

tional mapping and attention would have provided a more complete picture of Parthenay as a functioning town. It is also notable that greater attention is not given to the role played by monasteries in settling, cultivating, and populating the landscape. Parthenay's monastic bourgs are discussed, but again it is the churches that are highlighted. Monastic populations, like their secular counterparts (and often in collaboration with them), contributed to urban development and to settlement. All across Europe, monks were seen to work closely with secular patrons in the conversion of arable land at the edge of the forest. Many orders deliberately served and exploited urban parish populations as well as more remote suburban and rural dependencies. Much of Maxwell's description of Parthenay's architecture is focused upon the church alone (and on the decorative sculptures of church façades and capitals) rather than on the larger monastic settlement, omitting discussion of most claustral and service buildings, as well as dependent parishes, farms, and other properties. Finally, archaeological evidence is used, but not made prominent. Although Maxwell points to the layered aspect of the phases of urban construction (11), he largely ignores the stratigraphic evidence of urban archaeology that would have provided a sympathetic method. Such an approach is offered in Yves Esquieu's recent book on French towns.<sup>3</sup> Finally, it is surprising that the opportunity to produce new surveyed plans of the extant architecture of Parthenay was not taken.

Despite my wish that this book engage more fully with the material culture of urbanism beyond Parthenay's churches, it makes an important statement about the relationship of Romanesque to Gothic, and provides a magisterial survey of Parthenay's extant architecture and sculpture. It encourages us to reengage with the important questions about the rise of towns in Europe. The book is handsomely produced with excellent graphics and phased plans of Parthenay and the region. *The Art of Medieval Urbanism* will be the definitive statement on Parthenay and on visual approaches to urbanism, and will serve scholars and students well for years to come.

SHEILA BONDE  
Brown University

#### Notes

1. André Chédeville, Jacques Le Goff, and Jacques Rossiaud, *La ville médiévale: Des Carolingiens à la Renaissance* vol. 2 of *Histoire de la France urbaine*, ed. Georges Duby (Paris: Seuil, 1980); Robert Fossier, *Enfance de l'Europe: Aspects économique et sociaux* (Paris: Presses universitaires de la France, 1982), 2 vols.; Pierre Lavedan and Jeanne Huguency, *L'Urbanisme au moyen âge*, Bibliothèque de la Société Française d'Archéologie 5 (Geneva: Droz and Paris: Arts et Métiers Graphiques, 1974).
2. Henri Lefebvre, *La production de l'espace* (Paris: Editions Anthropos, 1974).
3. Yves Esquieu, *La Ville au Moyen Age: L'exemple français* (Joué-lès-Tours: Editions Alan Sutton, 2001).

Andrew Saint

#### **Architect and Engineer: A Study in Sibling Rivalry**

New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007,  
530 pp., 50 color and 260 b/w illus. \$65,  
ISBN 9780300124439

Andrew Saint's *Architect and Engineer* is a major contribution to the sociology of building practices in America, Britain, and France since about 1660. It should be noted at the outset that this roughly 500-page book is really a polemic against the cultural capital of the modern architect as artist, using the engineer as a foil. Its main audience will be empirically grounded historians in various fields, who will happily mine its vast erudition for decades. Saint's text should also be studied closely by theoretically minded academics concerned with the social construction of culture and class—although the latter word is mostly absent from this book. In short, *Architect and Engineer* is a landmark reference book that provides the raw material for many future studies.

One of Saint's enduring contributions to the field of architectural history is to insist on portraying the untidy realities of how built structures get built. His scholarship is grounded in a close reading of primary source material more typically used in social and labor history than in the study of architecture. In *Architect and Engineer*, the cumulative impact of deploying this methodology is an assault on the architect as a coherent social actor, sustained across time, national tradition, building material, and type. And for Saint, coming to terms with this messy reality is the point: "Once we enter into what happens when a structure is really

assembled in any age, we find designing and making, architecture and engineering, art and science muddled up together so constantly and utterly that a once-and-for-all process of dissociation . . . appears implausible" (492).

Saint's method is to provide a "nobler chronicle of building practice" (493). And indeed as a chronicle *Architect and Engineer* is almost encyclopedic in its consideration of the "how" and the "what." The rarer passages analyzing the "why" are less convincing, and thus some of the book's various parts may prove more valuable to scholars than the whole. In some respects, *Architect and Engineer* could be seen as an extended application of Raymond William's classic *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976) to the fluid terms "architect" and "engineer." There is a similar passion at work as well in the implied dream of writing a unified history of building based on the lived knowledge of skilled workers. One might suggest this book is less a study of sibling rivalry (Saint's subtitle) than a study of class rivalry.

*Architect and Engineer* is a lively read filled with Saint's distinctive and novelistic interest in every personality and in telling detail. In his rather recent obituary on Philip Johnson in *The Guardian* (29 January 2005), Saint elicited much comment for his candid and biting social history of the architect. This is the same curiosity that Saint brings to this detailed study of a vast cast of players in the building trades of three countries over the span of more than three hundred years. Know the man; know the work. And it is fascinating stuff. Saint recounts the stories of real individuals of diverse origins and motivations, struggling day by day to find places for themselves on the playing field of the built environment.

For example, in his discussion of Adler and Sullivan (197–202) Saint provides ample details about each man's thoughts on engineering versus architecture and on the strengths and weaknesses each came to accept in himself. Sullivan's pursuit of a marriage between art and building is chronicled with a richly illustrated discussion of his buildings of the 1890s. Saint concludes that Sullivan's "high philosophy doomed the architect to splendid isolation" and "appealed over the heads of the building

trades.” Further, this set Sullivan “aloof from the mere technician and builder—something Chicago culture had avoided” and indicates “the professional fragmentation in the building art of the 1890s” (202). This section on America in the chapter “Iron” ends with a treatment of Sullivan’s double-story shop front on the Schlesinger and Mayer Store. By 1900 the structural frame could be taken for granted by the architect, who could now turn to other collaborations, and Saint is at pains to point out the names of these collaborators, from draftsmen and modeler to fabricator. This is the goal—to celebrate the climax of “two centuries of interchange between the ferrous industries and art” (204). In this organic relationship between the trades, a true art of architecture was possible. But instead Saint laments that this building marks “a time when architecture is haplessly starting to rid itself of ornament, and the miracles of technology threaten to divorce man from nature” (205). The carpenter does not lay bricks; the engineer only solves practical problems; and things run amok when the architect loses his place in the web of labor.

The topic of education and on-the-job training consumes Saint in the final chapter, “A Question of Upbringing.” Unsurprisingly, he begins with a vivid retelling of the tale of Viollet-le-Duc being heckled off the podium of the *École des Beaux-Arts* at his inaugural lecture as new professor of the history of art and aesthetics in 1864. We learn the social contacts that gave him access to that podium, the agendas that led him to resign, and the alternative paths he kept turning to in his efforts to reform the architect’s education. Anecdotes aside, the material Saint has compiled in this chapter provides an extraordinary history of the intentions and goals for the preparation (or lack of preparation) of the building professions. He reviews almost every conceivable type of institution and training scenario devised from about 1750 or 1800 to the present. Given the breadth of his detailed knowledge, Saint is able to offer many insights that deserve further conversation. For example, Saint depicts Viollet’s efforts against the much broader canvas of all existing programs, pointing out that for a century already, by 1864, a second system of education had been turning out well-built,

reasonably handsome buildings. But they were designed and built by engineers, not architects: “France’s most thoroughly trained architects were engineers, and had been for a century” (436). Saint’s discussions of Léonce Reynaud’s role at first the Polytechnique and then the *École des Ponts et Chaussées* provides an historical counterpoint for assessing the reforms Viollet was trying to implement (444). What is this really about? Cultural capital? Class? Localized knowledge systems? Further analysis needs to be done. For Saint it would seem that the teaching of the ETH Zurich (originally the *Eidgenössische Polytechnikum*) provides a compelling ideal model for an education that supports the inextricable connection between architecture and engineering that he so admires. And on top of it, there was and is at the ETH a commitment to assigning an important role to brilliant humanists, beginning with Gottfried Semper and Jakob Burckhardt (447). What the Swiss got right is worth pondering as Saint launches into the gloomy section on the “Triumph of the Art School” and the sad state of architectural education today, when “words, as much as buildings or designs, have become the output of schools of architecture” (475). The final chapter of *The Architect and Engineer*, on the goals of an architecture education, should be required reading for every educator in a studio-based school.

This book provides a broad sociological history of the building professions and of the role and goals of education for those professions that is especially timely today. With the current economic crisis, architecture programs everywhere are being forced to rethink what their educational product is delivering, and why. This is a time of opportunity and change, given a drastic reduction in resources. There is a renewed rhetoric about interdisciplinarity (especially as it pertains to sustainability) and a further blurring of the boundaries that have separated not only architect and engineer, but also industrial designer, mechanical engineer, landscape architect, and various trade-based experts in “smart” or ecological materials and new technologies. This book is a historically informed place to start the discussion of where to go next.

Andrew Saint’s *Architect and Engineer* is

highly recommended, despite or perhaps even because it is filled with such a personal voice, sometimes as insistently as that of Henry Adams in *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*. Where else will you find an architectural historian scolding you for “a preference for the mollicoddling fellowship of the academy” (444)? Or being sure to remind you to give credit to each of Le Corbusier’s technical collaborators, and the famous man’s failings as a team member—didn’t Corbu see the problems that come with trying to build in distant countries where “the gap between design and construction is bound to widen” (277–79)? Likewise, Saint observes that the engineer Ove Arup, one of the author’s heroes, thought of the relationship between architect and engineer as marital, “with all the potential for harmony, conflict, perpetuity, and fruitfulness which marriage implies” (493), only to find him back away from assigning a gender to either profession. The field is lucky to have this large and idiosyncratic book, which sprang from Saint’s simple observations long ago about the relative locations of the departments of architecture and engineering at Cambridge, where he was teaching. What did it mean? How did we get here? A consummate empiricist, Andrew Saint is still engaged in surveying the trees, giving us glimpses of the forest as he found it. It is a landscape we would all do well to survey.

NANCY AUSTIN  
Newport, R.I.

Despina Stratigakos

**A Women’s Berlin: Building the Modern City**

Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, 264 pp., 77 b/w illus. \$24.95 (paper), ISBN 9780816653232

Against the profile of the *Trümmerfrauen*, the heroic rubble-women who reassembled Berlin after its wartime air attacks, Despina Stratigakos’s *A Women’s Berlin: Building the Modern City* reconstructs an earlier, forgotten generation of women’s roles in shaping the German Imperial capital’s identity circa 1871–1914. Whereas existing histories of Berlin mention the *Trümmerfrau*’s passive role as “an accidental builder,” the progressive, dynamic vision of a “women’s Berlin”