

Chapters 2 and 3 focus on the decision to build. In the former, titled “Problems of the Site and the Struggle to Enlarge the Church,” Sankovitch carefully situates the early history and planning of the current building within the context of urban developments in the neighborhood of Les Halles between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. Chapter 3 deals with patronage and convincingly brings Saint-Eustache under the umbrella of King Francis I’s ambitious urban projects of the late 1520s, along with Pierre Lescot’s design for the new Louvre and Domenico da Cortona’s interventions at the Hôtel de Ville. Sankovitch establishes a connection between Francis I and Saint-Eustache through the *prevôt de Paris*, Jean de La Barre, a representative of the king, who was directly involved in the financing and planning of the new church. Through a comparison of Saint-Eustache and Notre-Dame, she also draws a symbolic connection between the urban projects of Francis I and those of the Capetian king Philippe Auguste (1165–1223), who first established Paris as capital city.

Titled “A Revised Building History, the First Master, and Serlio,” chapter 4 presents a close analysis of the building’s architectural features; this ninety-page chapter, which features 199 illustrations, constitutes the core of the volume. Here, Sankovitch details the chronology of the building’s first construction campaign and provides a meticulous visual analysis of the architecture and decorations that characterize its different phases. She identifies the publication of Sebastiano Serlio’s Book IV (1537) as a defining event for the project of Saint-Eustache, after which the classicizing vocabulary of its decorative apparatus took an “orthodox” turn.

Chapter 5 deals with the identity of the building’s architect. Since the mid-nineteenth century, the design of the church has been attributed to, in turn, Domenico da Cortona, Pierre Lemercier, and Jean Delamarre. Given that the archival record has proved insufficient to confirm a name, Sankovitch’s aim is not to establish who designed the church but rather to create a “stylistic profile for the architect” (135). This approach, which brings the author into discussions of a variety of relevant buildings—including Saint-Maclou in Pontoise; Saint-Merry, Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, and Saint-Victor

in Paris; Saint-Martin in Triel; Saint-Pierre in Caen; and the churches of Villiers-le-Bel and Momtargis—thus resituates Saint-Eustache in the landscape of early Renaissance architecture in France. Sankovitch makes a compelling argument for attributing the building to Delamarre, and she also sketches a possible career trajectory for him. As Étienne Hamon points out in his response, her hypotheses have been supported—if not definitely confirmed—by recently discovered documentation on Delamarre’s work in Paris in the 1510s.

The book’s final two chapters consider the design choices made at Saint-Eustache and the principles regulating the project. Chapter 6, “The Presence of the Past at Saint-Eustache from Cluny to Pavia,” explores a variety of sources that help to situate the design among French Romanesque and High Gothic buildings. Sankovitch paints a complex picture of the relationship between Saint-Eustache and other Flamboyant buildings—a picture that has since been enriched by the recent contributions already noted on Flamboyant architecture in Paris and beyond. Chapter 7, “Gothic and Late-Gothic Strategies of Architectural Composition,” examines the design methods employed by the architect of Saint-Eustache. Sankovitch identifies two operative methods: first, the “repetition of the same form at a varied scale and proportions” (207), and second, the “decorative variety within the same or similar forms” (213). She then proceeds to illustrate how these principles were applied in the church’s composition, thus providing the reader with a clear analytical framework for comprehending its complexity.

It would be unfair to linger on the imperfections of a dissertation that was not intended to be published “as is,” but the editorial choice of not translating into English the numerous quotations from French literature seems questionable, as it prevents many nonspecialist readers from fully appreciating the subtleties of Sankovitch’s reasoning. This shortcoming, however, does not reduce the overall quality of a text that reads well, is supported by solid documentation, presents compelling arguments, and brings forth a theoretical approach that stands strong almost three decades after it was devised. The corrections that Hamon suggests in his response (xi–xiii) are of a chronological rather than a theoretical

nature, and they do not undermine the validity of Sankovitch’s work. *The Church of Saint-Eustache in the Early French Renaissance* is an authoritative reference on Saint-Eustache and a fundamental contribution to the literature on late medieval and early modern European architecture.

SARA GALLETTI
Duke University

Note

1. This literature is exemplified by the following works, all of which focus on Paris: Agnès Bos, *Les églises flamboyantes de Paris (XV^e–XVI^e siècles)* (Paris: Picard, 2003); Tiziana Pezzella, *Saint-Étienne-du-Mont: Storia di una chiesa parigina* (Bologna: Pitagora, 2009); Étienne Hamon, *Une capitale flamboyante: La création monumentale à Paris autour de 1500* (Paris: Picard, 2011). Other recent volumes treating the broader landscape of late Gothic and early Renaissance architecture include Yves Esquieu, *Du gothique à la Renaissance: Architecture et décor en France, 1470–1550: Actes du colloque de Viviers, 20–23 septembre 2001* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l’Université de Provence, 2003); Monique Chatenet et al., eds., *Le gothique de la Renaissance: Actes des quatrième rencontres d’architecture européenne, Paris, 12–16 juin 2007* (Paris: Picard, 2011); Ethan Matt Kavaler, *Renaissance Gothic: Architecture and the Arts in Northern Europe, 1470–1540* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2012).

Itohan Osayimwese

Colonialism and Modern Architecture in Germany

Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2017, 344 pp., 8 color and 74 b/w illus. \$49.95 (cloth), ISBN 9780822945086

For a work of historical scholarship, Itohan Osayimwese’s *Colonialism and Modern Architecture in Germany* has a surprisingly compelling opening. In the first sentences, the author stages a meeting in Berlin during the summer of 1913, where, gathered around a massive oak table, are “some of the men now considered to be the doyens of modern architecture in Germany”: Henry van de Velde, Hermann Muthesius, Bruno Taut, Walter Gropius, Hans Poelzig, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, and Dominikus Böhm, as well as some “lesser-known colleagues and protégés,” including Carl Rehorst, Adolf von Oechelhäuser, Konrad Wachsmann, and—the lone woman in the group—Margarete Knüppelholz-Roeser (3). On the agenda is a discussion of “the status

of architecture in the German colonies,” which leads to a conversation about ideas and language that, as Osayimwese suggests, “are familiar to readers today,” on topics such as the excessively ornamented “style architecture” in the protectorate of Kiaochow, the lack of objectivity in the floor plan of “‘parvenu’ villas” in the city of Qingdao, and the certain success of developing standard housing types and prefabricated houses in Dar es Salaam. Perhaps, Osayimwese imagines the group murmuring, “there is something to be learned from Germany’s costly colonial adventure after all” (3).

The meeting did take place, but not as described above. As the author notes, her depiction of the event is “fictitious in its finer details” (4). Most of those mentioned were not even present. Through this *mise-en-scène*, Osayimwese in one elegant stroke introduces the main protagonists in her book as well as the central theme that pervades her narrative, namely, “how colonial encounters and imperial entanglements affected architectural developments within Germany itself” (5). Not coincidentally, the meeting is staged in Berlin and not in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Douala (Cameroon), Windhoek (Namibia), or Qingdao (China). The book then can be understood, as the author states, as a response to that provocation for post-colonial studies articulated in 2000 by Dipesh Chakrabarty: the need to provincialize Europe.¹

Even if such an exercise is not entirely new in architectural history, doing it for the German context is important for at least two reasons. First, current histories have tended to overlook the fact that parts of the genealogy of modern architecture in Germany, the birthplace of the Bauhaus, need to be sought elsewhere, particularly outside Europe. Osayimwese convincingly fills this lacuna. Second, the scholarship on German colonial architecture is rather sparse, and what does exist is dispersed in publications not readily available or accessible to an international (let alone Anglophone) readership. In that respect, this book is a welcome addition to the scholarship on architecture in what were—from the late nineteenth century until 1919, when the Treaty of Versailles temporarily put an end to Germany’s international ambitions—territories under German rule or parts of its sphere of influence: South-west Africa, Togo, Cameroon, East Africa,

Kiaochow, and the Pacific colonies.² Osayimwese also points to some of the excellent recent historical scholarship on Germany’s colonial past.³ And yet, in both its content and its methodological approach, this book has relevance for the study of colonial architecture well beyond that of the German case.

Osayimwese’s account is organized into five chapters, most of which are closely interconnected. The opening chapter, dealing with the colonial presence as seen at international exhibitions held in Germany, in particular the 1896 Berlin Trade Exhibition, underlines a crucial methodological aspect of the study. The 1896 exhibition provides a case par excellence of what Osayimwese calls a “colonial archive,” a concept that is crucial to her argument that architectural practices and forms transformed “in response to new conditions such as colonialism” (14). Drawing on theoretical reflections on the archive by art historians like Thomas Osborne and Okwui Enwezor and postcolonial thinkers such as Ann Laura Stoler and Achille Mbembe, Osayimwese discerns two modalities of the colonial archive: one that sees it as “an encyclopedic documentation” and one that views the archive as functioning as “a system governing discourse,” defining what is being said and what is left out (17). Allowing her to think beyond notions like influence and translation, the archive becomes for Osayimwese a tool for “explor[ing] the profusion of writing, idiosyncratic language, and distinctive rhetorical formulations associated with both modernism and colonialism in Germany during this period” (18). The various types of colonial materials displayed at exhibitions in Germany—whether re-created native villages, model colonial houses, ethnographic artifacts, or photographs illustrating the achievements of the German colonial enterprise—form an important starting point for the book’s broader analysis. The theme of exhibitions as archive resurfaces in later chapters, in particular chapter 4, which considers the 1914 Werkbund Exhibition, that foundational moment in the history of Germany’s modern architecture, and chapter 5, which traces the colonial origins of modernist prefabrication.

Seeing exhibitions as “definitive embodiments of modernity” (22), Osayimwese situates them within her larger argument at

different levels of importance: as media to “amend public taste” and stimulate modernist reform (56); as forums for the “re-orientation of artistic and architectural production toward global markets” (46); as “floodgates for knowledge production,” allowing broad audiences as well as armchair scholars and professionals to gain information on areas previously unknown (50); and as sites where, despite differing viewpoints on the value of traditional cultures and which colonial policies should be implemented, racial and cultural differences were made explicit.⁴ It is the discursive role of exhibitions that holds Osayimwese’s attention, rather than the mere fact that they enabled architects to come into contact with foreign cultures, a topic already well addressed in many histories of architecture.

This attention to the discursive is at the heart of chapter 2, devoted to what Osayimwese calls “architectural ethnography.” Illustrating how German architects had become more globally mobile by the end of the nineteenth century, she demonstrates that the architectural profession in Germany was much less insular than standard histories lead us to believe, stressing that new genealogies of modern architecture need to include more in-depth discussions of how “architects’ travel experiences affected developments at home in Germany” (62). The chapter commences with brief descriptions of well-known cases showing how ethnography was “part of the late nineteenth-century German milieu” (63). These cases include Gottfried Semper’s fascination with the full-scale “Car-aib” Indian house from Trinidad displayed at the 1851 Great Exhibition in London, Bruno Taut’s interest in the Orient and his investigation of traditional architecture in both Turkey and Japan, and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s reading of ethnographic texts, in particular the writings of the German ethnologist Leo Frobenius, who praised the austere, stern, tectonic features of African architecture. More revealing, however, is Osayimwese’s discussion of those lesser-known, often state-certified architects or engineers who worked abroad as railway or construction experts, involved in what historian Dirk van Laak has termed “infrastructural imperialism” (13).⁵ Hermann Frobenius, father of Leo and author of *Afrikanische Bautypen: Eine*

ethnographisch-architektonische Studie (1894), is a case in point, as are Franz Baltzer in Japan, Karl Döhning in Siam, and Heinrich Hildebrand and Ernst Boerschmann in China.⁶ All of these men embodied the mythology of the German engineer, but they also produced studies of traditional architecture that, in turn, influenced the architectural debate at home via publications in journals such as the *Centralblatt der Bauverwaltung*, the official organ of the Prussian Public Works Ministry. Osayimwese reveals the fascinating intertextuality among these various architectural ethnographies, showing how they belonged to a productive colonial archive. Her book would have benefited, however, from expanding this observation beyond German borders—for instance, Leo Frobenius's documentation of African rock art later influenced 1930s debates on colonial architecture in France and Belgium.⁷

Yet Osayimwese has good reason to ground her analysis of the discursive dimension of the colonial archive in Germany, for the language used to discuss German colonial architecture was quite specific, as the third chapter of the book reveals. Structured around the fascinating question of how *Heimatschutz*, a notion crucial to the “fundamentally modern German discourse about belonging and identity” (108), played out in the context of German colonies, the chapter shows how some of the key notions around German colonial architecture at the turn of the century were closely aligned with those that would inform architectural reform inside Germany. Equivalents to some of these concepts, like *Sachlichkeit* (objectivity) and *Zweckmässigkeit* (purposefulness), surfaced in discussions of how to build in colonial territories beyond Germany's. But through the dimension of *Heimat*, and especially the related idea of *Bodenständigkeit* (contextualism), the German debate was quite distinct, as Kenny Cupers also has recently noted.⁸ Pleas for a colonial architecture whose built form and materials would suit the character of its location were advanced by figures like Adolf von Oechelhäuser, member of the Bund Heimatschutz, the Congress for Historic Preservation, and the Colonial Society. But Osayimwese's meticulous dissection of the debate on colonial *Heimatschutz* illustrates how fraught it was with contradictions,

especially because it remained unclear how one could reconcile the notion of *Heimat*, which is about “nurturing the *genius loci* of place,” with the basic premise of colonial ideology: that colonized people were devoid of any worthwhile culture of their own. Especially relevant here is how such colonial contradictions reflected the debate in Germany, for “in the colonial context, the problems with German architecture became clearer” (119). In this respect, it is quite telling that armchair scholars (those who studied the colonies without ever setting foot in them), rather than figures with embedded expertise in the colonial territories, were dominating the scene, and that at least one observer saw the refusal to acknowledge existing local architectural knowledge as perhaps “the greatest shortcoming of the project to reform architecture in the colonies” (123).

These contradictions also surface in Osayimwese's analysis of the few projects she was able to find from the significant number of entries submitted to a 1914 competition organized by the German Colonial Society, which invited architects to develop designs for a hospital in the South Seas, a government building in German Southwest Africa, a house in Cameroon, and a house in East Africa. Most of these designs were rather generic and suggest a preference for *Typisierung* (roughly, “industrialized standardization”) such as was advocated by one of the key protagonists of Germany's architectural reform movement, Hermann Muthesius.⁹ Not coincidentally, perhaps, as Osayimwese notes, the colonial archive is “replete with buildings that were conceived as types rather than as custom-designed solutions” (150). Drawing on the work of Peter Sriver, whose study of public works architecture in British India remains the most profound investigation of the principles underlying the type-based design approach in a colonial context, Osayimwese suggests that the “possibilities of ‘type’ as a heuristic for a modern architecture language became even clearer” when a model colonial house was designed for display at the 1914 Werkbund Exhibition (185).¹⁰

Chapter 5 demonstrates that the prefabricated structures designed for the colonial territories, conceived by German building firms such as Christoph & Unmack and F. H. Schmidt, are even more revealing of the intricate relationships

between colonialism and modernism. Designs like Christoph & Unmack's model tropical house of 1908—featuring sun sails, a veranda, mosquito netting, and special folding furniture—became darlings of German reformist architects for how they “appropriated architectural technologies and forms that had been perfected in the colonial field, and connected the modernist rhetoric of purposiveness (*Zweckmässigkeit*), objectivity (*Sachlichkeit*), and contextualism (*Bodenständigkeit*) with an existing discourse on building efficiently and contextually in the tropics” (187).

It is in this last chapter that Osayimwese reconnects her narrative with her book's larger ambition—that of presenting a “more global history” of German modern architecture. Yet these building firms were exporting their products far beyond the boundaries of the German Empire. Shelters closely resembling Christoph & Unmack's Doecker model, for instance, popped up along the emerging railroad network in the Congo Free State, where they were referred to as *maisons danoises*, or Danish houses. Such transcolonial flows and exchanges surface in Osayimwese's book but are not explicitly articulated, as they fall outside the scope of what is, first and foremost, a book that investigates how discussions of architecture in/on the German colonies prefigured and influenced those in the mother country. This is also why the widespread practice of self-building in German colonies (illustrated by manuals like Carl Pauli's 1911 book *Der Kolonist der Tropen als Häuser-, Wege- und Brückenbauer*) does not feature prominently in her analysis. It would, however, make sense to open the narrative beyond the nationalist framework and study the impact of German expertise beyond the foundational moment of German modern architecture and the 1919 endpoint of the German Empire. In this way, we might gain a better understanding of how a neglected figure like the engineer Friedrich Vick, for instance, was able to influence building practices in Central Africa with his 1938 book *Einfluß des tropischen Klimas auf Gestaltung und Konstruktion der Gebäude*.¹¹ If this remains a story to be written, it is one of the major contributions of Osayimwese's book, along with the crucial correction it makes about the genealogy of modern architecture in Germany, to have

demonstrated that any discussion of colonial architecture can no longer ignore the German case.

JOHAN LAGAE
Ghent University

Notes

1. Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Post-colonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

2. Wolfgang Lauber was the first to compile substantial documentation on German Togo and Cameroon, which is complemented by French scholarship. See Wolfgang Lauber, *Deutsche Architektur in Kamerun 1884–1914* (Stuttgart: Karl Krämer Verlag, 1988); Wolfgang Lauber, *Deutsche Architektur in Togo 1884–1914* (Stuttgart: Karl Krämer Verlag, 1993); Jacques Soullou, ed., *Rives coloniales: Architectures, de Saint-Louis à Douala* (Marseille: Parenthèses/Orstrom, 1993); Bernard Toullet and Marc Paboïs, eds., *Architecture coloniale et patrimoine: Expériences européennes* (Paris: Institut National du Patrimoine/Somogy, 2006). On Namibia, see Walter Peters, *Baukunst in Südwestafrika, 1884–1914* (Windhoek: SWA Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft, 1981). On Tanzania and the city of Dar es Salaam, there is a substantial body of work by Karl Vorlaufer, James Brennan, and, more recently, Patrick Hege and the Dar es Salaam Centre for Architectural Heritage. Eduard Kögel has done groundbreaking work on the presence and activities of German architects in Asia, China in particular.

3. For an engaged overview of German colonialism, see George Steinmetz, *The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa, and Southwest Africa* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007). Osayimwese's bibliography contains numerous references to German scholarship.

4. For an untangling and explanation of the commonalities and sometimes striking distinctions among Germany's colonial policies, see George Steinmetz, "The Colonial State as a Social Field: Ethnographic Capital and Native Policy in the German Overseas Empire before 1914," *American Sociological Review* 73 (Aug. 2008), 589–612.

5. Dirk van Laak, *Imperiale Infrastruktur: Deutsche Planungen für eine Erschließung Afrikas 1880 bis 1960* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004).

6. Osayimwese cites Eduard Kögel's extensive research on the work of Ernst Boerschmann, including reissues of some of his original texts.

7. Architects Henri-Jean Calsat and Henri Lacoste were familiar with Frobenius's work and were involved in designing projects for French and Belgian territories in Africa.

8. Kenny Cupers, "Bodenständigkeit: The Environmental Epistemology of Modernism," *Journal of Architecture* 21, no. 8 (2016), 1226–52.

9. *Typisierung*, a notion that goes back to the well-known debate between Muthesius and Van de Velde at the 1914 Werkbund Congress in Cologne, often has been translated as "industrialized standardization." However, it is closer to the

notion of "type," which was more about striving for "a universally valid, unending good taste" (Muthesius) and thus a means of "bringing order to the chaotic world of mass consumption ruled by fashion, individualism and *anomie*." See Adrian Forty, *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000), 307. 10. Peter Scriver, "Empire-Building and Thinking in the Public Works Department of British India," in *Colonial Modernities: Building, Dwelling and Architecture in British India and Ceylon*, ed. Peter Scriver and Vikramaditya Prakash (London: Routledge, 2007), 69–92.

11. Vick's book was a crucial source, for instance, for Belgian engineer Egide Devroey's report *Habitations coloniales et conditionnement d'air sous les tropiques*, presented in 1940 to the Institut Royal Colonial Belge.

Tamara Bjažić Klarin

Ernest Weissmann: Socially Engaged Architecture, 1926–1939

Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2015, 350 pp., 226 b/w illus. \$57 (paper), ISBN 9789531541893

Tamara Bjažić Klarin's *Ernest Weissmann*, published in both Serbo-Croatian and English, is the first scholarly monograph available on this little-known yet highly significant figure in the history of modern architecture and urbanism. Based on extensive archival research, Klarin, described here as a "longtime associate of the Croatian Museum of Architecture," offers a definitive and well-illustrated account of Weissmann's European career before 1939. She has consulted many Serbo-Croatian language archives in Zagreb and elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia, as well as the Bauhaus Archive in Berlin and the Ernest Weissmann Archive, which is now available at the Frances Loeb Library, Harvard Graduate School of Design.

Ernest Weissmann (1903–85) grew up in the Croatian capital of Zagreb, in what was then the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He received his diploma in architecture there in 1926 from the Department of Architecture at the Technical School of Higher Education, today the University of Zagreb. In the late 1920s he moved to Paris and worked with Adolf Loos on the Tristan Tzara House in Montmartre (1927–29).

With the help of Gabriel Guévrekian, Weissmann then joined Le Corbusier's atelier around the same time as Josep Lluís Sert, Charlotte Perriand, and Kunio

Maekawa. These associates, all then working on the Centrosoyuz project in Moscow, would later be central figures in the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne, founded in 1928. Once back in Zagreb in 1929, Weissmann led the Work Group Zagreb, a Yugoslav CIAM group, and attended the Barcelona meeting of the Comité International pour la Réalisation des Problèmes de la Architecture Contemporain (CIRPAC, CIAM's executive body) in 1932 and CIAM 4 in 1933. He then worked on the Yugoslav national world's fair pavilions in Paris and New York, immigrating to New York in 1939. Once there, Weissmann partnered with Sert in designing an unbuilt Manhattan apartment house project (not included in this book) before taking a staff position at the U.S. Board of Economic Warfare, Foreign Economic Administration, in Washington D.C. (1942–44). Klarin suggests that this job may have been the result of his earlier CIAM contacts with Buckminster Fuller, Knud Lonberg-Holm, and others in the New York group Structural Study Associates in 1933. In any case, Weissmann worked as an assistant to Fuller on his Dymaxion Deployment Unit project in 1941. In 1944, he was appointed director of the Industrial Rehabilitation Division of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and after 1947, he held many positions in housing and planning at the United Nations until his retirement in 1974.

Klarin's book presents a detailed, year-by-year account of Weissmann's educational influences and early career to 1939, and it offers the patient reader much new factual and visual material not previously available. The discussion of Weissmann's professional work includes his modern schools and his 1929 Centrosoyuz-inspired competition entry for the Zagreb Foundation Block, designed in violation of the rules with his non-Yugoslav Le Corbusier associates Norman Rice (United States) and Kunio Maekawa (Japan). Klarin also documents and illustrates his many CIAM-related activities, publications, and exhibitions after 1929 with Work Group Zagreb, which also included Yugoslav CIAM members Vladimir Antolić and Drago Ibler. Weissmann's other works from this early internationalist period included his Foundation and Clinical Hospital project in Zagreb, an innovative 1931 competition design illustrated on the book's cover.