

6. The “Bref estat” (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Mss., nouv. acq. fr. 22 936, fol. 130–135) was first published by Allan Braham and Peter Smith in *François Mansart*, 2 vols. (London: A. Zwemmer Ltd, 1973), 163–66.

7. Alexandre Gady, ed., *Jules Hardouin-Mansart, 1646–1708* (Paris: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l’homme, 2010), 565. Fonkenell announces a more complete demonstration in his contribution to the conference proceedings to be published in 2011.

Miguel Morán Turina

**La memoria de las piedras.
Anticuarios, arqueólogos y
coleccionistas de antigüedades en la
España de los Austrias**

Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica, 2010, 451 pp., 80 color and 96 b/w illus. €40, ISBN 9788493606077

The story Miguel Morán Turina tells is one seldom told. It is an obscure tale, one could even argue. In a word, antiquarian. Why, then, painstakingly trace the story of these early modern Spanish lovers of Roman antiquity, of their quixotic struggle against the inexorable forces of time to salvage, whether textually or graphically, the “memory of stones,” as the title of the book poetically evokes? It is not the least of *La memoria de las piedras*’ merits that it demonstrates the presence and relevance of the Roman past in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, most notably among its cultural and political elite. Superbly edited by the Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica (CEEH), which has been promoting the study of the Habsburg monarchy and early modern Spanish visual culture for close to a decade now, and lavishly illustrated with judicious selections from a vast array of little-known manuscript and printed sources, this book fills a long-standing gap in a field dominated by historians of art and architecture, who have traditionally been interested in and fascinated by the royal or private collecting of chiefly Italian paintings and the reception of Italian art forms.

La memoria de las piedras starts off with two introductory chapters, the first on the interest in and appreciation for Roman ruins in medieval Spain, and the second

focusing on Spanish travelers to the Eternal City as well as perceptions and descriptions of Rome in Spanish Renaissance writing. This initial section is followed by some fascinating pages on the development among Spanish erudites of a more systematic and rigorous method of studying Roman coins, transcribing Latin inscriptions, surveying the landscape for ancient monuments, and identifying archaeological sites. Conversely, in the following chapter, Morán notes the lack of interest and respect among the common people and a number of civic or religious authorities for those remnants of the pagan world, which they either reused as construction material, destroyed for religious motives, or simply ignored, causing them to decay and disappear. And they vanished at an alarming rate, as attested by various sixteenth- and seventeenth-century descriptions of the celebrated site of Itálica, outside of Seville. In his view, there was no serious engagement with Roman ruins at the time, no sense of their value as archaeological and architectural patrimony, and no real commitment to their protection and preservation on the part of Spanish institutions; in a nutshell, there was no modern notion of moral duty or legal responsibility.

The function of antiquities was perceived to be merely utilitarian or practical, as in the case of the well-known aqueduct of Segovia. Regrettably, Morán only briefly touches upon the much more historically grounded use and (re)appropriation of ancient statues, columns, arches, or inscriptions by several Andalusian municipalities in order to foster civic pride among their population. By doing so, he downplays the importance, significance, and symbolic value—in terms of self-perception and collective identity—of these artifacts’ strategic incorporation in existing buildings, such as the city hall of that most famous of all Roman cities in the Iberian Peninsula, Mérida, or new public spaces like the Alameda of Hercules in Seville.

This hunt for antiquities and the conservation and collection of antiquities by individual scholars, nobles, and city officials throughout the Iberian peninsula starting in the mid-sixteenth century, con-

nects these objects to Spain’s larger re-reading and re-writing of its past. It speaks to and intersects with its renewed sense of (mostly local and regional, not yet national) identity, as well as to Spain’s rediscovery, recovery, and new-found appreciation for its Roman—and, to a lesser extent, pre-Roman—heritage after centuries of Muslim rule. This was a lengthy process, in great part supported by the Spanish monarchy, which, starting with Philip II, sought to base its authority and legitimacy on both classical and Christian traditions, as the magnitude and complexity of the Escorial (with its architecture, its decoration, its library, and its relic collection) clearly attest.

In light of this, the author’s examination of the Habsburg kings’ relationship to classical antiquity and its place within the royal art collections can appear somewhat perplexing. It seems rather restrictive and narrow, and perhaps overly simplistic, for instance, to measure Philip II’s interest in antiquities (or lack thereof) only by his distaste for classical sculpture, and to compare it with his ill-fated heir don Carlos’ fairly substantial collection of antique statues, which he managed to build up in a very short period of time. Clearly, Spanish rulers understood the propagandistic value of antiquity and appreciated the reputation, respectability, and credibility it could afford them. And this was not limited to stones or statues. It could also be found in the visual rhetoric of monuments, pageantry and ceremonial, as well as in the discourse of print, poetry, and painting. Morán closes his book with a short chapter about Philip IV’s copies of famous antique statues that the great painter Diego Velázquez had commissioned on his behalf during his time in Rome in 1649–50, forming what the author labels the king’s “imaginary museum.” Once again, despite the obvious striving for prestige and distinction underlying such an undertaking, which are evoked but never seriously explored, Morán doubts the genuineness of the monarch’s interest in antiquities (read statuary) and questions his motives.

Morán is at his very best when he discusses the active participation of Spanish scholars in the learned circles of sixteenth-century Rome, especially in debates about

ancient society, beliefs, rituals, and monuments, as well as their pioneering role in Christian archaeology, most notably the (re)discovery of the Roman catacombs. This meticulous monograph recognizes Spanish antiquarians for their pivotal contributions to Renaissance humanism, finally allowing them to take their rightful places within the sixteenth-century European republic of letters. For ecclesiastics like bishop Antonio Agustín, a key figure in the field of Renaissance numismatics, who accomplished seminal work on Roman law throughout his years of service in the Papal curia, or Dominican friar Alfonso Chacón, an expert on ancient epigraphy well known for his detailed study of Trajan's column and for his history of the papacy, love of antiquity never contradicted their Christian faith. The two were never mutually exclusive. Rather, these churchmen sought to reconcile the two traditions by devoting scholarly attention to early Christianity, an interest that distinguishes early modern Spanish scholars from other European humanists of their time. Morán acknowledges but also slights this distinctive characteristic by focusing exclusively on the pagan Roman past.

Ultimately, one cannot help but sense that the author considers early modern Spain to have been something of a cultural backwater, a mere sub-province of Italy. This deeply engrained notion, still prevalent among numerous scholars of the Spanish Renaissance, especially Latinists and art historians, tends to view Spanish artistic and cultural productions through an Italian lens, comparing and judging Spanish art against the benchmark of Italian achievements. Therefore, all the large-scale collectors of antiquities and major connoisseurs of the Roman world Morán features in his book had direct and sustained contact with Italy, living there for a number of years alongside both its ancient and modern treasures. These men, who usually fulfilled diplomatic and administrative duties for the Spanish monarchy, either as ambassadors or viceroys (of Naples, most of the time), appear to have developed during their stay a marked taste and genuine passion for antiquity, and they imported to their Iberian palaces

statues, sculptures, and medals, which they did not find or, according to Morán did not bother to seek, at home.

How quickly these carefully assembled collections were dispersed and for the most part lost by the end of the seventeenth century further confirms, in the author's opinion, the superficial imprint of the classical legacy in Spain. The fact that the overwhelming majority of early modern Spanish collectors preferred medals and inscriptions over statues is an indication to Morán that their love of antiquity was superficial, an appreciation strictly and basely historical rather than aesthetic. This was their one major flaw, according to the author, who never seeks to understand or explain their underlying motives. They treated those precious Roman remains as archival sources of information rather than as objects of beauty—just as any self-respecting modern art historian would do.

GUY LAZURE
University of Windsor

Guy Nordenson, editor

Seven Structural Engineers: The Felix Candela Lectures

New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2008, 188 pp., 188 color and 66 b/w illus. \$45, ISBN 978087070703

Historical surveys of modern architecture often begin with a celebration of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century structural engineering, citing works such as the iron bridge at Coalbrookdale and the frame of the Home Insurance Building. But as the narratives advance into the twentieth century, such illustrations become less frequent, leaving awkward thematic gaps and a view of architecture that accounts poorly for structure, construction, and materials. Efforts to reframe the story have been hampered by a lack of publications bridging the disciplines of architecture and engineering. Andrew Saint's recent *Architect and Engineer: A Study in Sibling Rivalry* makes a valuable contribution to this end.¹ For its part, the Museum of Modern Art has published the Felix Candela Lectures, which were presented from 1998 to 2005 in conjunction with the schools of

architecture at MIT and Princeton University and the Structural Engineers Association of New York. Organized by Guy Nordenson, professor of architecture and structural engineering at Princeton, the lecture series offered a forum for distinguished engineers and scholars to share their thinking with a general audience. This proved to be a challenge, and the speakers took a variety of approaches in presenting their work, ranging from straightforward, chronologically organized descriptions to thematic and theoretical presentations. Interesting to review, these presentations are instructive as one considers how best to weave the subject of structural engineering into architectural history.

The seven engineers represented in the MoMA collection are Eladio Dieste (1917–2000), presented by Stanford Anderson, Cecil Balmond (b. 1943), Leslie E. Robertson (b. 1928), Heinz Isler (1926–2009), Mamoru Kawaguchi (b. 1932), Christian Menn (b. 1927), and Jörg Schlaich (b. 1934). A concluding essay by David Billington and Maria M. Garlock offers a survey of thin-shell concrete structures by Candela (1910–1997), Isler, Anton Tedesko (1903–1994), and Pier Luigi Nervi (1891–1979).

In his introduction, Nordenson seeks to devise a critical language for the art of structural engineering that accounts for the discipline's fusion of aesthetics and empiricism. Drawing on sources familiar to a museum audience, ranging from Octavio Paz on Marcel Duchamp to the poetry of William Carlos Williams and Stéphane Mallarmé, he locates the achievements of structural engineers "in the realm of things and order" (23), and sees their focused engagement with things as broadly expressive of human values (14). The argument is dense for a short essay but invites discussion.

Nordenson also addresses the problem of visibility in structural engineering. While familiar terms of object and authorship can be applied to certain buildings and structures, such as those designed by Dieste, Isler, and Menn, they are less useful in regard to the collaborative practices of Balmond, Robertson, Kawaguchi, and Schlaich. Robertson's contribution to a building