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The preferred debate of the history of modern architecture, between the winner and the design by Bauhaus director Walter Gropius, is shown to be a product of Gropius' self-promotion. It is unlikely that the jury ever saw Gropius' drawings, and in any case the jury was indifferent to those functionalist schemes that did arrive on time. Solomonson reviews Sullivan's writings about appropriate windows for different building types and the zoning restrictions that banned habitable space above 260 feet. In so doing, she demolishes any claim for rational expression on behalf of Gropius' design, with its "department store" windows showing equal disregard for function at the office floors and at the thirteen uninhabited floors of the upper tower.

The book also treats the construction and later life of the Tribune Tower site, the reception of the Tribune competition and building in popular culture, and the role of the developing corporate culture in the skyscraper city. Illustrations are particularly generous and well reproduced. The postscript reviews the historiography of the Tribune Tower competition. Part of the Cambridge Press series "Modern Architecture and Cultural Identity", it ably fulfills the series mandate to explore "the complex interplay between modern identity and local, regional, national and related cultural traditions."
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Naquin's magisterial study explores the central place of temples and general religious life within the social, cultural, and physical geography of Peking during the Ming (1368-1643 CE) and Qing (1644-1911) dynasties. Contemporaries, readers familiar with the now-standard mainland Chinese hanyu pinyin romanization "Beijing", may find the older style "Peking" incongruously replete with Western associations and bias. Yet, as Naquin notes, the appellation "Peking", with its long history in European languages, is as arbitrary as "Jingshi" (Capital city) or the various other Chinese names by which the city was known during this 500-year period. Naming her subject "Peking" emphasizes the inadequacy of any single name to encompass the discontinuities and shifting identities of this grand city's successive transformations.

Consisting of a preface, sixteen topical chapters, and an epilogue, the text traces the changing valuation of particular temple sites and the genius "temples" within the shifting constructions of Peking as a physical and imagined place. Several chapters focus on the significant influence of imperial patronage, whether through an elaborate bureaucratic system of registering deities and providing annual temple subsidies, or the individual piety of members of the dynastic house. These activities fostered state penetration of Peking society and earned it a reputation for benevolence, especially when imperial support favored locally popular deities. At other times, imperial patronage explicitly furthered state policy, as during the Qing, when munificent support for existing and new Tibetan Buddhist temples reflected the dynasty's claims to suzerainty over Tibet.

This work augments the long-established focus on the family and the state with research on the still largely unknown early modern Chinese world that lay beyond. Naquin demonstrates how temples constituted the site and substance of communal life. Peking was highly compartmentalized by class, courtyard walls, ethnic and native place identities, family networks, and creed. The 2,564 known Buddhist, Daoist, Christian, Muslim, and local folk temples (400-700 seem to have existed at any given time) both reflected and transcended these divisions. The Ming and Qing states widely supervised all cities, Peking in particular, to arrest the development of autonomous political and civic organizations, which were assumed to be potentially seditious. Peking was celebrated for its open urban scenery, e.g., the expansive Forbidden City palace, imperial park and altar complexes, the development and social import of which Naquin examines. Yet these sites were closed to the public (especially during the Qing, when the northern "Inner City" was officially reserved for Manchu banner personnel) and the city lacked other large open areas. Temples and their compounds thus provided a rare form of public space and were used by urban residents for a wide array of activities — state functions, public charity, marketing, pilgrimage, politics, and leisure. Naquin highlights the different capacities of urban society to organize itself and intervenes in recent debates on the applicability of work on the European public sphere. She suggests that while inanously public, the autocratic reach of state power limits the relevance of Habermas and should move us to appreciate the different structure of late imperial civil society.

This study is a tour de force of scholarly dedication and imagination. Students of late imperial China face a relative dearth of social history sources — the journals, diaries, broadsheets, and pamphlets that have enabled the vital historiography on Europe and Japan are few or non-existent. Naquin has overcome this deficit through scrupulous consideration of a wide-range of sources, including a particularly dogged examination of inscriptions in stone and metal on steles, bells, and walls. These often overlooked, far-flung sources provide Naquin evidence of the presence and actions of the varied multitude, otherwise unknown, who favored particular gods, frequented specific temples, and participated in the lay associations that dominated organized religious life. Naquin thus constructs a vivid, holistic portrait of disparate actors, for example, powerful, long-lived empress dowagers, eunuchs whose incapacity to father children moved them to endow temples to care for their spirit tablets in perpetuity, pious widows, successful merchants, and prelates as connected through their religious belief and practice.

Despite these virtues, one must admit that this is a dauntingly thick tome. Yet, as Naquin herself notes, it is both overly long and too brief. I anticipate that many readers will, like me, adopt
the latter view. Naquin’s wonderfully written text conveys an immense amount of information and offers trenchant analysis, which only whets the appetite for even more extended discussion. Researchers will mine this book as a historiographic milestone and basic source for detailed information and reference materials for some time to come. It will be a touchstone for all future work on Peking and Chinese cities as a whole. However, the book may prove especially valuable for readers outside the field. By crafting a theoretically informed and richly detailed, yet almost encyclopedic, study of Peking, Naquin has made this amazing city and the general history of late imperial Chinese cities newly accessible to non-China specialists. This contribution should help correct the Western myopia of much comparative research and theoretical discussion by bringing the urban experience of late imperial China into dialogue with ongoing debates on the nature of civil society, popular religion, and state power in the early modern and modern periods.
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Richmond’s Monument Avenue is a beautifully produced book, with a large format and many well-printed color photographs. Produced with the support of local historical associations, it represents, in a sense, a celebration of Monument Avenue’s 1998 designation as a National Historic Landmark. For a book of this type, basically an architectural history, the subject matter is unusual: a single streetscape rather than an architecturally significant building or historic district. True, it is an elite streetscape, built by, and for, wealthy people, but no famous architect designed its plan and most of its buildings were designed by little-remembered local architects. Such a study is a welcome addition to the cultural landscape literature.

Within this context, however, Monument Avenue is a difficult subject matter. True to its name, it is a street of monuments, four out of six of which depict confederate civil war heroes – Robert E. Lee, J.E.B. Stuart, Stonewall Jackson, and Jefferson Davis. Erected at successive street intersections by local civic groups between 1890 and 1919, they were meant to celebrate the memory of the “Lost Cause.” Not surprisingly, Monument Avenue had a long history of deed restrictions against black ownership or tenure. Interestingly, the most recent statue, erected in 1996, depicts and celebrates the life of the black tennis star Arthur Ashe, who was born in Richmond. These potent facts demand a sensitive and critical approach to historical analysis and documentation. The authors do the former well, particularly in the discussion about the circumstances surrounding the Ashe monument and the goals associated with it, but not the latter, pointing instead to cultural studies done by others. While social criticism may not have been the project the authors set for themselves, the book would have benefited from a broader social focus within the bounds of an architectural history. That being said, the book has much to offer. It is organized into five thematic chapters: Origins; The Statues; Building a Neighborhood; House, Styles and Architects; and Influence, Decline and Rebirth. Each provides a succinct, mostly chronological discussion of its subject matter.

A detailed story is told about the processes by which the statues were designed – how the sculptors were selected, who they were, and, most interestingly, how the statue designs were modified to meet public expectations. For readers interested in the history of city planning and the development of American urban form, the book provides an informative account of the street’s subdivision, which illuminates how such processes occurred in American cities in the late 19th century and early 20th century subdivision. We learn that three different families owned consecutive tracts of land through which the street passed and each subdivided their land differently. This had both major and subtle impacts on what was built. The book provides a rich description of the buildings along the street and biographical detail of the architects who designed them, effectively showing how a cohesive whole was achieved through what was in fact great variety, as the more eclectic responses of local, often self-trained architects mixed side-by-side with the more academically correct styles of several big name New York architects.

We are told, as well, of what lies behind the house facades. We are taken into the great halls, with their lavish stairways in dramatic entrances, and formal public rooms. However, we learn little of the rear servants quarters and outbuildings. This is an area where a broader focus would have enriched the study, especially since a plan of the street indicates that part of Monument Avenue shared the unusual alley-block configuration of the adjacent Fan District neighborhood where block centers housed black communities. There are other stories that are not told. A feature that sets Monument Avenue apart is the wide tree-lined mall that runs down its center. More contextual discussion of the origins and evolution of streets of this type would have been useful. Commonwealth Avenue in Boston, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, is cited as the precedent. But that street was much wider and its central mall was designed with a pedestrian walkway intended for promenades, whereas Monument Avenue’s mall was planted with grass. There were strong community-making goals as well as aesthetic goals associated with Olmsted’s design that may not have been fully translated to the Richmond context.

A more conspicuous missing story is what the public space of the street was like and how it was used. It would be helpful to know such things as the dimensions of the street’s cross-sectional elements, how the roadways and sidewalks were surfaced, and the types of trees and their spacing. The 1860s to 1920s, when the street was laid out and developed, was a time of rapidly changing transportation technologies.
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