by the commentary of critics such as Colin Rowe and Reyner Banham, Lawrence sees Stirling’s range of references at Leicester as corrections to projects by architects as varied as Konstantin Melnikov and Frank Lloyd Wright. Expanding upon Bloom’s model of how artists mature, Lawrence ably moves her narrative forward to show how Stirling advanced beyond mere quotation to achieve a synthesis resulting in “one enormous gesture” (Vincent Scully’s phrase, quoted on 121) in the Florey Building at Cambridge (1971).

Having thoroughly explained Sterling’s predilection for quotation, Lawrence is able to make a good case for seeing the range of references in his unbuilt museum for Düsseldorf (1975), not as postmodern contextualism but as Stirling’s own more nuanced “contexturalism,” a neologism for his conflation of context and texture. Working through Bloom’s influence theories to their finish, Lawrence concludes the book with Stirling rewriting his own works when he inserts thirty of his own projects into Noll’s eighteenth-century map of Rome for Roma Intervolta (1978), a project epitomizing postmodernism, where nine different architects were asked to reconceive sections of the plan of Rome. Elaborating upon his contextualism, Stirling painstakingly sited his buildings among the ruins of Rome. For Lawrence, this is not postmodernism at its most coyly self-referential, because Stirling’s Roma interrotta entry posed bigger ontological questions than those of his postmodernist contemporaries. Lawrence writes, “Stirling violates the entire system of influence and revision and most importantly the stability of the referent. What does it mean to revision yourself? And what does it mean to revision yourself if the project to which you are referring to is itself already a revision of something else?” (197).

Though persuasive, Lawrence’s reading is sometimes so inward looking and airtight that it brings to mind the hermeneutics described in Manfredo Tafuri’s “L’Architecture dans le Boudoir” (1974), a text that, in fact, surfaces in Lawrence’s discussions. Her chapters are almost formal readings, as eloquent as Bloom’s parsings. As she explains in her introduction, this book concerns only the projects themselves and only certain aspects of them. Her analysis concentrates upon elevations and particular drawing types, such as the axonometric. For a book that discusses specific buildings in such depth, there are unusually few photographs of interior spaces, and the accounts are very circumscribed. The necessary facts about client and site are briefly laid out and some avenues of architectural discourse are followed in an illuminating fashion, but there is deliberately no larger sense of historical forces or of Stirling himself. His Liverpool origins are mentioned briefly. The boisterous Stirling described in Mark Girouard’s biography is absent. The name Stirling...
functions only as a signifier in the text for the agent who makes the buildings. Lawrence is candid in her introduction about bypassing biographical detail in order to concentrate on selected projects, but this approach results in some surprising lacunae. For example, she never mentions the considerable time Stirling spent teaching at Yale during the years the book encompasses. This is an aspect of Stirling’s development that could have deepened her discussion about the strained postwar Anglo-American relationship. His World War II service also is not mentioned. In the Düsseldorf chapter, the reader realizes with surprise that Stirling must have been in the conflict when Lawrence remarks obliquely that it must have been significant for a British paratrooper to design a project for a bomb-devastated site in Germany. Nevertheless, Lawrence’s book is more than just a skillful exercise in method. It stands as a lucid, new interpretation of Stirling that raises the level of analysis about his architecture head and shoulders above the rest.

TIMOTHY M. ROHAN
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Notes

Mary Anne Hunting
Edward Durell Stone: Modernism’s Populist Architect

Although Edward Durell Stone’s work is highly visible, he remains relatively unknown to both general and architectural audiences. Mary Anne Hunting’s *Edward Durell Stone: Modernism’s Populist Architect* is an attempt fill that gap. To start, she reminds us that this lack of recognition was not always the case. During his career he was very well known as the designer of the original Museum of Modern Art building, the “lollipop” building on Columbus Circle, both in New York City, and the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C. Along with Eero Saarinen, Paul Rudolph, Philip Johnson, and Minoru Yamasaki, he was considered to be part of the much-maligned “ballet school” of architecture, whose members challenged modernist orthodoxy by championing expressive and ornamented forms. His late work, such as the American Embassy in India, incorporated highly patterned ornamental screens, a motif that was much copied.

In Hunting’s chronological narrative we also learn that Stone’s career was fueled by personal connections and media exposure. He grew up well-to-do in Fayetteville, Arkansas. He was a lifelong friend of J. William Fulbright, who, as a US senator, helped Stone secure a number of key government commissions. By all accounts, he was an affable and gifted colleague, “able to ‘draw anything except a sober breath,’” that is, until he quit drinking in the late 1950s. As a twenty-year-old he moved to Boston, where his brother was a practicing architect. His drawing ability landed him a job at Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott, where Henry Richard Shepley took him under his wing. In Boston he attended—but did not graduate from—Harvard and MIT, where he received a Beaux-Arts education. In both places he was a nonmatriculated special student. (As he admitted himself, he was never much of an academic.) It was Shepley who aided his admission to Harvard, and their relationship had a lasting influence: Shepley was on the juries that awarded Stone a Rotch Travelling Scholarship and, much later, the Indian Embassy commission.

After school and a tour of Europe, Stone found himself in New York City working for Wallace Harrison preparing drawings for the gilded art deco interiors of Radio City Music Hall and the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel (under Leonard Schultze). Sensing a cultural shift, during the Depression he designed a series of International Style houses for wealthy clients. He befriended Howard Meyers, the editor of *Architectural Forum*, who promoted the dissemination of his work and introduced him to Henry and Claire Boothe Luce.

These early houses and friendships helped Stone become the architect (in conjunction with Philip Goodwin) of the Museum of Modern Art’s building in Manhattan. Before and after World War II, he designed a number of long and low houses made of brick and wood; many of these were featured in the architectural and popular press. It was only in the 1950s that the symmetrically planned, concrete-screened, gold-white-and-red-decorated buildings became his signature style as embodied in the aforementioned embassy in India and the Kennedy Center.

These and many other facets of Stone’s life are presented in this thoroughly researched, well-documented, highly illustrated book. Hunting’s is the first dispasionate account of Stone’s career: a scholarly complement to the two autobiographical tomes Stone penned in the 1960s and the biography recently published by his youngest son. Perhaps Hunting’s most important contribution is to document the ways Stone leveraged his charisma and connections to become an effective architectural operative and media star. Here the book complements recent research on the similarly media-propelled careers of Eero Saarinen and Philip Johnson. It is also indebted to Alice Friedman’s *American Glamour and the Evolution of Modern Architecture* in its exploration of the “glamorization” of the modern style. In comparison to these books, however, Hunting’s account of Stone’s career is not as thoroughly historicized or theorized but instead attempts to reposition Stone’s legacy in an enthusiastic and well-written biography.

Stone’s work was widely published and reviewed from the 1930s, often in Lucerne publications such as *Architectural Forum* and *House & Home*. The Luces would become good friends and clients. Buckminster Fuller and Frank Lloyd Wright were also close acquaintances: there seem to be few who were not charmed by him. In the 1950s, his second wife, Maria—who officially acted as his publicist—transformed him into a media star, persuading him to change his name from Ed Stone to Edward Durell Stone. Like Saarinen and Yamasaki, he was on the cover of *Time* magazine and, like Johnson, was often on TV with appearances on the *Ed Sullivan,* etc.