These are samplings of the narratives that I was able to tease from the text. I learned much, but the reading was difficult. Overall, the book lacks coherent organization and consists of impenetrable prose awkwardly translated from the Italian. Even more frustrating is the lack of critical commentary on the archival material, which is simply presented at face value, often leaving the reader with the impression that the opinions quoted, especially regarding chemistry and archaeology, are true in cases where we now know them to be wrong. The book is heavily illustrated with nicely reproduced color images of the archival drawings, but unfortunately the images are not referenced in the text. This volume provides a valuable resource, especially for those who already know the subject and the period and who are looking for documentary evidence, but readers of all types will find that extracting the information is a challenging endeavor.

LYNNE C. LANCASTER
Ohio University

Note
1. Gargiani points out that the desire to attribute the invention of artificial stone to the ancients can still be seen today (11n2). For example, as recently as 2008, Joseph Davvidov proposed that the limestone blocks of the Great Pyramid were artificially produced. Joseph Davvidov, “Geopolymer Chemistry and Applications,” 4th ed. (Saint-Quentin, France: Institut Géopolymère, 2008), 367–86.

Matthew M. Reeve, ed., Tributes to Pierre du Prey: Architecture and the Classical Tradition, from Pliny to Postentity

“The classical tradition meanders in and out of the history of architecture, sometimes looping back upon itself as if to suggest that time has stood still,” Pierre de la Ruffinière du Prey notes at the opening of Hawksmoor’s London Churches: Architecture and Theology.1 In that book, du Prey explores how the buildings of the early Christians, although known to Nicholas Hawksmoor only through texts and drawings, inspired the idiosyncratic Anglican churches that Hawksmoor designed in the early eighteenth century. The question of renewed relevance that underpins du Prey’s Hawksmoor study, as well as much of his other work, also ties together the sixteen essays of Tributes to Pierre du Prey, edited by Matthew M. Reeve. One of the strengths of this Fest-schrift is its coherence.

An opening essay by Mark Wilson Jones lays out the stakes by posing a dual question: Why do the orders have the forms that they do, and why has that problem proven so intriguing for writers from Vitruvius to the present? He then surveys the various possible origins of three architectural elements—fluting, the Ionic capital, and the Doric frieze—to argue for a multivalent understanding of the orders. Although no single justification for the architectural form of the orders has been produced, Wilson Jones asserts that contradictory explanations can reinforce each other rather than cancel each other out.

The title of Guy P. R. Métraux’s essay, “Some Other Literary Villas of Roman Antiquity besides Pliny’s,” recalls du Prey’s book The Villas of Pliny from Antiquity to Postentity, a magisterial examination of the influence of Pliny the Younger’s letters on country house design.2 Métraux supplies context for Pliny’s letters, which describe Tuscan and Laurentine villas, by describing the letters of Seneca the Younger, written about forty years before Pliny’s, and of Sidonius Apollinaris, written four centuries later. In placing Pliny within a broader ekphrastic tradition, Métraux shows how his letters belonged to but also criticized an epistolary genre. Mistakes of historical interpretation have fascinated architectural historians for so long that they have become their own genre: the Florentine Baptistry, an eleventh-century building that was believed in the Renaissance to be an ancient Roman temple, is the canonical example. In “The Tempietto del Cistunno and San Salvatore near Spoleto: Ancient Roman Imperial Columnar Display in Medieval Contexts,” Judson J. Emerick considers two other early medieval Christian buildings that have been similarly misinterpreted as ancient, including by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and by Francesco di Giorgio. But Emerick does not end his story in the Renaissance; he discusses more recent efforts to place (or misplace) the buildings near Spoleto within particular historical contexts, in order to critique the practice of periodization itself as the most fundamental type of misinterpretation. Eric Fernie’s essay, “Romanesque Historiography and the Classical Tradition,” reinforces this point. Fernie charts the meanings of the terms romanesco and romanesca as they have been applied variously for half a millennium.

The next two essays examine cases of formal recirculating, or episodes in which specific architectural tropes have been deployed as explicit references to their own historical legacies. John Beldon Scott’s “Uses of the Past: Charles V’s Roman Triumph and Its Legacy” traces the route of the Holy Roman emperor’s entry into Rome that took place on 5 April 1536. Modeled on an ancient triumph, the event is the last one counted in Onofrio Panvinio’s 1557 chronology of Roman triumphs, a list that begins with Romulus. Scott shows how after the city of Rome was reshaped around the particular event of Charles V’s entry, the practice of the passeo, the papal triumph in which a new pope proceeds from Saint Peter’s to the Lateran, developed in response. Examining a set of events that took place on a single site over the next four centuries, he demonstrates how physical strata also accumulate the metaphorical weight of political overtones. For Scott, the passeo becomes the “living link” between Charles V’s triumph and Hitler’s entry into Rome in 1938. In “Classicism in a Rococo World: Steadfastness and Compromise in Late Colonial South America,” Gauvin Alexander Bailey considers how the orders themselves constituted another kind of link when certain forms popular in sixteenth-century Roman architectural practice were reused in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century South America. Focusing on projects by Giovanni Andrea Bianchi (1676–1740), who traveled from Rome to Argentina, and Giovanni Battista Primoli (1673–1747), who worked on the Paraguay Reductions, or mission towns, Bailey asks why models that were by then out of date in Rome, such as Serlio’s Doric order, were applied to new church façades. He argues that these models, rather than referring to specific historical moments, refer to “a more generic Golden Age,” that is, to Augustan Rome at the time of Christ’s birth (107).
a quotation from Tommaso Porcacchi, who described his collaborator Porro as possessing “the most acute eye, but of imperfect vision.” Porro worked as an engraver on L’isola più famose del mondo (1572) and the Funerali antichi diversi popoli et nationi (1574), both encyclopedic publications that, as Hickson argues, “operated as mirrors of the world, painstakingly indexed and represented . . . but imperfectly seen and comprehended when viewed through the controlling eye of Venice itself” (114). Her meditation on the aims of geographic representation is followed by Una Roman D’Elia’s “Acanthus Leaves and Ostrich Feathers: Claude Perrault, Tradition, and Innovation in Architectural Language,” an essay that in many ways fulfills Wilson Jones’s request for more elastic considerations of the orders and their origins. D’Elia investigates Perrault’s decision to decorate the Corinthian capital of his French order with ostrich feathers rather than with the more traditional acanthus leaves. She provides a rich background for that curious choice, including the anatomical studies that Perrault performed at the Académie des Sciences as well as the historical associations of the ostrich feather itself, from the book of Job to Egyptian hieroglyphs.

Each of two further essays contextualizes a pair of previously unpublished drawings within an architect’s career. In “Classical Themes and Creative Variations from the Sixteenth Century: Two Unpublished Drawings of Palace Façades Related to Giulio Romano,” David McTavish examines drawings that once formed part of Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Museo Cartaceo and tentatively attributes them to Jacopo Strada. He associates one drawing with the Palazzo Te in Mantua and describes the other as a related façade design that also recalls Raphael’s destroyed Palazzo dell’Aquila. Janina Knight, in “Two Drawings by Giovanni Battista Montano in the Canadian Centre for Architecture,” places drawings of reconstructed Roman tombs within Montano’s oeuvre. She discusses the architect’s antiquarian activities as the basis for his imaginative graphic reformulations of ancient monuments in drawings that merge the real and the fictive.

As John Pinto points out in “Ruins and Restitution: Eighteenth-Century Architects and Antiquity in the Bay of Naples,” du Prey’s work continually explores how the reconstruction of the ancient world has served as an architectural design brief. Rather than using an ancient text as his starting point, as du Prey does in The Villas of Pliny, Pinto begins with an ancient site, considering how Giovanni Battista Piranesi and Hubert Robert, among others, responded to a set of ruins near Pozzuoli. He describes their various representations of these fragmentary remains as embodying a tension between two modes: positivist documentation of a fundamentally archaeological type and inventive restoration of a more subjective nature. Pinto discusses each architectural response as a calibrated combination of these two, demonstrating how topographical drawing itself can reflect an entire worldview privileging both accuracy and imagination. Matthew Reeve structures his essay, “A Gothic Vaccine of Greece and Rome: Horace Walpole, Strawberry Hill, and the Narratives of Gothic,” around a similar theme of evocative restoration. He describes the setting of Walpole’s novel The Castle of Otranto: A Gothic Story (1764–65) as a “literary double identity for his house,” the villa Strawberry Hill at Twickenham (189). Reeve emphasizes the experiential character of both the novel and the house, explaining how narrative works in textual and spatial contexts to dismantle anticipated formal hierarchies.

Essays by Peter Coffman and Luc Noppen examine the architecture of Canada, another topic that has been central to du Prey’s career. In “The Gibbsian Tradition in Nova Scotia,” Coffman follows the United Empire Loyalists, who, as part of a wave of reaction against the revolution in the American colonies, settled in the Annapolis Valley of Nova Scotia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As these British loyalists established their presence in their new homeland, they sought an architectural language that would signal their anti-republican ideology. This meant erecting churches modeled on James Gibbs’s St Martin-in-the-Fields (1721–26) of London, which in the previous half century had become the archetype for Church of England parish buildings. By the end of the eighteenth century, Coffman explains, republican dissent already had an identifiable architectural identity, embodied by the Protestant meeting house (214). In following the Gibbsian model for their own churches, loyalists used the standard visual code of Anglican theological presence, which at that time had become synonymous with the English government’s presence. Coffman’s case studies demonstrate how, in this reactionary climate, even the most basic aspects of theological space assumed the functions of political symbols. In “Thomas Baillairgé and Victor Bourgeau: Architects, Architectural Practice, and the Nineteenth-Century French-Canadian Church in Quebec,” Noppen also takes an oppositional approach to his subjects. Although Baillairgé and Bourgeau have been positioned in the past as paradigmatic of a Quebec City–Montreal cultural rivalry, Noppen discusses them not as antagonists but rather as products of two different professional paths, one a formally trained draftsman, the other an unschooled carpenter.

Two essays on modern appropriations of the classical tradition round out the volume. Sebastian Schütze, in “The Stadio dei Marmi in Rome: Inventing a Classical Stage for the Colossal Heroes of Fascist Italy,” discusses the sculptural program of the stadium of the Accademia Nazionale Fascista di Educazione Fisica in Rome as the embodiment of the uomo fascista. Completed between 1930 and 1938, the figures arranged around the stadium boundary referenced the forms of older sculptural traditions, from antiquity to Michelangelo and Bandinelli, to create new ideals of modern athletes. Schütze uses historical photographs to show that through the figures’ monumental scale and low placement, statues and spectators stood nearly on the same level. “The aggressive, archetypal new man is presented on the classicizing stage of the stadium,” Schütze writes, “thus apparently linked with, and legitimated by, tradition” (235). Attempts to legitimate Fascist ideology through aesthetic analogies to the classical tradition made that tradition anathema to an entire generation of postwar architects, as Phyllis Lambert observes in her essay, “Mies Klassizismus: Some Notes.” In a series of case studies, she examines the internal battle that Ludwig Mies van der Rohe waged against his predecessors, particularly Karl Friedrich Schinkel and Peter Behrens, as emblematic of a larger conflict about the role of historical models in modernism.

In a postlude, du Prey writes of his own predecessors, from his mentor Donald Drew Egbert to his contemporary Robert Venturi. He thus situates himself within the classical tradition that the essays in his
In 2008, Austrian architect, theorist, and scholar Günther Feuerstein published a volume titled Urban Fiction: Strolling through Ideal Cities from Antiquity to the Present Day. The book combined visual evidence from historical illustrations and written evidence into a series of playful descriptions of what it might be like to wander through unbuilt places of utopian imagination. By rendering these fictional cities in a fictional fashion, Feuerstein adopted a unique strategy to avoid one of the problems that has long haunted would-be scholars of utopian architecture: how to subject the buildings of literature to visual evidence from the formal and historical analyses that are the tools of architectural historians. This problem has encouraged past historians to concentrate on ideal cities that have been visually rendered in some capacity, as with Ruth Eaton’s copiously illustrated Ideal Cities: Utopia and the (Un)Built Environment (2002) and Helen Rosenau’s narrower but more rigorous The Ideal City: Its Architectural Evolution (1972). One of the issues with utopian images, however, is that they often suffer from a lack of fidelity to the texts they are meant to illustrate, perhaps most famously in the case of Thomas More’s seminal Utopia (1516), early editions of which featured a frontispiece depicting conventionalized representations of Renaissance cities bearing almost no likeness to the Utopian towns described in the book. Tessa Morrison attempts to tackle both the methodological problem of formally analyzing written architecture and the analytical problem of reconciling illustrations with texts in her new book, Unbuilt Utopian Cities 1460 to 1900. She does so by creating digital models for ten ideal cities (four from the Renaissance and six from the age of industry), all of which, she argues, are “representative of their time” (xv). Like Feuerstein, she synthesizes both visual and textual architectural evidence; unlike Feuerstein, however, Morrison attempts to create visual architecture, which requires her to fill in some of the gaps left by the illustrations and the texts, and, in moments of contradiction between the two, to grant one precedence over the other. This is a challenging project, and the terms of success are never made clear. Scholarship and scholarly art making vie with each other to define the book; neither loses completely, but neither wins.

Unbuilt Utopian Cities began as an experimental survey that Morrison and Mark Rubin conducted in 2014 “to test whether the philosophies that were embedded into [historical utopian] cities are apparent to a modern audience.” The researchers showed a group of undergraduates digital representations of utopian cities and asked for their impressions. The results do not seem to have been particularly revealing, with students from many points on the political spectrum applauding the orderliness of the overall urban forms while generally criticizing the architectural monotony. One of the lessons of these findings may be that it is difficult to extract a specific political philosophy from architecture presented in a contextual vacuum. Morrison and Rubin may have been better served by engaging with the scholarship on the problem of reader response, not least Kenneth M. Roemer’s Utopian Audiences: How Readers Locate Nowhere (2003), but there is no evidence of such scholarly foundation work, either in the survey or in the monograph that Morrison has developed from it.

Happily, the monograph includes discussions of the politics motivating the utopian visions in question. Each chapter is dedicated to a single utopia and is composed in roughly the same manner: historical background on the utopian vision is presented, followed by a summary of the vision’s political philosophy, and finally a description of the architecture and brief explanation of the reconstruction. Many original illustrations are provided, most redrawn by the author (presumably to avoid fees for publication rights). Morrison usually does a good job in covering the background and political philosophy, but the relationships among the different segments—historical context, political philosophy, and the architecture and urbanism itself—are often left unarticulated.

This positions the book in some ways as a continuation of the initial experiment, or perhaps as a very rich catalogue for a creative exhibition, in which readers/viewers are equipped with a backstory and then left to wander through the architecture imaginatively on their own. The single-file case study format of the book—not uncommon among works that deal with this topic—facilitates a rewarding in-depth focus on specific visionary utopias and their reasons for proposing utopian reforms, but it also segregates them from one another, obscuring some connections and compelling Morrison to repeat herself when visions have a great deal in common.

A foreword by Michael J. Ostwald and preface and introduction by Morrison set an imperfect stage for what follows, partly because the authors never define their core terms or acknowledge any of the existing scholarship on ideal cities, and partly because they offer cursory summaries of early utopian urbanisms that are sometimes inaccurate. Morrison states, for example, that Atlantis was Plato’s “ideal city” (xvi). While it is true that the ringed urban plan of Atlantis was spectacular, Plato described the city as politically corrupt—his kallipolis, or “good city,” was essentially an ideal Athens. More important is the conspicuous lack of discussion of the Judeo-Christian tradition of the New Jerusalem. This is surprising given that Morrison has herself produced scholarship on this very topic, referring to the New Jerusalem as “the ultimate utopian city” and explicating its enduring influence in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe. The exploration of late Renaissance utopias at the start of this book is hampered by a lack of full engagement with the role played by the idea of the New Jerusalem in sixteenth-century millennialism, in the birth of natural science, and in the attendant pansophic movement. The only exception is found in the discussion of Tommaso Campanella’s City of the Sun from 1602, which Morrison thoughtfully compares with Juan Bautista