



SOCIETY OF
ARCHITECTURAL
HISTORIANS



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

Review

Author(s): Lawrence A. Herzog

Review by: Lawrence A. Herzog

Source: *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 65, No. 2 (Jun., 2006), pp. 294-296

Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the Society of Architectural Historians

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25068273>

Accessed: 29-04-2016 23:34 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Society of Architectural Historians, *University of California Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*

which older divisions were blurred, the economy expanded, and finally, Chinese political movements formed to resist Western control. Bergère then turns to the ambivalent relation of the communist regime to this former hotbed of capitalism. She also covers recent developments, such as the declining role of historic areas in the city's general economy. Bergère on occasion tends toward Shanghai exceptionalism, as when she states that the city "monopolized Chinese modernity" before 1949 (52). Those who have studied other major Chinese cities such as Nanjing or Guangzhou will question this but overall the essay is an excellent introduction to Shanghai's history. Peter Rowe's contribution, "Privation to Prominence: Shanghai's Rapid Resurgence," is a satisfying summary of the government master plans for Shanghai's development in recent decades. In reviewing these plans, he enables the reader to gain a more in-depth understanding of the planning process in China, and puts forth a comparative analysis of success in the implementation of these plans.

The most impressive discussions of architectural history reside in Seng Kuan's "Image of the Metropolis: Three Historical Views of Shanghai" and Jeffrey W. Cody's "Making History (Pay) in Shanghai: Architectural Dialogues about Space, Place, and Face." Kuan focuses on "panoramas of the Bund," a "bird's-eye view of greater Shanghai," and Lujiazui, the cornerstone of planning for the Pudong New Area. Moving from the skyline of commercial architecture produced by capitalist demands on valuable real estate along the Bund to the Beaux-Arts planning of the Republican-era plans for the Shanghai Civic Center, Kuan sees their synthesis in the grand plans of Lujiazui Financial Center. The spatial and historic legacies in Kuan's views of Shanghai convincingly allow Lujiazui more meaning than the individual buildings' gauche corporate glitz might at first suggest.

In his somewhat poetic essay, Cody explores the resonance he finds in the contrasts and layered meanings of specific sites and links these reflections to historic

preservation concerns. He begins by pondering socialist and capitalist globalization through the juxtaposition of the stepped profiles of the Soviet social realist Shanghai Exhibition Center and the adjacent and larger Shanghai Center (1990) by American developer John Portman. He then considers the multiple associations of the Morriss Apartments, constructed in the early 1930s as one of the first works of fully "modern" Western-built housing to accommodate the cosmopolitan taste of upwardly mobile Shanghaiese. The final site for the author's ruminations is a segment of Nanjing Road (historically a main shopping street of the city, and a center of *haipai*, "Shanghai style") where plans for a pedestrian mall raise questions about the commodification of history. As Cody asserts, much of Chinese architectural heritage is preserved only to the point that it can be of use in the marketplace. Cody urges the academic and architectural community to enter into conversations concerning the built heritage of Shanghai (and by implication, China). Thus he ends in a place not so far from the conclusion of *Architectural Encounters with Essence and Form in Modern China*. The two books provide ample background from which to start an engagement with the burgeoning field of Chinese architecture.

JOHNATHAN A. FARRIS
Washington University in Saint Louis

Notes

1. Xing Ruan, "Accidental Affinities: American Beaux-Arts in Twentieth-Century Chinese Architectural Education and Practice," *JSAH* 61 (Mar. 2002), 30–47, and Delin Lai, "Searching for a Modern Chinese Monument: The Design of the Sun Yat-sen Mausoleum in Nanjing," *JSAH* 64 (Mar. 2005), 22–55.
2. A superb and detailed account of Murphy's work can be found in Jeffrey W. Cody, *Building in China: Henry K. Murphy's Adaptive Architecture, 1914–1935* (Seattle, 2001), reviewed in *JSAH* 63 (Mar. 2004), 120–22.

Joseph L. Scarpaci

Plazas and Barrios: Heritage Tourism and Globalization in the Latin American Centro Histórico

Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005, xix + 236 pp., 105 b/w illus., 14 tables. \$45, ISBN 0-8165-1631-6

One of the least publicized endangered species of the twenty-first century is the historic landscape of cities across the planet. Too often the built environment is atomized (by architects, the media, investors, or property owners) and worshipped in its most recognizable form—the individual structure. Meanwhile, the larger space that nurtured the building—its neighborhood—is forgotten or ignored. This oversight, as Joseph Scarpaci skillfully argues in his new book *Plazas and Barrios: Heritage Tourism and Globalization in the Latin American Centro Histórico*, is a critical loss to the historic preservation movement, since the meaning of buildings is fundamentally deepened by the unique sense of place embedded in the communities (barrios) and public spaces (plazas) that surround them.

Scarpaci's book may be grounded in his fields of cultural, urban, and historical geography, but this timely and carefully researched volume is important for architectural historians, landscape architects, designers, urban scholars, and Latin Americanists. Its publication comes at a watershed in architectural history. The beginning of the new millennium has been marked by digital technology and other globalizing trends, whose accelerating pace poses new challenges to the preservation of more "low-tech" phenomena such as architectural history. Scarpaci's book serves an important purpose in helping to move architectural history away from individual buildings and into the more critical arena of historic centers. It offers those who study the field a wealth of new information that both places architecture in a geographic and institutional context and explores frameworks for those who are fighting to preserve historic centers and their edifices.

The book is organized around three thematic chapters and three case studies, framed by an introduction and a conclusion. In chapter one, "Approaching Latin America's Built Environment," Scarpaci lays out his case, tracing the evolution of historic centers in Latin America at the local and international scales. The pivotal Quito Letter, facilitated by the Organization of American States in 1967, established a key precedent for creating legislative structures to implement historic preservation in the Americas. A UNESCO source offers a definition of historic districts as "those living settlements that are strongly conditioned by a physical structure stemming from the past, and recognizable as being representative of the evolution of a people" (10). This definition is important, because its people-place connection partly shapes Scarpaci's approach in the remainder of the book. The following two chapters take the readers into the thick of the Latin American historic center in a dizzying journey of methods and approaches. Chapter two, "Historical Geography of the Spanish American Centro Histórico," is a free-wheeling mosaic of bits of history and journalistic anecdotes, either drawing from on-site observations, or from contemporary updates on events in the inner city. These glimpses are vivid and wide-reaching, from Havana and Buenos Aires to Bogotá and Puebla, but sometimes attempt too much: history, geography, urban planning, and a sense of local flavor all in one chapter.

In chapter three, my least favorite, the author heroically sets out to measure, code, and compare visual indicators of land use and building quality in nine historic centers. A rigorous sampling methodology amasses nearly thirty thousand observations about factors and details such as building quality, height, and doorways. We learn that Cuban and southern cone cities have more low-quality buildings, while Mexico and Ecuador have higher-quality historic structures (due to better programs of historic preservation, according to Scarpaci). But I am not sure the results warrant the level of empirical detail imagined by the sur-

veys. Here and elsewhere, social science method and unexamined jargon—"disembedding," "globalism," and "globality" (127)—feel forced on subjects of more qualitative study (such as residential perception of historic preservation) that do not seem to require mathematical measurement ("Pearson coefficients") or "contingency analysis" (144).

Chapter four, "The Social Construction of Latin American Historic Districts," is the core of the book. Here the author lays out some of the key concepts that he weaves through the book. Scarpaci puts his finger on several crucial challenges architectural historians and designers must confront in the next fifty years in Latin America. First and foremost: Can historic preservation be profitable? Since the neoliberal economic model has dominated much of Latin America in the 1980s and '90s, this question goes to the heart of the downtown redevelopment debate. Judging from the luxury hotels and glass-and-steel high-rise buildings marching toward historic centers in Buenos Aires, Mexico City, and Rio de Janeiro, this issue may be the most pressing of all. Nearly as challenging is the concern Scarpaci discovered in focus studies he carried out: local residents themselves may not embrace historic preservation. And finally, the effects of massive unregulated globalization across local and national economies (defined by the author as the quick transfer of capital, commodities, and people) may be fundamentally incompatible with heritage preservation.

In effect, the three case studies in chapters five, six, and seven explore these issues for the cities of Cartagena, Havana, and Trinidad (Cuba), respectively. From ancient walls and the special rights accorded to a famous author in Cartagena, to the remodeling of historic plazas in Havana and the future of Ancón beach at Trinidad, the process of historic preservation is meticulously examined in the unique context of each case. These chapters are full of helpful maps, drawings, and photographs.

The concluding chapter remedies some of the narrative's inconsistencies

and disjunctions by reviewing some of the book's general themes. But even here some unevenness is found. For example, several topics—including "urban and regional theory" and "urban design and the automobile"—show up in the conclusion but are largely missing from the main text.

I believe, however, that the book's value is greater than the sum of its parts and that the work should find a place on every scholar's shelf. The issues Scarpaci raises are immensely critical to architecture and urbanism in the twenty-first century, and, to his credit, he attacks them with a razor-sharp scalpel, carving a path into areas that have not received enough attention. The book asks: What constitutes history in the urban built environment, and who ultimately decides which pieces of architectural history are preserved and which are not? The further importance of *Plazas and Barrios* is that it emphasizes that urban architectural history must be conceptualized in discrete spaces where that history is ingrained within the larger city. Scarpaci also raises the critical point that the historic preservation process is politicized, or, in his words, "socially constructed." His book reminds us of the wide swath of interest groups—residents, merchants, property owners, politicians, global investors—thrown together in historic centers. Scarpaci has done yeoman's work in beginning the challenging process of considering what the role of local and national governments might be in preserving history, and the extent to which international aid agencies might lend a helping hand. Future scholarship must continue to probe this area.

Finally, as the author argues, no discussion of downtown redevelopment or preservation can fail to acknowledge the significance of globalization, which may be an even darker and more profound phenomenon than he indicates. The long-term danger of increasing global influence could lead to what might be termed the "globalization of history." Historic centers or other architecturally significant districts could be transformed by global entrepreneurs into "theme

parks,” simulated environments where the main objective is to maximize profit from visitors. Quality of life and architectural authenticity might be cast aside. Just enough old architecture remains to keep the illusion of the past alive, but gradually these spaces might yield to global commerce (fast food, fast coffee, video rental stores, and so forth). Over time, global interests strive to gain control over valuable real estate. Lacking a coherent design plan, piecemeal investment might multiply, and the original sense of place of historic districts would be permanently lost.

Every historic district in the world faces this dilemma. It is especially pronounced in neoliberal Latin America. A seismic rumble lies beneath Scarpaci's book and leaves us pondering: Can architects, historians, and policy makers find a way to make historic preservation sustainable in the face of globalization? Will plazas in Latin America serve as sacred spaces to celebrate memory, or will they become containers for globally managed consumerism?

LAWRENCE A. HERZOG
San Diego State University

Uses of the Past

Maria Fabricius Hansen

The Eloquence of Appropriation: Prolegomena to an Understanding of Spolia in Early Christian Rome

Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2003, 339 pp., 150 b/w illus. \$157, ISBN 88-8265-237-8

For historians of art and architecture, the term *spolia* indicates an older work of art that has been incorporated into a newer one. The definition of what constitutes a work of art can vary. Free-standing sculpture moved from one venue to another, such as the “Horses of San Marco” in Venice, are one example. The horses began their life somewhere in the Roman world in the late second or third century, moved on to Constantinople in the fourth century, and were taken to Venice

in the thirteenth. In the nineteenth century, they were taken to Paris for a short tour atop the Arc du Triomphe du Carrousel before being brought back “home” to San Marco.

The well-traveled statues represent one definition of the term *spolia*. More sedentary are the architectural elements of buildings that begin their life in one period and go on to an afterlife in another. Here *spolia* can be everything from utilitarian brick and ashlar to richly carved columns, capitals, and moldings, as well as sculptured panels. From the modern perspective, this type of reuse, which often relies on the dismantling of extant monuments for the creation of new ones, represents a kind of destructive recycling. The fourth-century Arch of Constantine is perhaps the best-known example of this phenomenon. Virtually all of the architectural elements—masonry blocks and columns alike—and most of the sculpture derive from earlier Roman monuments.

As the San Marco horses make clear, the phenomenon of reuse expressed in the term *spolia* is not limited to a single period. It is, however, in the late third and early fourth centuries, the age of the Arch of Constantine, that the habit of recycling architectural members from Roman buildings of the early imperial age into new construction projects became a hallmark of design and construction across the territories of the Roman world. Within that world, no city was more richly endowed with such architecture than Rome itself. Apart from a handful of monuments from the late imperial period, such as the Arcus Novus of Diocletian, which no longer survives, or the Temple of Romulus, which does, the best evidence for this building practice is found in the city's ecclesiastical architecture. From the great fourth-century foundations of Constantine, such as the Lateran basilica and St. Peter's, through the twelfth century, Roman church architecture consistently reused elements of classical architecture to shape and highlight its congregational and liturgical space. This reuse brought with it a breakdown in the classical system of the orders in favor of

an architecture that has seemed by comparison overly varied and almost piecemeal in conception.

The use of the word *spolia* to define this habit of reuse occurs first in the sixteenth century. Giorgio Vasari seems to have been the first to employ the term to discuss a process that he viewed with contempt and adduced as evidence for a decline in artistic standards that in turn shored up his own definition of Renaissance originality. Until recently Vasari's opinion has held sway, with reuse being explained as a function of artistic and economic decline. Over the last twenty years, however, a greater appreciation of late antiquity in general and of its aesthetic values and artistic processes in particular has transformed the sense of what reuse means. Thus, while it is clear that economic factors often played a part in the growth of the phenomenon, recent scholarship also allows it to be understood less as a function of artistic and economic decline and more as an expressive choice.¹

It is in the context of this discussion that Maria Fabricius Hansen's *Eloquence of Appropriation* appears. Taking the practice of reuse in medieval Roman architecture as her subject, Fabricius Hansen both observes and attempts to explain the impulses behind it. Her overall aim is to right what she sees as a gross historiographical wrong, the pejorative attitude toward the tradition that has prevailed in the scholarly literature from Vasari's time until very recently. Her argument is not with those scholars who seek to reassess the phenomenon of *spolia*, but rather with thinkers of an earlier generation, such as Bernard Berenson (*The Arch of Constantine, or The Decline of Form* [New York, 1954]), who had nothing good to say about the matter and whose opinions can still be found to color the basic approach to late antique and medieval building in such handbooks as Diana Kleiner's *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven, 1992). Fabricius Hansen understands this persistent judgment to be rooted in a distinct bias toward the classical, which has led to the characterization of the use of *spolia* as the shameful by-product of