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Ongoing and Upcoming
We are writing this message during our fourth EAHN annual business meeting. This time the gracious hosts are our Turkish colleagues and we are very grateful for the warm welcome they have given us. Not only did they organize an afternoon of presentations offering a fascinating overview for us of research related to architectural history in Turkey, but they also showed us what hospitality at the Middle East Technical University means. During the course of the weekend we received a brief but excellent introduction to the culture of the city of Ankara in the broadest sense. In the Anatolian Museum of Civilizations and in the contemporary city we again realized how multilayered culture can be and how various influences from different traditions can merge. Notwithstanding (or perhaps even because of) this diversity, we experienced Ankara as both a modern capital but also as the center of Turkish culture and identity.

At the presentation of research institutions, we heard Turkish colleagues from Ankara and Istanbul describe their sometimes frustrating position at the crossroads between Faculties of Social Science, the Humanities, and Technical Science (architecture and urban planning). This is one of the aspects that makes architectural history so fascinating, but it also makes it difficult to establish ourselves as a distinctly recognizable discipline in this age of classification, formalization, registration, citation indexes, and continuous evaluation. For this reason we decided last year at our Leuven meeting to develop our own ranked list of journals in the field. With a small working group now formed for this project, we aim to have a list ready to present to the relevant national and international organizations after final discussion of it at the Guimarães conference next year.

We are pleased to see the EAHN Thematic Groups becoming well established, with active projects currently pursued by the Eastern Europe and Balkan group and the group on judicial architecture. The group on colonial architecture, which investigates the architectural histories in former European colonies from an international perspective, also seems to be well underway and has presented itself on our newly revised website.

The members of the Guimarães conference committee devoted many hours of their time in Ankara to the selection of twenty-five conference sessions and roundtables from among the sixty-seven proposals received for our 2010 conference.
The good overall quality of the proposals (with some truly excellent submissions) made decisions difficult, but those selected will ensure a balanced and innovative program which will complement the distinguished slate of varied keynote speakers being assembled for the conference.

This conference will mark the coming of age of our organization. In the fifteen months remaining before Guimarães, it is of the utmost importance that we succeed in gaining more formal support and financial backing from organizations, institutions and individuals. Only in this manner can we continue to strengthen existing projects and also to realize some of our dreams, such as a comprehensive international database of new monographs in the discipline, or our own independent scholarly journal.

In the meantime we can celebrate another achievement with the launch of our brand-new website, which integrates the newsletter contents with other organizational information and a database of events listings to which any member can contribute. Our established projects continue: the EAHN Newsletter appears regularly every three months, and we are planning more tours to “new geographies,” and lesser-known sites in well-known countries. In April we hope to meet new colleagues at the Society of Architectural Historians annual meeting as we already did at the College Art Association meeting last month. And after the successful joint conference with the SAH and gta/ETH in Zurich last summer, we look forward to the joint symposium with the SAMGB in London this spring, British Architecture Seen from Abroad.

Last but not least we continue to profit from the commitment of our dedicated committee members, and can now count on the skills and enthusiasm of four Turkish colleagues newly elected to the committee. Next year we hope to welcome at least as many new people to our fifth annual business meeting in Bologna, because although the network faces a necessary process of professionalization, above all we want to remain an open community of friends in love with architecture.

Christine Mengin                      Rob Dettingmeijer                     Jorge Correia
President                            First Vice President                   Second Vice President
EAHN Fourth Annual Business Meeting, Ankara

The Fourth Annual Business Meeting of the EAHN committee took place at the Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara from 13-15 February 2009. Committee member Belgin Turan Özkaya along with Elvan Altan Ergut and other colleagues from the Faculty of Architecture ably coordinated the weekend’s exceptionally full program, allowing for discussions with Turkish colleagues and the exploration of several millennia of architecture in Ankara, in addition to the business meeting agenda. Fourteen out of twenty-three committee members attended the meeting, and on Saturday we welcomed four new committee members to our group, bringing our total to twenty-seven for 2009. In addition to the committee members, Isabel van der Zande from the EAHN office at MIT, TU Delft, as well as Marc Visser, director of the MIT Research Center, joined the meeting in Ankara.

After a lunch hosted by the METU Rectorate on Friday, we continued the tradition begun at our 2008 business meeting in Leuven with presentations on Turkish graduate programs and research institutes in architectural history organized by our hosts for our first afternoon at the METU Faculty of Architecture. Representatives of ten research programs and organizations presented profiles of their curricula, projects and facilities. The day concluded with a lively reception hosted by the METU Faculty of Architecture Alumni Association.

Committee members discussed Network business all day on Saturday, reviewing the accomplishments of 2008 and planning new projects for 2009 and beyond. Committee member Jorge Correia was elected Second Vice President of the EAHN, reflecting his outstanding efforts as General Chair of the EAHN First International Meeting in Guimarães, June 2010.

The EAHN 2010 Advisory Committee worked intensively during the entire weekend, meeting Friday morning and early afternoon, Saturday evening after dinner, and Sunday morning to plan details of next year’s conference in Guimarães. The publications committee met Saturday evening over dinner to discuss plans for a future journal. Sunday midday and afternoon we toured
Emin Onat and Orhan Arda, Mausoleum of Atatürk, Anıttepe, Ankara, 1941-53
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a traditional Ankara orchard house maintained by the Vekam research center, which also hosted our lunch there. After lunch, we continued our tour in the historic center of Ankara.

Full reports on the Turkish research forum and the EAHN business meeting will be published in the June issue of the EAHN Newsletter; the minutes of the meeting will be posted on the EAHN website.

SAHGB-EAHN Annual Symposium: Program Published and Registration Open

British Architecture Seen from Abroad
London, 16 May 2009

The program for the SAHGB-EAHN Annual Symposium, British Architecture Seen from Abroad, has now been published. The day-long symposium features twelve papers, with speakers coming from nine countries in Europe, Asia and North America, and subjects ranging from medieval and early modern architecture through nineteenth- and twentieth-century topics.

The symposium will be held at the Art Workers Guild, London, www.artworkersguild.org. Symposium registration includes lunch and refreshments.

For the complete program and other information, or to register for the symposium, visit the symposium website at: http://web.me.com/asquins2002/Site_2/Symposium_2009.html.

A Ranked List of Journals: Reconfiguring Assessment in the Field

As many members of EAHN will be aware of, European universities are increasingly assessing their faculty by examining research output. Research Assessment Exercises as conducted in the United Kingdom might not yet be omnipresent, but in many countries one can definitely see a tendency to head in that direction.
Catalogue cover from the Exhibition on British Urbanism, shown at the following venues: Ankara, People’s House, 25 January-11 February 1947; Istanbul, Fine Arts Academy, 14-28 February 1947; Izmir, Cultural Park Exhibition House, 11-24 March 1947
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Catalogue cover from the Exhibition on English Architecture, English Cultural Council, 1944. A study of British architectural exhibitions in Turkey will be among the papers presented at the SAHGB-EAHN Annual Symposium on 16 May in London.
Photograph: Elvan Altan Ergut
When universities and regulating bodies develop a research assessment system, they often base themselves on what are seen as commonly accepted parameters in the sciences and life sciences. In these disciplines, books are not regarded as particularly important, and exhibition catalogues are unheard of. Major publications in these fields are articles in reviewed journals with high ranking and high impact factors. The ranking of journals and the calculation of their impact factor is generally done by relying upon the *isi* Web of Science, which offers such services through its *sci* (Science Citation Index), *ssci* (Social Science Citation Index) and *ahci* (Arts & Humanities Citation Index). Unfortunately, the *ahci* is far less comprehensive and serviceable than the other two citation indexes. Books are not excerpted in *ahci* and many important journals never made it into their list of titles. *ahci* is therefore not a good basis for assessing the research output of architectural historians. Nevertheless many universities seem to be inclined to use the *ahci* – basically for reasons of simplicity of procedure and for lack of an alternative system.

The humanities in general and architectural history in particular thus increasingly feel the pressure to develop a system of their own that would offer guidelines in assessing the research output of scholars. For the moment no such system is available, although initiatives are being taken by several bodies (among them the European Science Foundation). Such a system should be able to acknowledge the value of books and exhibition catalogues, next to articles published in international journals. The *eahn* wants to play a role in these developments. As a first step, we plan to produce a ranked list of journals relevant for architectural history and conservation, and to this end formed a subcommittee during the *eahn* annual business meeting in Ankara. The subcommittee aims to prepare a ranked list of international journals to be approved during the 2010 *eahn* conference in Guimarães, Portugal. A tentative draft list of journals is now available on the *eahn* Website at: www.eahn.org/resources/uploads/135/List%20of%20periodicals%20(proposal%201108).pdf

Initial members of the subcommittee established in Ankara are Hilde Heynen, Maristella Casciato, Elvan Altan Ergut and Cana Bilsel. We warmly invite other *eahn* members to join this subcommittee in order to have a more extensive coverage of countries and languages. Scholars from Germany, Spain, Portugal, Greece, the UK
The EAHN ranked journals project aims to develop a reliable tool which will help both institutions and individual scholars orient themselves within the maze of periodical publications in architectural history.
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and eastern Europe are especially encouraged to join us. Work will be conducted through e-mail exchanges, Skype conference calls and one intermediate meeting coinciding with the EAHN business meeting of January 2010. If you are interested in volunteering for this subcommittee, please contact hilde.heynen@asro.kuleuven.be.

Hilde Heynen

**New EAHN Website Launched**

On 11 February, the EAHN launched its newly revised website www.eahn.org. The new site, conceived by a committee led by Nancy Stieber and designed graphically by Reto Geiser, was produced by the Swiss web designer Simon Kägi (www.urukai.ch). The new site contains the contents of the quarterly *EAHN Newsletter*, documentation of EAHN activities, and a searchable database of current and past conferences, exhibitions, and other items of interest to architectural historians. A portal on the home page makes it easy for anyone to submit an events listing.

**EAHN now a CAA Affiliated Society**

On 1 March the board of the College Art Association (CAA) voted to grant the EAHN affiliated-society status with the CAA. This recognition from the leading scholarly society for art historians and university-based visual artists in North America brings numerous benefits for the EAHN, all of which increase the organization’s visibility among the CAA’s 14,000 members: listing in the online directory of over sixty affiliated societies on the CAA website; the possibility to publish EAHN news such as conference announcements or calls for papers in the CAA newsletter; and eligibility for an EAHN business meeting at the CAA annual conference, as well as the opportunity to apply for an EAHN program session at the conference. In anticipation of the board’s vote, the CAA kindly provided the EAHN with facilities for an information meeting at the CAA’s ninety-seventh annual conference in Los Angeles on 26 February. Other CAA affiliated societies include well-known organizations such as the Society of Architectural Historians, the Renaissance Society of America, and the London-based Association of Art Historians. For further details of the CAA affiliated societies program, including the online directory of affiliated societies, visit www.collegeart.org/affiliated.
The new EAHN website contains both HTML and PDF versions of all EAHN Newsletter issues, organizational documentation, and the “Ongoing and Upcoming” database. Everyone is invited to submit events listings for the database through the “Add a Listing” page.

The College Art Association website provides complete information on the CAA Affiliated Societies program.
EAHN at SAH 2009, Pasadena

As in recent years, the European Architectural History Network will be represented at the Society of Architectural Historians sixty-second annual meeting this coming April. The EAHN meeting at the SAH conference is scheduled for Thursday, 2 April, from noon to 13:30, in the Redwood room of the Sheraton Pasadena. Please join EAHN committee members in Pasadena for an update about the network and discussion regarding the organization’s new, continuing, and prospective projects. EAHN general members or potential members with comments, suggestions, or an interest in active participation in the network are particularly encouraged to attend.

On the Calendar

**EAHN at SAH**: Thursday, 2 April 2009, Redwood Room, Sheraton Pasadena, 12:00-13:30

**SAHGB-EAHN Annual Symposium**: *British Architecture Seen from Abroad*, London, 16 May 2009

**EAHN First International Meeting**, Guimarães, June 2010: call for papers to be released in early April 2009; call for papers submission deadline, 30 October 2009
Plan to attend the EAHN information session at the SAH annual meeting in Pasadena this April.
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During the academic year 2008/9 the Department of Landscape at the University of Sheffield celebrates its fortieth anniversary. As the largest and most research-oriented Department of Landscape in Great Britain, it is one of the leading landscape architecture schools in the world.

HISTORY

Initiated by the School of Architecture, the Department of Landscape Architecture (as it was initially called) was until recently incorporated within the Faculty of Architecture; since 2007 it belongs to the Faculty of Social Sciences. The first cohort of students joined the M.A. in Landscape Design in October 1968 for a two-year postgraduate course aimed at candidates with a degree or approved professional qualification in Architecture, Civil Engineering, Geography, Town Planning, Agriculture, Botany, Forestry, or Horticulture. This course aimed to produce “professionally qualified landscape architects to deal at urban and regional scales with a wide range of problems, including development of New Towns, recreation in towns and in Countryside and National Parks, and to tackle problems of dereliction and land reclamation.”

The first Head of Department was Professor Arnold Weddle, a town planner and architect, who had qualified externally in landscape architecture, after which he taught landscape design at the Department of Civic Design in Liverpool. Weddle’s influential Report on the Recruitment, Training and Employment of Landscape Architects (London: ILA, 1961) offered far-reaching proposals that were implemented in Liverpool and later formed the basis for the curriculum in Sheffield also. Liverpool and then Sheffield pioneered in systematic survey and evaluation of large-scale (urban and regional) planning problems, as well as the design and testing of development and redevelopment proposals, all based on research. This was supplemented with a view of landscape architects as practical people who understood various landscape techniques, as exemplified in Weddle’s book Techniques of Landscape Architecture (London: William Heinemann, 1968). Thus, the Sheffield program established its reputation in research and survey-led design.

Weddle could advocate this approach internationally when he became chairman of the Education Committee of the International Federation of Landscape Architects.
The Arts Tower, the home of the Department of Landscape, was designed by the London firm Gollins Melvin and Ward and completed in 1963. It is being refurbished 2008-2010 and is shown here domineering the university library, which was designed by the same firm and completed in 1959. Photograph: University of Sheffield Photographic Collection
The Sheffield Botanical Garden designed by Robert Marnock in 1834, was recently restored with a £6M grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund; the application for this grant was prepared by the Department of Landscape, which carried out the historical and social research needed. Photograph: Peter Lathey

(1970-76); simultaneously he was founding editor of Elsevier’s *Landscape Planning*, now *Landscape and Urban Planning*, a pioneering academic journal on landscape architecture begun in 1974. From 1973 the Sheffield Department of Landscape Architecture expanded with an undergraduate course. This was both the first interfaculty course offered in the University, in which students commenced with courses in the “natural environmental sciences, botany, geography and geology as well as landscape studies,” and the first landscape course to do this nationally. As a result of this general approach with an emphasis on research activity the new department attracted a number of Ph.D students.

Sheffield graduates were soon in demand for their “dual” degrees, with a range of Departments being associated with Landscape over the years: Animal and Plant Sciences (Ecology), Archaeology, Town and Regional Planning, and Architecture.
Department size remained limited in the 1970s, with approximately twenty-five students and five staff members. Since 1995 the staff has gradually expanded to the present twelve members: four professors, two readers, three senior lecturers and three lecturers. In 2008 Sheffield was one of the most popular destinations for landscape design studies in the UK, with sixty-three incoming MA students, and sixty-three undergraduates for a total of 310 students over the various courses (Landscape Architecture and Planning; Landscape Architecture and Ecology; Architecture and Landscape Design). In addition, there are thirty-seven research (Ph.D) students and further post-docs. Sheffield has been able to maintain this popularity partly through a coordinated delivery of teaching and its dual degree courses, but possibly more importantly this has been through consistently good results in the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), held in 1996, 2001 and 2008 (a rating of 5 out of 5*). In the latest RAE, announced in December 2008, research was rated internationally excellent or outstanding.

RESEARCH AIMS

The Department’s research agenda responds to “the growing need to provide rich and meaningful landscapes for living, in face of external drivers such as climate change; the challenge of sustainable development; declining biodiversity; social, cultural, economic and technological change in urban and rural environments; and changes in the nature of landscape practice. Landscape Architecture needs to develop and embrace new ideas and paradigms to respond to these changes and we aim to be in the vanguard in developing these.” The strategy is thus to maintain its position as the UK’s leading Landscape Architecture research group and expand its international reputation for excellence; to advance landscape architecture research by adopting interdisciplinary approaches that integrate ecological, social and cultural perspectives; and to shape national and international research, knowledge transfer, policy and practice agendas. The approach develops both theoretical aspects of landscape architecture by attracting funding from research councils and charitable trusts, as well as policy and practice-oriented research through government and agency contracts. This strategy has increased funding, volume and quality of research output, the size of the research school, and collective and individual esteem.
For purposes of the RAE, research was classified according to four broad themes that seemed to harness the activities of individuals, and which are helpful in explaining the breadth of research currently undertaken in the Department:

- **Urban ecological landscape design and management** concentrates on the “application of ecological theory to landscape practice to improve sustainability whilst meeting human aesthetic and functional needs,” is informed by social-cultural context, and is fundamentally interdisciplinary.

- **Planning and management of rural and peri-urban landscapes** concentrates on “shaping future multifunctional landscapes in the face of socio-economic and environmental change.”

- **Human interaction with landscapes** concentrates on “how social, cultural and personal circumstances affect perception of designed landscapes and their capacity to provide meaningful experiences.”

- **Landscape design theory** concentrates particularly on “how design decisions are conceived within social and cultural contexts,” recognizing that in fact theory underpins all sectors of landscape architecture.
While these four themes create rather artificial divisions between the work of individuals as interconnected within the Department and with other faculties, in practice they have been useful in stimulating ideas, nurturing funding bids, targeting conference attendance, discussing research directions and structuring peer review.

RESEARCH IN DESIGN THEORY

The design theory grouping is perhaps of greatest interest to architectural historians. This includes Cathy Dee, a practicing artist who focuses her research agenda on the interface between fine art and visual practice, and the philosophy, culture and pedagogy of environmentally-oriented landscape architecture. Her unique contribution and growing international reputation lie in bringing together these facets to develop Landscape Architecture theory; raising the visual from unreflective practice to more serious scholarly attention and use as critical method; and examining the question “What kind of art is an (ecological) landscape architecture?” She is one of the founding editors of the new European Journal of Landscape Architecture (JoLA) which provides a platform for innovative contemporary research methodologies specific to the discipline. She has shaped new perspectives within landscape architecture through her influential book Form and Fabric (2001), and her widely-cited paper “The Imaginary Texture of the Real” has helped shape the development of practice-based methodologies.

Dr. Kevin Thwaites, a landscape architect and co-founder of International Sustainability through Environmental Design Network, has developed a program of experiential landscape research which pioneers the synthesis of experiential and spatial dimensions in the analysis and design of outdoor settings used by people in daily activity. The research underpins the potential of experiential landscape as a methodology through which to give voice to under-represented sections of the community in processes of environmental improvement that affect them. The research departs from established working patterns by developing much-needed but currently unavailable practical tools that can reveal experiential dimensions of open-space use in ways relevant to current analysis and design practices.

His research has been disseminated in journals and at international conferences. His book Experiential Landscape: An Approach to People, Space and Place (2007), details
experiential landscape methodology in the context of the wider philosophical and theoretical context of people-place-space relations.

Dr. Jan Woudstra, a landscape architect and historian, former editor of *Garden History*, is one of a select handful of scholars who has advanced contemporary design theory through applying a historical perspective. His work spans from the Medieval to the present. He has sought to understand how designers have worked and how and why they have made their design decisions. His unique contribution involves practical issues of design and management processes which, while critical, are often conspicuously absent from design theory. Much of this research has been undertaken by studying individual designers and specific design sites. In some cases this has been undertaken in conjunction with architects (particularly Professor Peter Blundell Jones, of the University of Sheffield) to achieve a more complete understanding of projects and theories. His detailed knowledge of historical fashions and theories has allowed him to critique current trends from a unique perspective, and conclude that many modern schemes fail in terms of conservation, authenticity and meaning.

His Ph.D students are involved in aspects of landscape design with history, theory and conservation, and lie firmly within the humanities. A group of students working on similar topics has helped create momentum in the research community with regular inter-departmental conferences which encourage exchange of information. One of the most prominent groups of students currently are those with a Far Eastern origin. Here resources are combined with those of the School of Architecture, with regular East-West conferences (currently some three per year) open to all those interested. Eastern-themed research currently undertaken includes: “A framework for garden conservation in Korea”; “Attitudes and values of garden heritage in China”; “Scenic improvement in Ancient China”; “Thirty years of landscape design in China (1949-1979): The era of Mao Zedong.” Research with a sustainability theme includes students taking a historic perspective: “Sustainable landscape regeneration in middle-rise housing through case studies in Sweden, Germany and Mexico”; “Contemporary Persian gardens; in search of a new language”; “Water in Persian gardens from ancient times to the present.” Other topics include those stretching the boundaries of traditional (art historical) approaches in “Celestial expression or worldly magic: a critical investigation of some philosophical aspects in the design of Tycho Brahe’s Uranienborg” and
Jan Kip and Leonard Kniff, View of Chatsworth, c. 1700
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“The Serviceable Ghost: the forgotten role of the gardener in England from 1600-1730.” More contemporary research is undertaken in “Hermann Mattern (1902-1971), landscape architect: life and work,” supervised in association with Blundell Jones. Other Department staff also include aspects of interest to landscape historians in their research: Professor Paul Selman, the Head of Department includes a project into landscape time-depth, Professor Carys Swanwick was the main author of the seminal Landscape Character Assessment Guidance (2002), while Andy Clayden examines cemetery landscapes as an expression of vernacular culture and has explored the history of “natural” burial.

RESOURCES

Postgraduate research and visiting fellows are supported by various means. British and European students frequently receive financial support from one of the research councils (Arts and Humanities Research Council, or Economic and Social Research Council); other students may qualify for a University fee waiver; and most foreign students arrive with a secured grant from their home countries. An important part of the department income derives from research into countryside issues and knowledge transfer grants, particularly associated with children’s play, as well as various European grants—for example a government supported Green Roof Centre. Students are normally provided with office space and computer access. The university offers a particularly good library and state-of-the-art library facilities, as well as easy access to the British Library, with free weekly transport to the Boston Spa branch. The university library Special Collections includes the Hartlib papers, which are of great interest to garden historians.

The dynamic nature of the Department assures that there is a steady demand for positions for visiting scholars either within the Department or one of the research projects. A temporary move to the University’s Crookesmoor building while the Arts Tower, a 1960s icon, is being refurbished, means that the various activities can now be unified. This move will affect both the Department of Landscape and the School of Architecture who will jointly occupy the top of the Miesian tower on their return in 2010, with more space available for both.

Jan Woudstra
Department of Landscape, University of Sheffield
Research by Dr. Oliver Gilbert, an ecologist and early member of staff of the Department of Landscape, discovered how the sloping lawn at Chatsworth was laid out in the 1760s by the landscape gardener Capability Brown and had been maintained continuously ever since. They are now known as the Salisbury Lawns and contain a richly varied vegetation. Photograph: Jan Woudstra
The Southwest Cemetery in Stahnsdorf and Other Berlin Cemeteries

Throughout history, necropolises and cemeteries have shaped the landscape and built environment near settlements, addressing cultural, religious, and aesthetic needs while providing essential infrastructure for public health. As such, they are major but often little-known monuments through which the histories of art, architecture, gardens, landscape, and urban planning intersect.

Berlin probably has more significant cemeteries than any other European city. With a population of 3.4 million, Berlin has 223 cemeteries covering an area of 1,600 hectares, 1.5% of the city’s area. Most of them (191) are still used for burials, and seventy-five are listed historic monuments or districts. Because of Berlin’s particular history, the available burial ground far exceeds what is actually needed for burials. Today, while less than half of the cemeteries in Berlin are needed to function as burial locations, they all provide high-quality natural areas of enormous importance for the city’s ecology. Furthermore, they have been continuous witnesses to the city’s tumultuous history. Their preservation should be a civic and national priority.

Development of the Stahnsdorf Cemetery

The largest cemetery of Berlin is the two hundred hectare Southwest Cemetery in Stahnsdorf, a protected heritage site. Situated only a few meters outside the city limits, the cemetery is owned by the Protestant Church of Berlin. The cemetery opened on 28 March 1909 and thus celebrates its one hundredth anniversary this year.

In 1900 Berlin had about 2.5 million inhabitants and was the third largest metropolis in Europe. By 1920, the population, including that of the suburbs, had increased to 3.9 million. As a result of this rapid growth, church parishes were compelled to find new cemetery space as quickly as possible, developing new ideas and strategies for burial sites. Thus, the Protestant Church of Berlin decided to establish new, concentrated cemeteries outside the city limits. In 1906 the church authorities bought three large properties outside of Berlin, in Mühlenbeck, Ahrensfelde and Stahnsdorf. While the ideas for Mühlenbeck were never realized, and Ahrensfelde was only partially developed, the Southwest Cemetery in Stahnsdorf was realized completely.

In 1907 a competition was held to collect ideas for the design of the new cemetery serving about six hundred thousand inhabitants of southwest Berlin. None of the fifteen proposals, however, could fully convince the jury, so the staff landscape architect of the Protestant Church, Louis Meyer, was charged with the design of the new cemetery. He was to pool the best ideas of the competition and incorporate them into the creation of a new work.
Gustav Werner, mourning chapel, Stahnsdorf, 1908-11
Photograph: archive W. Gottschalk, 2007
**DESIGN AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

The program called for creating a woodland cemetery on the two hundred hectares where the twenty-one church parishes would each receive its own burial area. These “little cemeteries” were arranged along the ring road which runs more than two kilometers through the cemetery. The burial sections are connected by pathways of varying sizes, their crossings often marked by impressive fountains. These pathways and visual axes, together with small stairways, walls and several small service buildings, were able to connect and unify the different sections into a complete work of distinctive character. By the end of the 1920s more than one hundred thousand trees had been planted to emphasize the forest-like character of the green space.

Despite this romantic atmosphere the cemetery was a very modern place and technically up-to-date. A large pipe system for the water supply of the whole area was installed, fed with water pumped up with a high pressure system, called “Hydrophor.” The service buildings and areas—among them two gatehouses at the entrance, a blacksmith’s workshop, a plant nursery covering eight hectares, houses for the employees, and chapels—are very sensitively integrated into the forest area with its now more than eighty-year-old trees.

At the cemetery, garden design was unified with art, architecture and sculpture. The most important building is the mourning chapel, built from 1908-11 by the architect Gustav Werner. The wooden chapel is built in the style of Norwegian stave churches. With its art nouveau stained glass windows, interior wooden panelling, and the original organ, the chapel and its furnishings have been completely preserved to the present. From 1930-31 a new building for the administration was erected. Designed in a cubic, sober style, the red brick building differs from the rest of the cemetery but is still in use today, unaltered, with even its wooden interior fully preserved.

The cemetery’s location on the outskirts of the city was inconvenient for visitors to reach, so in 1908 the management decided to build a 4.4-kilometer-long railway line to connect it to the city train lines of Berlin. In addition to the rails, bridges and embankments, a complete new train station and restaurant were built in front of the cemetery entrance. Furthermore, several buildings for the railway employees were built along with two big halls for coffin storage, one in Stahnsdorf and one at the head of the train line in Wannsee, all designed by Gustav Werner. During the day, visitors took the train to reach the cemetery; by night, the deceased were transported by the “corpse train.” Despite its considerable distance from the center, the cemetery registered more than thirty-five thousand burials in its first twenty-five years. Today it contains one hundred and ten thousand graves.
On 13 August 1961 the Berlin Wall was built, abruptly separating the cemetery from many of the districts it served. That day the last train arrived at the Southwest Cemetery. During the following twenty-eight years, it was nearly impossible for West Berliners to visit the cemetery, and its grounds became increasingly overgrown and neglected. Plants and trees grew between the graves and many mausoleums and monuments were damaged. Only a few people from Stahnsdorf and some nearby villages were buried here in the intervening years. After the fall of the wall and reunification in 1990, the cemetery gradually came back into use. Several recent projects have succeeded in partially stopping the deterioration, and today it is again possible to recognize the value of the ensemble for landscape and architectural history. In 2008 there were over five hundred burials at the cemetery.

GRAVES AND MONUMENTS
Many prominent people were buried in the cemetery, which also features numerous significant art works from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. The earliest art works and monuments arrived at the cemetery in 1938-39 as a result of reburials and the transfer of graves and monuments from elsewhere in the city. But the most important ones were site-specific and erected between 1909 and 1939.

People like the Social Democrat Rudolf Breitscheid, the artists Lovis Corinth and Heinrich Zille, the composers Engelbert Humperdinck and Hugo Distler, the actor Gustav Kadelburg, Walter Gropius (the father of the architect), and the film director Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau are buried here, as well as entrepreneurs like Werner von Siemens, the publishers Gustav Langenscheidt and Louis-Ferdinand Ullstein, the geographer Ferdinand von Richthofen, and the aeronautical engineer Edmund Rumpler. Characteristic for the forest cemetery are the rustically designed gravestones and natural stones like those of Zille, Corinth and Humperdinck. In addition, one can find many large graves and unusual mausoleums here, such as the mausoleums of the Caspary and Harteneck families, the neo-Renaissance mausoleum of the Langenscheidt publishing family, and the large grave of the Siemens family, itself a little private cemetery.

Of particular importance is the Expressionist funerary monument of the Wissinger family, the only executed design associated with the Glass Chain group. Erected in 1922-1923 by Max Taut, it is inspired by Gothic cathedrals, but constructed in reinforced concrete.

The cemetery also includes three foreign sections: British and Italian military cemeteries and a section for the Swedish parish of Berlin. The British grove was laid out for 1,172 prisoners of the First World War and a monumental stone cross with a sword marks its center. In 1928 the Italian cemetery with an obelisk at
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Gustav Werner, railway station, Stahnsdorf, 1913
Photograph: Orenstein & Koppel, 1913 / archive Southwest Cemetery

A fountain at the intersection of cemetery paths, Stahnsdorf
Photograph: archive Southwest Cemetery, 2005
its center was opened for 1,650 Italian victims of the First World War. Near the mourning chapel one finds the cemetery for eighty members of the Swedish parish of West Berlin, designed by the Swedish architect Alfred Grenander who was active in Berlin for many years.

REBURIALS AND GRAVE TRANSFERS
Especially important for the history of Berlin is the reburial of thirty thousand deceased resulting from the construction of the so-called North-South Axis during Albert Speer’s monumental urban reconstruction project in the late 1930s. Many graves with their respective monuments and mausoleums were transferred to Stahnsdorf. Most of the monuments were moved from the Old St. Matthäus cemetery and brought by train to the Southwest Cemetery. Here they were re-erected in a 1.5-kilometer-long line at the north of the cemetery.

Since 1991 the Protestant Church of Berlin has invested more than six million euros in the restoration of the Stahnsdorf cemetery grounds, buildings and facilities. The large number of visitors reflects the great interest in the cultural-historical and art historical features of the park. Since January 2000 the Stahnsdorf Southwest Cemetery Support Association e.V. has given its support to the protection of the historical monument and thus the preservation of the cemetery culture. Today, the Stahnsdorf Southwest Cemetery is not only considered a place of burial, mourning, and memory, but has also gained increasing importance for the recreational and social functions it serves in the community.

OTHER SIGNIFICANT CEMETERIES IN BERLIN

Alter St. Matthäus Kirchhof
Großgörschenstraße 12-14, 10829 Berlin

This is one of the most important cemeteries of Berlin, founded in 1856 for parish members in the Tiergarten district. The parish itself has disappeared, due to the Nazi plans for the South-West Axis and the ravages of the Second World War. Today the friends of the cemetery (EFEU e.V.: Erhalten, Fördern, Entwickeln, Unterstützen) organize several cultural projects at the cemetery. Important graves include those of the composer Max Bruch, the women’s rights activist Minna Cauer, the Brothers Grimm, the Hansemann family of bankers and politicians, and the author David Kalisch; in recent years, a monument for the victims of HIV has been added.
Langenscheidt Mausoleum, Stahnsdorf, 1895. This mausoleum by an unknown architect was moved from the Old St. Matthäus Cemetery in the city center to the Southwest Cemetery in 1939 as a result of Nazi-era urban planning. Photograph: archive Southwest Cemetery, 2005

Friedhof der Gemeinden Dorotheenstadt und Friedrichswerder
Chausseestraße 126, 10115 Berlin

The cemetery was opened in 1763 and today is known as the cemetery for Berlin’s prominent citizens. Here you find important names as well as numerous graves of art historical importance, such as the authors, playwrights and theatrical directors Heiner Müller, Bertolt Brecht and Helene Weigel; the author Heinrich Mann; the philosophers Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and Herbert Marcuse; the artist John Heartfield; the sculptors Christian Daniel Rauch and Gottfried Schadow; and the architects Karl Friedrich Schinkel and Friedrich August Stüler.

Friedhöfe vor dem Halleschen Tor
Mehringdamm 21, 10961 Berlin

These six cemeteries are of great importance for the (art) historical development of Berlin. Founded in 1735, they are the city’s oldest cemeteries which are still in use for burials. Graves include those of the mathematician and astronomer Carl Friedrich Gauss, the architect David Gilly, the ophthalmologist Albrecht von Graefe, the author Adelbert von Chamisso, the pharmacologist Ernst Christian Friedrich Schering, the composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and his sister Fanny Caecilie Hensel, the postal pioneer Heinrich von Stephan, and the writer and famed salon hostess Rahel Varnhagen von Ense.

Friedhof der Märzgefallenen
Landsberger Allee / Ernst Zinna Weg, 10249 Berlin

The revolutions of 1848 erupted in Berlin that spring, after they had begun in Paris and continued in Vienna. At the barricade fights on 18 March 1848 more than 250 revolutionaries were killed. A few days later they were buried in a new cemetery created specifically for them on the hills of the Friedrichshain. A new project is currently underway to develop the cemetery into a national monument for the 1848 revolution.

Jewish Cemetery Weissensee
Herbert-Baum-Straße 45, 13088 Berlin

The cemetery was designed in 1880 by the architect Hugo Licht, and 115,000 people are buried here. In contrast to other Jewish cemeteries with their puristic, modest graves, here one can also find monumental graves from the late
The British military cemetery, Stahnsdorf
Photograph: archive Southwest Cemetery, 2004

Reinhold Felderhoff, Kühn Mausoleum, Stahnsdorf, 1901. The mausoleum was moved to the Southwest Cemetery in 1939 from the Old St. Matthäus Cemetery in the center of Berlin to make way for Albert Speer’s North-South Axis.
Photograph: archive Southwest Cemetery, 2007
nineteenth century. Near the entrance stands a Holocaust memorial monument to the six million murdered Jews and also steles with the names of all the Nazi concentration camps. For some years the cemetery has been seeking UNESCO World Heritage status. Graves include those of Ury Lesser, the publishers Samuel Fischer and Rudolf Mosse, Albert Mendel, and the Panowsky family grave.

Martin Ernerth
Berlin and Association of Significant Cemeteries in Europe
Max Lippert, "Brunnenskizze für Heilige Geist," plan and elevation for a fountain in the cemetery section for the Holy Spirit parish in the Southwest Cemetery, 1927, detail
Photograph: archive Southwest Cemetery

Max Lippert, "Urnenhain auf dem Südwest-Kirchhof in Stahnsdorf," plan for an urn section, 1920. Lippert was a draftsman in the office of the cemetery designer Louis Meyer.
Photograph: archive Southwest Cemetery
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*Cemeteries in Berlin and Elsewhere in Germany*

Southwest Cemetery, Stahnsdorf
Opening hours: summer 7:00 – 20:00; winter 8:00 – 17:00
www.suedwestkirchhof.de

Foundation for Historic Churchyards and Cemeteries in Berlin-Brandenburg
(Stiftung Historische Kirchhöfe und Friedhöfe in Berlin-Brandenburg)
www.stiftung-historische-friedhoefe.de

Overview of Berlin Cemeteries
www.friedhоеf-berlin.de

Sepulchral Museum, Kassel
(*Zentralinstitut und Museum für Sepulkralkultur*)
Arbeitsgemeinschaft Friedhof und Denkmal e.V.
Weinbergstraße 25–27
D-34117 Kassel
Tel: (0561) 918 93-0
Fax: (0561) 918 93-10
www.sepulkralmuseum.de

Overview of Hamburg Cemeteries
www.friedhof-hamburg.de

*Other Important European Cemeteries*

Association of Significant Cemeteries in Europe
www.significantcemeteries.org

Cemeteries in Barcelona
www.cbsa.es

The Certosa Cemetery in Bologna
www.certosadibologna.it/

The City of London Cemetery
www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/Corporation/ LGNL_Services/Community_and_living/ Deaths_funerals_and_cremations/cem etery_crematorium.htm

Cemeteries in Paris
www.paris.fr/portail/Parcs/Portal. lut?page_id=1702

Cemeteries in Vienna
www.wien.gv.at/kultur/friedhoefe

Mirogoj Cemetery, Zagreb
www.gradskagroblja.hr/default.aspx?sec=92
Ian Thompson, a landscape architect, has written this book on Versailles for a general public, but he also intends to appeal to those with an academic interest in the subject. On the whole, The Sun King’s Garden is a good account of the progress of the works at Versailles and Trianon, their main protagonists, and the technical challenges (levelling, hydraulic engineering, optics) brought about by their unprecedented change of scale. The huge costs of these works—financially, politically, and in human lives—are well observed. Thompson provides details of foreign policy and society during Louis XIV’s reign, although not without some misinterpretations (for instance, regarding Molière). Various pertinent and interesting remarks come to the fore. He mentions issues under debate about the site’s history (such as the authorship of the parterre d’eau), unfortunately lacking in detail. Some misconceptions are perpetuated, such as Louis XIV taking over the Vaux team for his personal benefit, although most of them had long been working in the service of the king. Thompson states that Versailles would be “true to the Cartesian spirit of the times” while Le Nôtre would be “heir to Descartes’ rationalism”: such an affirmation, important for a seventeenth-century cultural history, should be better supported by arguments.

One might expect assessment of Le Nôtre’s achievements as seen through the eyes of a landscape architect to be among the book’s strengths. Thompson offers interesting insights from this perspective, but not enough. To assume (as Michael Brix had done in 2004) that at Vaux-le-Vicomte “the château’s façade and dome are perfectly mirrored in the Carré d’eau, an effect that must have required the careful calculation of distances, levels and angles of reflection” needs to be demonstrated. Nor should Thompson assert without evidence that Le Nôtre was “no great plantsman.”

The book traverses rather summarily the history of Versailles from the eighteenth to the twentieth century, concluding with the influence of Versailles, an issue in
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THE SUN KING’S GARDEN
Louis XIV, André Le Nôtre and the Creation of the Gardens of Versailles
IAN THOMPSON
itself which is dealt with too superficially. Discussing the critical reception of Le Nôtre and Versailles among British landscape architects from the eighteenth century on, for example, would definitely have been a more original and useful contribution.

The selection and layout of the book’s many illustrations is problematic. The text never refers directly to the images, which are unnumbered and often inserted far from the text passages they illustrate. As far as gardens are concerned, these images are not very different from those that can be found in the publication of Pierre-André Lablaude (1998). Far too many plates are borrowed from Dezallier d’Argenville (1709). They are not relevant to the topic, whereas, on the other hand, no drawings by Le Nôtre for Versailles are included at all, despite their immediate pertinence for the subject. The sole document bearing Le Nôtre’s handwriting to be seen in this book (namely the Greenwich garden plan) does not appear before page 274. Though drawings by Le Nôtre and his collaborators are regrettably scarce, ten or so of them are connected with Versailles and Trianon. Their absence here is all the more regrettable since most of them can be found in Franklin H. Hazlehurst’s monograph (1980).

Similarly, the book’s scholarly apparatus leaves something to be desired. As endnotes are not marked in the main text, the reader is unable to know which passages are supplemented with further references. Moreover, the select bibliography is not relevant enough. Instead of quoting Érik Orsenna’s biographical novel, one would have expected to find (at least in the endnotes) Gerold Weber’s monograph (1985), in which Versailles is dealt with in depth, as well as the studies by Gérard Sabatier (1999) and Vincent Maroteaux (2000).

A pleasant read, this book will certainly meet the expectations of the general public at which it aims. It will nevertheless leave readers with a more academic interest somewhat unsatisfied as it offers little in the way of references, nor does it reveal anything new about these mythical garden history icons: Le Nôtre and Versailles.

Aurélia Rostaing
Paris
aurelia.rostaing@noos.fr
Carlo Maratta, Portrait of André Le Nôtre, 1687.
Château de Versailles.
Photograph: Réunion des musées nationaux, from Thompson, p. 26.

Plan of the gardens of the Queen’s House, Greenwich.
Attributed to André Le Nôtre by Ernest de Ganay (most of the annotations are in the landscape architect’s hand).
Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Institut de France.
Photograph: Réunion des musées nationaux, from Thompson, p. 274.
BOOK REVIEW

Martin Calder, editor

Experiencing the Garden in the Eighteenth Century
Bern: Peter Lang, 2006, 251 pp., 41 illus., £38.60

Drawn from a one-day conference of the same title, the papers in this volume bring together a range of disciplinary perspectives on the garden in the eighteenth century, including garden history, art history, architecture, and French language and literature. The papers present a rich sense of the era, making insightful analytical connections between the nature of gardens and parallel developments in philosophy, psychology and visual theory. Four themes develop throughout the volume: visual theory; the power of word vs. image; the role of time; and the theatrical dimensions of experiencing the landscape.

The dominant thread is visual theory, and the contextualizing of theory with practice provides some valuable insights. For example, Katherine Myers’s characterization of Descartes as the horizontal plane and Berkeley as the vertical – what Gombrich called the “map” and the “mirror” as conceptualizations of space – provides a powerful frame for analyzing the nature of garden design and landscape understanding at the time. One of the fascinating dimensions of the discussion of visual theory is in the condition of blindness. Myers conveys the eighteenth-century theorists’ interest in how perception is achieved without sight, as in Descartes’ hypothesis of a blind man navigating by means of using two sticks as a kind of surrogate for vision.

One of the prominent criticisms of eighteenth-century picturesque theory, and its subsequent all-pervasive grip on landscape architecture through to the present day, is its elevation of the visual at the expense of all other sensory experience. It is therefore refreshing to find glimmers of some counterviews, indicating some of the ways in which other sensory phenomena persisted amidst the extreme pursuit of visual theory. Martin Calder’s exploration of the work of Girardin illustrates how the sense of touch was identified as the perceptive tool of near space, while it was the anticipation of touch which was aroused by looking into distant space.
Martin Calder (Ed.)

Experiencing the Garden in the Eighteenth Century

Peter Lang
Calder describes the experience of a garden in this way as a “bitter-sweet interplay,” where the roving eye constantly stimulates the sense of the tactile, but does not fulfil it due to the detachment of distance. Other senses were evoked in spaces such as Girardin’s Grotto in his garden at Ermenonville, which is a dark and damp space, suppressing the visual realm and allowing the senses of smell and hearing to become more significant.

Word and image become intertwined in the writing and making of gardens in the eighteenth century. The contingency of one upon the other perplexed some theorists, and as Katja Grillner explains, Thomas Whately attempted to circumvent the way in which an image can overtake the imagination by providing only written descriptions in his *Observations on Modern Gardening*. This would, he believed, avoid the images themselves becoming slavishly copied, and encourage readers to apply the principles of what he was describing, rather than the particular execution that an image would show. As Grillner puts it, “Whately trusts the word more than the image.” Words also gravitated into the gardens themselves, as in David Maskill’s discussion of the Laborde and Cook monuments and their *in situ* texts, or Jean-Marcel Humbert’s reference to Princess Helena Radziwill having the *Et in Arcadia Ego* phrase inscribed on a replica of Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s tomb in her garden, “Arkadia,” in Poland.

Time is the dimension which most distinguishes garden design from other art, and a number of papers in this volume touch on this, in particular through the tradition of *Et in Arcadia Ego* – the trope of “death in paradise.” Michel Baridon’s comparison between Versailles and Castle Howard very effectively conveys the shift between Le Nôtre’s static and seemingly timeless garden, towards the explicit expression of time and memory in Vanburgh’s landscape through such devices as statuary and the Mausoleum. Time is also experienced in moving through a garden, and Katja Grillner’s observation of Joseph Heely’s description of Envil as being remarkably “filmic” brings to mind Timothy Brownlow’s comment that picturesque theorist William Gilpin “used his eye like a cine-camera.”*

Like the cinematic analogy, landscape as theater also gained traction during the eighteenth century, and terms such as “scenery” reinforce the legacy of the conflation of landscape and theater. Renata Tyszczuk’s paper on Stanislas’s *Chartreuses*...
is an entertaining glimpse of the aristocracy’s garden theatrics, of their “gaming” and “playgrounds.”

Given the strong French bias in the papers, and the announced concern with the experiential, the absence of phenomenology is noticeable. The most influential phenomenological theorists come from France, including Gaston Bachelard and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and contemporary thinkers such as Jean-Luc Marion and Michel Henry. The discussions on visual theory and blindness (Katherine Myers), and the way in which imagination forms in the mind’s eye (Katja Grillner), to name just two, could be greatly enhanced through a phenomenological perspective.

A volume of papers by different authors always brings challenges. Ideally the papers should all be autonomous, while also contributing to the whole being more than the sum of the parts. *Experiencing the Garden* includes a range of interesting papers, but as a whole it does not achieve this meta-level of coherence, and instead there is some repetition of points between papers which skillful editing would have eliminated. Added to this is the production of the book itself, which is uninviting in its design. The illustrations are all black and white, which in itself is not problematic, but many lack contrast and some are of poor resolution.

Jacky Bowring
Lincoln University (New Zealand)
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Eve Blau and Ivan Rupnik

*Project Zagreb: Transition as Condition, Strategy, Practice*

With contributions by Hrvoje Njiric, Helena Paver Njiric, Charles S. Maier, Vedran Mimica, Vladimir Mattioni, Ivan Rogic, Fedja Vukic, Snjeska Knezevic, Aleksander Laslo and others

Barcelona and New York: Actar, 2007. 336 pp., color and duotone illus., € 30


Eve Blau and Ivan Rupnik’s book *Project Zagreb* examines how the recent transition in Central Europe is neither new nor a phenomenon particular to post-communism, since Central European cities have been more or less continuously in transition since the beginning of the modern period. By transition, Blau means “a state of instability with uncertain outcome, not as the passage from one stable condition to another.” Urban Zagreb, as the Croatian capital, is a creation of the modern period, and a perfect site to examine the generative dynamic of such transitions in which it has almost 150 years of continuous experience. In fact, almost every twenty or thirty years Croatia was in a new period of intense political turmoil and radical social transformations, in which architecture was an important factor in the program of overall modernization and constructing new meanings in relation to the complex national history, cultural traditions, opposed political programs and identities. In other words, it is not so much the influence of its current experience of transition as much as the impact of a long history of adapting to and creatively engaging instability that has enabled Zagreb to endure as city with a strong urban and architectural culture. This history and experience make a city like Zagreb a key subject for understanding the spatial dynamics and potentials of the transition today.

*Project Zagreb* began with a two-semester long seminar at the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University in 2004-2005, taught by Blau and organized in collaboration with Rupnik. The two brought the Harvard students to Zagreb, a travelling exhibition was developed and shown at multiple venues, and the project came to a close with this book published in 2007. The project analyzed the *modus operandi* of Croatian architects in permanently changing and unstable conditions from the mid-nineteenth century to the beginning of the twenty-first century. The
book is organized chronologically, according to the types of transitions characterizing particular historical periods which have left physical traces in the tissue of the city, documented by the authors in seventeen case studies.
The first chapter, entitled “Supranational Empire: Modern Infrastructure and Identity 1848-1907,” examines the shaping of the national metropolis under the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, analyzing among others the following elements: the city’s central square (which reinvented its appearance many times—beginning with a representative stage set, then reshaping existing buildings and constructing new ones); Mirogoj cemetery (an example of multicultural and religious tolerance which brought together earlier, scattered graveyards, and is considered one of Europe’s most beautiful cemeteries); and the “Green Horseshoe” (an example of a liberal interpretation of Vienna’s Ring).

The second chapter “Avant-Garde: Modern Architecture as Urban Instrument 1908-1931” demonstrates how modern movement architecture found its room in interpolations, while larger projects were executed either as fragments of the initial idea or in several stages. Here, the emphasis is put on a series of examples from housing architecture as well as on the round Croatian Artists exhibition pavilion constructed in Zagreb in 1938, unique in this part of Europe.

“CIAM Urbanism: The Functional City 1932-1956,” the third chapter, traces the fate of Zagreb’s General Regulatory Plan which emerged from the 1930 international competition, was subsequently presented at CIAM’s meeting in Athens in 1933, endorsed in 1937 as the example of the Capitalist Functional City and changed in 1947 into the General Plan of the Communist Functional City.

The fourth chapter “Self-Management: City as Site of Experiment 1957-1989” explores the architecture of the Zagreb’s International Fair, the works of the large construction enterprises and autochthonously achieved standardization of construction elements, the so-called Jugomont 61.

The fifth and the final chapter, entitled “Transition Economy: Urban Rules 1990-2007,” discusses the small steps taken in solving the enormous urban chaos created in recent years, focusing on international seminars organized around the endorsement of the master plan for Zagreb in 2000. The authors propose that in a transitional environment there is no stability needed for the normative planning: each and every architectural or urban project in such an environment starts under one set of conditions and ends under another set of conditions, as documented by the case studies in this book.

Mirogoj Cemetery, founded in Zagreb in 1866. From Blau and Repnik, case study 2.
All chapters are supplemented with texts by art historians and architects from Zagreb.

In examining Zagreb’s urban situation Blau and Rupnik used all possible sources—from research studies, scattered archival materials, photographs and documentary films, to interviews with stakeholders in construction and urban planning. The ingredients of this book have been long known to the historians of Zagreb’s architecture but in the book Project Zagreb they are combined in a new “recipe.” The authors conclude that Zagreb’s architects and city planners—by working in an unstable environment bearing uncertain consequences for the final result—developed original strategies for shaping the city.

In addition to the text itself, the book’s great value lies in visual analysis and interpretation. By focusing on multidimensional variables the authors examine and analyze transition as condition, strategy and practice through a range of graphic techniques: assembly, mapping, diagramming, layering, animation, projection, analytical modelling, and stop-frame photography to visualize synchronous and non-synchronous transformations occurring at different rates in different sectors. This method of reading and analysis brings into sharp focus the role of practice and of architectural knowledge in the urban process.

Two decades after the fall of the Iron Curtain the architecture of the former communist countries is still not integrated into the history of the European architecture. Blau and Rupnik’s book about Zagreb—as an open city in which transition has been the permanent condition for the city’s architects and city planners for more than a century—is an unavoidable work not only for architects but also for sociologists, historians and others examining the culture of the city. This work has also given names to many phases of the process in which the post-communist countries witness the speedy transitions from centralized state economy to liberal market economy, giving rise to pluralistic democracies and new divisions of social classes.

Darja Radovic Mahecic
Zagreb and Geneva
EVE BLAU AND IVAN RUPNIK

PROJECT ZAGREB

Transition as Condition, Strategy, Practice

Transition is a condition that creates opportunities for architecture and urbanism. Zagreb is the perfect site for examining this generative dynamic: practicing in conditions of continuous instability, its architects and planners developed strategies for creatively engaging the conditional and open-ended—for anticipating and instrumentalizing the condition of irresolution. Moving between texts, maps, and diagrams, Project Zagreb reads the city as an open work, dynamic but coherent, in which architecture plays an active role in the formation of both urban practices and the city itself.
EXHIBITION REVIEW

Oasen der Stille: Die grossen Landschaftsgärten in Mitteleuropa
Curators: Johann Kräftner, Alexandra Hanzl

Liechtenstein Museum Wien
6 June to 18 November 2008

In recent years several exhibitions on gardens have taken place which dealt with the representation of gardens in the fine arts or literature in a broader context. The exhibition Oasen der Stille (Oases of Tranquillity) also took this approach as it focused on “The Great Landscape Gardens of Central Europe,” according to the subtitle. It merits special attention since it treated the most important landscape gardens in Eastern Austria and Moravia for the first time on the basis of material from the Lichtensteins’ private archives and art collection. The subtitle is misleading in a sense, however, since there are other important landscape gardens in Central Europe such as Muskau or Veltrusy which are not documented in the Liechtenstein archives.

The large Liechtenstein gardens but also those of other aristocratic families like Esterházy, Schönborn, Harrach, Schwarzenberg, and Lacy as well as the imperial Habsburg dynasty were presented in the former ladies’ apartments and the library of the Liechtenstein garden palace which now houses the Liechtenstein museum. The objects on display such as paintings, drawings, books, porcelain and historical garden tools—mostly owned by the Liechtenstein family—are of high value and gave an excellent impression of the gardens. Following an introduction with the somewhat hackneyed title “Back to Nature,” various gardens were presented with each section of the exhibition displayed on one wall. The garden at the Liechtenstein summer palace in Vienna, for instance, served as an example to demonstrate the transformation of a geometric garden into a landscape garden. The Liechtensteins’ Moravian garden retreats in Eisgrub and Feldsberg (today: Lednice and Valtice) as well as the Esterházys’ “Eisenstädter Kulturlandschaft” and
Albert Christoph Dies, Leopoldine Temple with Pond, Park of Schloss Eisenstadt, 1807, detail (Esterházy Privatstiftung, Schloss Eisenstadt)
Photograph: © Liechtenstein Museum: Die Fürstlichen Sammlungen, Vienna
the imperial park of Laxenburg filled considerable parts of the exhibition. One of the highlights was undoubtedly Peter Joseph Lenné’s “Verschönerungsplan” for Laxenburg dating back to 1815, but rediscovered only in 2000. Unfortunately, the accompanying gallery text stated “Das Gartenareal wurde von Jospeh Lenné [sic] nach englischem Vorbild modernisiert [...],” although Lenné’s plan was in fact never executed (as stated correctly in the catalogue).

The exhibition featured a remarkable focus on architecture, especially folies. Important topics of landscape gardens, however, such as plants and their usage, plants as design elements, color, routing, or even vistas were covered only marginally or not at all.

The section entitled “Documentation of Flora and Fauna in the Properties of the Liechtensteins” displayed assets from the Liechtenstein archives in the historical library. A particularly outstanding group of objects here was the “Hortus Botanicus” (1776-1804), a florilegium in fourteen volumes with about 2700 gouaches. Uniform labelling for the historical prints and drawings of plants would have been preferable, though. For some objects the identification was incomplete, for instance the etching labelled only “Cedrat muscati, 18. Jh. Kupferstich” is from Johann Christoph Volkamer, Continuation der Nürnbergische Hesperiden, Nürnberg, 1714, p. 61.

In terms of venue and exhibition installation, the Liechtenstein garden palace in Vienna’s present-day Rossau district, constructed at the end of the seventeenth century, is surely an ideal place for such an exhibition. Reopened in 2004, it maintains the private character of a princely art collection. Probably to reinforce this private character, the curators chose not to label the exhibits in the ladies’ apartments. Instead, these were assigned numbers, and the relevant information could be found in thematic texts on a series of laminated sheets the visitor could carry through the galleries; these sheets also contained short introductory essays to each theme. This turned out to be far more inconvenient than the museum’s earlier practice of handing out informational booklets to visitors. The “French
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The “French Wall” in the Oasen der Stille exhibition installation
Photograph: © Liechtenstein Museum: Die Fürstlichen Sammlungen, Vienna

A gallery installation from the Oasen der Stille exhibition in the Liechtenstein garden palace
Photograph: © Liechtenstein Museum: Die Fürstlichen Sammlungen, Vienna
Wall” in one of these galleries was aesthetically appealing, yet details of paintings hanging too high were difficult to see.

The plates in the catalogue are of excellent quality. Similar care would have been desirable with regard to editing the text. “Didaktische Klappseiten, die den Vorher-Nachher-Effekt zelebrieren” (catalogue, p. 13) had not been used in Hirschfeld’s Theorie der Gartenkunst, but – as demonstrated in the exhibition – in Pückler-Muskau’s Andeutungen über Landschaftsmalerei, modelled on the Red Books of Humphrey Repton. Jacquin was not the director of the imperial gardens of Schönbrunn (p. 21), but was in charge of the botanical study and indexing of the plants there. And although Engelbert Kaempfer published his Flora Japonica already in 1712, exotic buildings in the gardens at the end of the eighteenth century did not (yet) have their prototypes in Japan (catalogue, p. 29ff.), but only in China. Furthermore, terms such as “Voluptuarbauten” can be regarded as uncommon in garden history literature. The expertise of garden historians could have avoided such inaccuracies in the preparation of the texts for both the exhibition and the catalogue.

Oasen der Stille was based on the holdings of a private archive. One hopes it provides an impetus for further projects on historic gardens using other private collections and archives which are likely to contain important visual, textual, and material documentation on aristocratic gardens.

Publication related to the exhibition:


Claudia Gröschel
Vienna
Oasen der Stille exhibition vitrines in the library of the Liechtenstein garden palace

Photograph: © Liechtenstein Museum: Die Fürstlichen Sammlungen, Vienna
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