Discipline & style

The Ecole des Beaux-Arts and the social production of an American architecture

DAVID BRAIN
Department of Sociology, Indiana University

> Ah, silent multitudes, ye are a part
> of the wise architect's supreme and glorious art.
>
> Richard Watson Glider
> (from a poem celebrating the World's
> Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893)

> Thus did the virus of a culture, snobbish and alien to the land, perform its work of disintegration; and thus ever works the pallid academic mind, denying the real, exalting the fictitious and the false, incapable of adjusting itself to the flow of living things, to the reality of and the pathos of man's follies, to the valiant hope that ever causes him to aspire, and again to aspire; ... a culture lost in ghostly *mesalliance* with abstractions, when what the world needs is courage, common sense and human sympathy, and a moral standard that is plain, valid and livable. Louis Sullivan, *Autobiography of an Idea*[1]

In the late 1880s, American architecture took a sharp turn in favor of the stylistic canons of Renaissance classicism as taught at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris. This stylistic turn, which has been characterized as a "revival of the revivals," was the leading edge of a movement toward a mode of design distinctly different from the eclecticism that had dominated American architecture since mid-century.[2] Although still eclectic in taste, this mode of design emphasized "correct" reproduction of historical styles, axial symmetry in massing and composition, and located the highest architectural values in the ceremonial grandeur, monumentality, and formal discipline of the classical orders.

In 1893, consolidation of a Beaux-Arts "movement" in the United States was dramatically marked by the widely publicized "White City" at the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The Chicago Fair, and, in particular, the central Court of Honor with its white lath-and-

Theory and Society **18**: 807–868, 1989.

plaster façades, has been credited with launching a national vogue for classical architecture in the Beaux-Arts tradition, with focusing national attention on the possibilities of city planning and urban design as solutions to the problems of the city, and, finally, with bringing national prominence and prestige to architects working in the Beaux-Arts mode.[3] Contemporaries saw the Fair as an impressive and hopeful achievement. Commentators in the popular press were impressed by the effect of an ordered composition at such a scale, and by the fact that it was the result of extensive collaboration among planners, architects, artists, landscape architects, city officials, and prominent citizens. They saw in the White City a tangible and practical ideal for urban reform.[4] Architects saw in the success of the White City a validation of an "American Renaissance" and a new professional role.[5] The success of the Fair brought public recognition to the architect as the guiding intelligence in a division of labor among experts concerned with the urban environment, and established a place for the expert practice of design near the center of Progressive-era urban reform.

As a symbolic turning point, the Chicago Fair occupies a prominent place in the historiography of American architecture. In the decade following the Chicago Fair, Beaux-Arts classicism was rapidly installed as the orthodoxy in American design. Its hegemony lasted, at the very least, until the reconstruction of the discipline of design under the influence of European modernism in the 1930s. The suddenness of this classical turn is readily apparent in the architectural press of the period. In the fifteen years prior to the fair, the press had been dominated by the Romanesque and picturesque styles; in the following decade, buildings in these styles were almost completely displaced from the pages of the major architectural magazines by illustrations of buildings in the classical mode.[6] The institutional dimensions of this shift are apparent in an increasing reliance on Beaux-Arts traditions in American architectural education.

Assessments of the impact of the Fair made thirty to forty years later contrast sharply with the enthusiasm of contemporary accounts, and reflect a focal concern with the so-called "lost cause" of progressive architecture.[7] If one believes standard accounts, the turn toward Beaux-Arts classicism was not only sudden, but at the expense of architectural tendencies in which historians now routinely locate the roots of "modern" American architecture. This so-called "progressive" impulse has been identified in the commercial architecture of Chicago (William Le Baron Jenney, William Holabird & Martin Roche, Daniel Burnham

& John Root, Louis Sullivan & Dankmar Adler); in the early "Shingle style" work of Charles McKim and Stanford White; in the work of California architects like the Greene brothers, Irving Gill, and Bernard Maybeck; and in the work of Frank Lloyd Wright and the Prairie school architects.[8] According to standard accounts, the progressive tendency in American architecture reflected the changing social, economic and technological circumstances of the late nineteenth century, and represented an effort to develop an architecture responsive to the practical exigencies and symbolic needs of an urban, democratic, and industrial society. The dominance of the "academic ideal" of Beaux-Arts design is indicated by the careers of these progressive architects; by 1920, all had gone into decline or failed altogether. Although they were each affected by various circumstances, the dominance of Beaux-Arts architecture seems to figure prominently in each case.[9]

In 1931, Lewis Mumford wrote of the aftermath of the Fair: "The continuity of American architectural tradition was broken, and instead of advancing solidly toward modern forms, our architects wandered for forty years in the barren wilderness of classicism and eclecticism."[10] Here Mumford echoes Louis Sullivan, whose Transportation building with its famous "Golden Door" registered his protest against the uniform classicism of the major buildings at the Fair. In an often-quoted passage in his autobiography (1923), Sullivan bitterly denounced the Fair as a "virus" responsible for a contagion of classicism that spread from the east: "The damage wrought by the World's Fair will last for half a century from its date, if not longer. It has penetrated deep into the constitution of the American mind, effecting there lesions significant of dementia."[11] Modernist criticism has consistently echoed this assessment. Siegfried Giedion, author of one of the most widely read of the modernist histories, writes: "At the very moment when the Chicago school gained a mastery of the new means which it had created, its further development and influence was abruptly choked off."[12]

According to standard historical accounts, then, the "free" eclectic architecture of the preceding period (1865–1885) contained the stirring of an indigenous movement toward modern architectonic expression. In the relatively unornamented commercial buildings of Chicago, in the informal and open plans of the "Shingle style" summer homes of the northeast, and in the Romanesque stonework of H. H. Richardson's Marshall Field warehouse, historians have identified the roots of an architecture based not on historical traditions, but on the nature of materials, functional considerations, an expression of structure, and a

"geometric and spatial discipline in design."[13] From this perspective, Daniel Burnham betrayed the cause of American Architecture when, as Chief of Construction of the Fair, he appointed an architectural board dominated by eastern Beaux-Arts architects.[14] "Architecture," Sullivan let it be it known, "was dead"[15] – killed, as we come to understand, by snobbish pretention, midwestern cultural insecurity, and the reduction of architects to retailers of imported styles. According to modernist critics, when Burnham allowed the easterners to monopolize design of the most important structures at the fair, "the logic of architectural history was perverted."[16]

Recent scholarship has tempered such harsh and dramatic assessments of the impact of the Fair, but the Beaux-Arts episode still raises interesting questions, particularly for the sociology of culture. There is a number of ways in which urban building can be seen to reflect its historical context and material conditions, but this episode frustrates efforts to explain it as a simple reflex of economic and technological developments.[17] The "revival of the revivals" emerged during a period when developments in the economics, technology, and the social demands of commercial and urban construction seemed to be pressing away from traditional understandings of architecture. At what seems to have been the natural threshold of "modern" architecture in the United States, when urban development seemed to demand such an architecture and technology had begun to make it possible, American designers turned sharply away from functionalist tendencies in favor of an increasingly formal, academic, and derivative classicism. In the place of an architecture that was to have been responsive to local tastes, national culture, economic conditions, and new construction technology, the American architectural establishment turned toward an ideal architecture that was held to represent eternal values. According to Fiske Kimball, "[t]he issue, whether function should determine form from within or whether an ideal form might be imposed from without, had been decided for a generation by a sweeping victory for the formal ideal."[18] How does this sudden and apparently retrograde development fit into the historical formation of the discipline of design in the United States?

Precisely because the Beaux-Arts episode seems to move so sharply against the current of architectural development, historians have turned to sociological factors to account for it. These accounts come in two general varieties:

(1) *Architecture as a reflection of the culture of late nineteenth-century capitalism.* Some historical accounts have related the influence of Beaux-Arts styles to broad changes in society and culture. For example, it has been seen as a response to urbanization and to the problem of bringing order to the city.[19] It has also been seen as the cultural reflex of the end of the "heroic" period of laissez-faire capitalism, a period in which new forms of authority were being constructed in the city and in which new elites sought to overcome their cultural insecurity in relation to European traditions.[20]

(2) *Architecture as a reflection of elite interests.* Other accounts focus more closely on those specific groups and individuals responsible for the diffusion of Beaux-Arts design – as its patrons or as its producers. It doesn't seem to have been entirely Sullivan's bitterness that led him to suggest that the Amercian Renaissance began as a fashion among urban elites in the northeast.[21] Clearly none of this work would have been built without the support of powerful interests in both the public and private sector, and there is a clear historical association between Beaux-Arts classicism and social elites of the eastern seaboard. Others have pointed out that it represented the ability of a professional elite to use its connections with key social groups to command the most visible and prestigious commissions.[22]

The most generally accepted view is probably some combination of the two kinds of argument sketched above: that Beaux-Arts design was foisted on both the public and the profession by an alliance between certain prominent architects and commercial interests with cultural pretensions. This received wisdom raises questions for the sociology of cultural production. The first type of account, which might be called a "reflection" model, suggests that the symbolism of Beaux-Arts architecture was motivated by broad social and cultural tendencies. It says little, however, about the processes that mediated such a reflection. How were broad social and cultural forces translated into the production of actual forms? What was it about the Beaux-Arts approach in particular that led to its reception as the dominant mode of design, not simply as a source of new styles among others? This episode is interesting for the apparent suddenness with which the Beaux-Arts approach became orthodoxy, and for its ability to overwhelm other available "styles," many of which were equally European and representative of "old world" culture. It was not just a question of the diffusion of foreign styles, but a specific reception, a particular use of the Beaux-Arts model in the construction of a discipline.

The second type of account, with its emphasis on elites, boils down to a familiar sociological argument: the dominant ideals are the ideals of the dominant group. This focuses attention on specific interests that might be at stake, but raises the question of precisely how their dominance was achieved – and, again, why it took the specific forms it did. As a profession, architects have never been a homogeneous or unified group, and the divisions between eastern and western architects had been growing sharper in the 1880s.[23] Even if we grant the importance of an eastern elite as key agents in this process, what was it that allowed this elite to achieve its hegemonic position in the profession, to do so rapidly in the last decade of the nineteenth century, and to hang on to this position for several decades? How was this hegemony constructed, given a diversity and factionalization of professional interests?

This turn in the formation of the discipline was not simply a reflection of broad cultural tendencies, the result of a failure of nerve on the part of American architects, nor simply the result of allowing American architecture to fall into the hands of a narrow elite. The main thrust of my argument is that the linkages between Beaux-Arts design as a cultural form and the social context of American architectural practice were structural. The exigencies of maintaining the social organization of professional practice under particular historical conditions determined the particular "fit" between the discursive characteristics of Beaux-Arts design practices and American conditions.[24] The reception of Beaux-Arts design was determined by its ability to provide a coherent basis not only for the design of buildings but for the reproduction of "architecture" as an authoritative practice that could be sustained in a market context.

Although architectural developments are clearly affected by developments in society, politics, and technology, they cannot be reduced to these broader forces. Such effects are mediated by the organized field in which architecture is produced, and by the responses of particular agents operating within that disciplinary field. From this point of view, the "American Renaissance" can be seen as a necessary phase in the construction and institutionalization of the professional discipline of design. Although it appears as a momentary reversal of the process of modernization in American architecture, it was the keystone of the historical process of institution-building that made possible the construction of an abstract formal discipline and laid the foundations for the later reception of what is now referred to as modern architecture.[25]

This reading of the history of the American architectural profession emphasizes the way a rhetoric of style has functioned to link the articulation of a distinctive professional status with the reproduction of an architecture. The following section outlines the conceptual foundations for a sociology of design. To put historical flesh on these conceptual bones, section II examines the way certain practical tensions were built into the distinctive occupational role of the architect in the first part of the nineteenth century, and the way the discipline of design reflected the structural bases of the architect's status. Section III looks at the consolidation of a Beaux-Arts hegemony, and argues that it can be understood as a strategic solution to the dual problem of institutionalizing the professional status of the architect and organizing a market for architectural services. It was a solution to problems that were simultaneously sociological and architectural, concerning both the distinctive status of the "architect" and the construction of a coherent practice of design. This is not to suggest that Beaux-Arts design was a mere mask for professional interests, but rather that its specific reception provided the basis of the disciplinary framework within which diverse interests could be organized into a coherent strategy.

This analysis of the construction of a Beaux-Arts hegemony reveals a pattern that is, in some ways, familiar in the literature on professions. My purpose here is to call attention to the structural relation between the historical processes of institution-building and the formation of the discipline of design, to cast a different theoretical light on some of the processes of professionalization, and to illuminate its consequences for the production of culture. The concluding section draws some general theoretical implications for the sociology of culture.

I. The sociology of design

The aesthetic component of architecture has been historically important to the definition and substantive development of the architect's role. In the United States, the first architects were gentleman-amateurs, successful builders, or draftsmen who assumed a role as dealers in styles, as specialists in forms of public expression and good taste. It is somewhat less obvious that the aesthetic component of architecture has also been *sociologically* central to the historical formation of a distinctive discipline of design. This argument has two consequences, one related to the substantive nature of architecture, the other to sociological theory. First, the centrality of aesthetics to architecture has been

structured into both the practices of design and the institutional arrangements that support that practice; as a result, it has persisted long after the social conditions that shaped the early occupational role of the architect have passed away. Secondly, the role of the production of style in the social organization of the professional practice of design appears as the key to understanding the sociology of a professionalized architecture. Modernist rhetoric denouncing style notwithstanding, the production of style has provided the organizing and orienting framework for the social production of architecture.

The importance of style as part of the social construction of an aesthetic practice has been suggested by the institutional theories of art.[26] Where past aesthetic theories focused on the individual and subjective dimensions of art, the institutional theory focuses on the attribution of the status of "art" and the dependence of aesthetic objects on the conventional matrix in which they are embedded. An "aesthetic object" is constituted by the conventional matrix in which the work is embedded – including both the "primary conventions" of presentation that characterize a form or genre and the "secondary conventions" of style.[27] These historically specific and socially located interpretative frameworks constitute aesthetic perceptions by highlighting particular attributes of artworks (or other objects) and loading them with a potential for signification.[28]

It is the relationship to other works, to the conventions and modes of interpretation of an art world, which renders aesthetic qualities and intentions legible. The recognition of parallels between comparable works, grasped in terms of formal and stylistic conventions, endows the medium with a certain opacity, and the work with particular "features of coloration" in which we recognize the particular aspects of an object that can be invested with artistic intent and significance.[29] This opacity constitutes what is referred to here as a rhetoric of style – that is, it gives rhetorical qualities to stylized elements themselves. By being brought into relation with other objects, art works are enabled to carry a rhetorical point within a specialized context of aesthetic concerns. Stylized elements, highlighted in this way, both demand interpretation and refer to the context in which they can be interpreted.

An implication of this is that the crucial character of an art work lies in a metaphorical relationship between form and content that depends on the structure of justification constituted by the whole field of related works.[30] This becomes a sociological point as one notes that the rele-

vant field is socially as well as semiotically constituted; the social and historical context of a specialized art world is of critical importance in the constitution of the structures of justification on which the rhetoric of style depends.[31] This raises questions at a level of analysis different from that usually occupied by the sociology of art. Instead of focusing on the way particular objects reflect their social context, attention is focused on the way the interpretative processes relevant to the production and reception of art are located in a "semi-autonomous field."[32]

This understanding of the sociological significance of style has particular implications for the sociology of the professional practice of design. Architectural designs use the rhetorical quality of style to carry two kinds of significance relevant to the organization of the professional field. First, their aesthetic qualities signify their general claim to inclusion in a framework of interpretation, and their specific claim to the status of "architecture." (One could also say that they make specific claims *about* the status of architecture.) Secondly, they carry specific rhetorical claims about the relationship of architectural form to a particular building task. Without the latter, the architectural aspect of building would not register as meaningful nor could a design appear as a rational response to a particular building problem.

These two aspects of architectural style simultaneously constitute both the design intentions and the authorization of the architect. Stylized qualities serve as the medium in which the architect's service is represented, and at the same time refer to the authority of the discipline. In the imposition of stylized qualities on building tasks, the architect participates in a collective process of producing a coherent practice of design and, more generally, the institution of "Architecture." As these practices crystallize into conceptions of identifiable styles, the institutional boundaries of architecture are established as an interface between the practices of design and the tastes of the relevant public.[33]

When a client comes to an architect with a building task, the architect is given a mandate to formulate a solution that is not only responsive to the client's wishes but economical, durable, and attentive to the demands of propriety and taste. The architect plays the role of a translator, translating the client's various needs and wants into a specified building intention, and the range of practical and symbolic considerations into a building with a particular *form*.[34] Ultimately, the architect is responsible for translating this conceptualization of a building task into working drawings (plans, elevations, details) and specifications that

guide construction and serve as the key instrument of the contractual agreement with the builders.

Although historically architects have sought to justify design in terms of natural relationships between architectural form and function, form doesn't follow function with any motivation or necessity unless practitioners can collectively sustain a set of rules and conventions that allow stylized forms to represent certain kinds of building intentions. However rationalized the decison-making process, no matter how carefully the various parameters of the project are delineated and weighed, there is still a point where there must be a leap of faith in fitting form to function. The architect is enabled to make this leap only by bringing to bear values and conventions that are external to the specific project at hand. As Scruton points out, the function of style is that "of giving order to otherwise nebulous choices, of situating primitive preferences in a framework of enduring possibilities. Style ennobles choices, giving them a significance that otherwise they lack."[35]

"Architecture," then, can be seen as a framework of significance within which building tasks can be conceived; "design" refers to the more or less rationalized practice of organizing building intentions within a cultural system. Architectural design is a discipline in that its principles and practical conventions constitute a way of locating and giving conceptual definition to problems that are then susceptible to practical solution. Design involves a translation of the client-presented problem into terms provided and authorized by a body of practice to which the solution refers. A design solution is not only a response to a given problem, but a *significant* response: it signifies its own responsiveness, the particularity of the response, and its authorization as a particular response. For historical reasons to be developed below, aesthetic and stylistic considerations have provided a framework of significance that is crucial for the generalization of a building problem into a design problem.

The rhetoric of style is not only crucial to the construction of a coherent aesthetic practice, but also to the organization of professional status and the construction of a market for professional services. Larson has noted that the formation of a profession depends on the ability of an occupational group to define a distinctive product, and to maintain a "monopoly of competence."[36] This focuses attention on the way an organized segment of a profession mobilizes various kinds of resources to establish its dominance in the profession, in the division of

labor, and in the market place, but can lead to an exaggerated view of the unity and organizational efficacy of professional interests. One interesting question that arises concerns the ability of an organized profession to mobilize practitioners with diverse interests in sustaining a market that gives advantages to particular segments.[37]

A market can be understood as a piece of social structure that has two sides to it.[38] On the one hand, the buyers must be prepared to recognize and discriminate among the products, and to construct the terms of trade that sustain a coherent and enduring market. The producers must be able to construct the necessary ground of comparability of their products if they are to compete and, from their side, sustain the coherence of the market. The interpretative context of an "art world" – in this case, the institution of "Architecture" – provides a framework in which producers can achieve recognition and reputation and in which the discriminations of the buyers can be matched to the practices of the producers.

Architects work at discovering rules according to which to make and justify design choices – in order to orient themselves toward what others are doing in the market, to give their designs significance and authority. An architect looks for reasons to make decisions about form by generalizing from the immediate situation to a whole body of practice articulated within an ordering framework of interpretation. Professional organization isn't simply a question of defining a distinctive product or establishing monopoly, but of constructing a coherent practice and organizing a market in terms of the constitutive rules governing that practice. To sustain a market for professional services, architects must orient their designs toward each other and toward common understandings of the distinctive problems of the discipline, as expressed in practical conventions. These conventions are constructed in the search for comparability between diverse and individualized efforts, but are reproduced only if anchored in social structures.

A market for professional architecture has to be sustained not only by external constraints and institutionalized sanctions, but also from within – in and through the actions of these diverse practitioners as they operate in a wide range of practical situations. The organization of the market has to be linked to the constitutive rules of the discipline. A rhetoric of style serves as the medium of this linkage. Style, then, is not only a collective production; it is a crucial part of the production of the social structure of architectural practice and part of the phenomenol-

ogy of the production and reproduction of a market. It is a medium in which the comparability of products can be signalled, and it is the basis on which an autonomous practice is organized and anchored in social structure.

II. Eclecticism & professional status

In the first part of the nineteenth century, articulation of the architects' distinctive place in the division of labor depended on the capacities of an occupational group to take advantage of a combination of historical circumstances: broad elite interest in architecture that was distinctly different from vernacular building, expanding opportunities created by the first waves of urban growth and a boom in speculative building, and a strategic location in the division of labor organized around the production of drawings. These circumstances provided the context in which key architects constituted themselves as the elite core of an occupational labor market. These "professional" architects used their association with elite patrons and elite culture to isolate the design function from the building process, to distinguish themselves from builders who offered "architectural" services, and to construct an architecture not simply as a canon of historical styles, but as a practical discipline for the production of architectural qualities fitted to unique building tasks.

The aim of this section is to show how the structure of the architect's professional status, as it emerged, produced a dynamic of eclecticism that undermined both the bases of architectural judgement and the architect's distinctive status. Against a background of an expanding patronage for architecture, the discipline of design was anchored in an association between a professional core and a relatively limited and homogeneous social elite. As a result, its practical coherence and material foundations were quickly undermined by the expanding market that had also been a condition of its possibility.

The emergence of "professional" architects

In the eighteenth century, the title of "architect" was shared by gentleman-amateurs and successful builders, the former as an indication of a gentlemanly avocation, the latter as a way of consolidating their social status. New cultural concerns associated with independence provided

an opportunity for particular designers to impose an overall artistic intention on a building, outside the existing system of builders and often in open conflict with it.[39] At first this work was taken up by gentleman-amateurs (such as Thomas Jefferson or Dr. William Thornton, the original designer of the Capitol building), by foreign-trained architects,[40] and, to an increasing extent, by successful builders. In the 1820s, as the cities of the eastern seaboard experienced a boom in speculative building, more and more builders and housewrights began to adopt the fashionable title of "architect," which carried connotations of respectability, prestige, and gentlemanly status.[41]

Expansion of the market for "architecture" opened up a route to the title of "architect" by way of what one British-trained surveyor called the "horse-in-a-mill routine of grinding out drawings for the builders."[42] Interest in styles of architecture that were not part of the builders' vernacular put an increasing emphasis on the production of measured drawings – to ensure that builder and client shared an understanding of the architectural qualities of the proposed building, and to guide craftsmen in the production of unfamiliar building forms.[43] Builders who offered architectural services employed draftsmen and surveyors to produce the required drawings. The boom in speculation encouraged efforts to give a wider range of buildings distinctive stylistic character, and contributed to the demand for draftsmen who could not only produce the necessary working drawings, but also produce diverse "architectural" compositions. With the increase in speculation, many of these builders were more financiers than builders, making them all the more dependent on these draftsmen.[44] It was a relatively easy step for draftsmen to move from producing drawings for the builders and speculators to offering their services as independent consultants working on a free basis for the owners. Richard Upjohn (1802–1878) provides a good illustration of this. Apprenticed as a cabinet maker, he went to work in a lumber and building company as a draftsman. When the plans for a court house came into the office one day with the signature of the architect on it, Upjohn claims to have decided, "If that's architecture, then I am an architect, and after that I hung out my shingle." His first commission was a house for a lumberman met through his employer.[45]

Between about 1820 and 1840, there was a shift in the center of gravity of architectural practice: from the builder/architect to the independent architect providing designs and plans for a fee. The new breed of "professional" architects distanced themselves from the building process

and associated themselves with elite culture.[46] The draftsman/architect lacked the craft knowledge and experience of the builder or the builder/architect, as well as the wealth, status, and scholarly training of the gentleman-amateur, but was able to turn drafting skill into a practical appropriation of the conceptualization of building tasks in terms of architectural style. Participation in elite cultural institutions that were taking shape in the first part of the century – art academies, art clubs, museum associations, and so on – provided a key connection between practitioners and prospective patrons, a common ground for interaction among practitioners, and also the general context of interpretation and art criticism in which their practice could be situated. They provided a crucial context in which key architects could establish their place within both high culture and the community. Although professional architects made up only a small portion of those who claimed the title, their offices became both the practical locus and symbolic center of an emergent body of architectural practice.

If the status of the architect as a "professional man" depended on the association with elite culture, consolidation and reproduction of this status depended on the ability of this occupational elite to occupy the center of an occupational labor market. This period saw the emergence of the junior architect/draftsman working on a stable basis in established architectural offices. The production of drawings, already skilled work, took on additional significance as the entry point into a job ladder and an occupational internal labor market.[47] By the 1820s, office apprenticeship had become both a route to social mobility for the sons of builders and a route into professional life for middle-class aspirants attracted by its combination of practical usefulness and high cultural associations, a combination of virtues these new recruits were quick to emphasize.[48] The well-known offices of the 1820 and 1830s attracted educated young men of professional backgrounds – the sons of successful builders, ministers, lawyers, physicians who would pay for the privilege of learning the profession from established architects.[49] Depending upon a combination of drafting-room experience and middle-class cultural capital to establish a distinctive occupational identity, they became energetic boosters of Architecture in local art associations and academies.[50]

The dynamic of eclectic design

The architecture of the colonial period was characterized by a general-

ized classical vernacular based largely on English influences, refracted through the methods and materials of American construction, and ingrained in the craft traditions of the building trades.[51] Following independence, elite interest in an architecture that would reflect the values of the new republic and its break with England created a demand for specialized knowledge of the classical styles drawn either directly from sources in classical antiquity or from French fashions.[52] The development of an independent architectural profession was closely linked to the widespread vogue for Greek and Roman revival architecture, which made it possible for architects to take advantage of markets for architectural services that extended from the eastern seaboard into the middle western parts of the country.

The urban population of the United States increased by 800 percent between 1820 and 1860, while the total population only increased by 226 percent.[53] Much of this urbanization was of a regional nature: suburbs and smaller cities surrounding the major urban centers of the east, and new urban centers in the west.[54] The population of Kentucky, for example, increased by 50 percent, while the population of Louisville increased by 650 percent. The population of the state of Ohio increased four-fold between 1810 and 1830, while the population of Cincinnati increased 12-fold.[55] At the same time, there was a rapid growth of rail and water transport linking the rapidly growing urban centers. Whereas a relatively isolated and self-contained city could support only so much "architecture," a city that served as a cultural center for a broader region could support a greater concentration of architects. Rivalry between cities produced an increasing demand for building with architectural qualities. The patronage for architecture was broadened by both economic growth and geographic expansion, as architectural fashions created by the older and relatively homogenous elites were diffused by the emergence of new mercantile and manufacturing wealth in both the older and new cities.

For the first generation of professional architects, classical revival forms were not a restrictive canon but, as Hamlin points out, "a powerful means of breaking the shackles of the past."[56] Long usage in American building gave classical forms a self-evident validity, but their "revival" represented a sharp break with the vernacular and the relative lack of architectural self-consciousness that went with it. The Greek and Roman Revival styles were not only fashionable but provided the basis of an explicitly theorized structure of justification that sharply distinguished an architect-designed building from one produced

according to traditional building practices. This break with the vernacular put new stress on the relation between different architectural styles and particular buildings tasks. What had seemed a natural connection was now articulated as a realm of significant choices. In the context of this broader, less organized market, the newly salient ambiguity in the relation between the historical styles and contemporary building provided the space for the architects' appropriation of the conceptualization of building tasks.

Throughout the first half of the century, the architect's judgment as a designer was governed by an ethic of revival. This ethic provided practical conventions governing the application of style to buildings and maintained the articulation of the design practices with elite tastes. The client selected the kind of building, decided upon its general architectural character, perhaps with some consultation with the architect with regard to the range of possibilities.[57] From this point, it was the architect's task to compose a building within the chosen style. This mode of design involved a borrowing from various times and places, but a borrowing that insisted on consistency and accuracy in reproducing a particular historical style. The goal was not to create new styles, but to compose unique architectural statements in terms drawn from the past and applied in a manner consistent with both their original usage and the building task at hand. A sense of propriety based on the historical reference of the design, on the mutual reference of the various elements to a common historical precedent, was shared by architects and the relevant public.

Where architectural criticism of the period put its emphasis on accuracy in the reproduction of styles, however, architects emphasized their own professional role, often in tension with the revival ethic. The New York Custom House (designed by Town and Davis) was denounced as "utterly monstrous and barbarous" by the American Monthly Magazine (1835) because the architects had combined a Greek portico with a Roman dome.[58] From the architect's point of view, however, the designer's expertise rested not only in scholarly knowledge of historical styles but in a capacity for disciplined (and rationalized) invention. One architectural writer, for example, wrote in 1830 that a great work of architecture was the result of "a taste so well DISCIPLINED as to be able to judge with instinctive certainty as regards beauty of form, and this taste exercised with increasing industry in combining such forms and in trying their combinations. This, and nothing but this, will make an architect."[59] Taste, in the sense used in this passage, refers to a culti-

vated capacity of judgment in the creative interpretation of recognized conventions.

As it was formed in the first half of the nineteenth century, the discipline clearly reflected the structural situation of the draftsman/architect. The conception of the architect that had crystallized by the 1830s and 1840s put an emphasis on liberal education and cultivated taste, combined with the practical skills of a draftsman and an understanding of the building process acquired through the experience of office work. An architect, as opposed to a builder, would be expected to know the distinguishing characteristics of a number of historical styles, and be able to reproduce them in a fashion both historically convincing and appropriate to the specific demands of the building task at hand. The associations claimed for different styles were not always clear or exclusive, often as dependent on contemporary fashions as they were on historical precedent, but in general architectural usage was based on historical and literary associations. The practical demands of providing differentiated solutions to unique building tasks, and the link between professional status and the authorship of designs, militated against the mere copying. The professional architect drew a sharp distinction between a work of architecture and a mere reproduction of an historical building.

Association with elite culture enabled the professional architect to introduce what Hamlin refers to as "fresh colors from a new palette" into the architectural world of the 1830s, creating a service with which the older builder/architect could not successfully compete.[60] It wasn't only that the new architect made use of new styles, however. Exclusive judgement could not extend to the choice of style or preclude the client's assertion of particular tastes, nor could it rest on the expert control of construction technology. Anchored in elite taste culture, the distinctiveness of the architect's role depended upon the ability of architects to appropriate a domain of practical judgments located between (but pointedly distanced from both) elite taste and the craft-based processes of construction. The architect's authority was expressed not only in terms of scholarly knowledge (with which any amateur with access to an architectural library might compete) but in terms of a distinctive capacity to translate contemporary building needs into an appropriate architectural statement. The occupational status of the architect depended on the construction of a discipline that would govern *application* of those "fresh colors" by defining them as solutions to particular kinds of building tasks. The key architectural

problem, which was simultaneously a problem of professional discipline, was to establish not only the propriety of different styles for different uses but conventions governing the adaptation of historical styles to contemporary needs.

Throughout the first part of the century, these problems were resolved with reference to a broader elite culture; the architect depended on the coherence and exclusiveness of this culture as the basis of disciplinary authority. As a result of growth in both the demand for architecture and the supply of architects, the middle decades of the nineteenth century were a period of experimentation and increasing stylistic chaos. Clients' interest in the display of wealth and status and the speculative builders' interest in meeting this demand with distinctive buildings converged with the architects' interest in expressing their own status as the authors of designs, resulting in the introduction of new styles and new variants of familiar styles. Even during its period of popularity, Greek Revival architecture was criticized for its evident lack of appropriateness for different types of contemporary building. Hamlin's judgment is that "logic and ostentation of the new-rich unified to give the death sentence to the Greek Revival," but it was logic imposed by the professional architect in the effort to match stylized architectural forms to contemporary needs in a way that synchronized the status interests of the architects and their "new-rich" clientele.[61] As the popularity of the Greek style waned, architects ransacked architectural history for styles that might be adapted to contemporary purposes and carry (arguably) appropriate associations.[62]

As a result, an "eclecticism of taste" characteristic of the first half of the century gave way to an "eclecticism of styles" – the mixing of stylistic elements without regard for historical authenticity.[63] Some of this was the result of ignorance among architects without direct experience of European traditions or the resources to support an architectural library, but much of it was a question of responding in differentiated ways to increasingly varied building tasks and presumably unique commissions, under the pressures of the expanding market. Historical scholarship and new archaeological knowledge of the sources of architecture, accessible first to the elite, undermined old assumptions and added new possibilities. This loosening of stylistic conventions characterized the work of elite architects as well as those one would expect to be more oriented toward popular tastes. By the 1860s and 1870s elite architects were becoming both increasingly erudite and increasingly eclectic in their use of historical styles, studying historical precedent

more carefully while more and more self-consciously avoiding copying. For the generation that appeared on the scene immediately after the Civil War, eclectic practice provided an opportunity to show off both erudition and inventiveness.[64]

The dynamic of eclectic practice in an expanding market brought about an erosion of stylistic conventions. Neither the apprenticeship system of training nor the pattern of social exclusivism on which the architectural elite had relied provided a defense against this dispersion. Architectural standards, derived from elite fashions and crystallized into a design "ethic," slipped away in the flood of competitive adaptations to the expanding demand.[65] This process was given added momentum by the increasing availability of mass-produced architectural ornament that greatly lowered the cost of giving a building architectural character.[68]

The result of an accelerating eclecticism was that the authority of the profession was made to rest on an uncertain basis, while the practical need for an architect as designer was reduced by the availability of manufactured architectural fancy dress that could be applied by builders without the architect's guiding intelligence. Without clear and established criteria distinguishing professional design from the work of builders, anyone could pile together an assortment of interesting details, and achieve an effect sufficiently "architectural" to satisfy the undiscriminating eye.[67]

Architects who took a "free" eclectic approach assumed a greater authority over building form, and created a kind of design which the speculative builder could not duplicate – original, individual, fitted to the particular client by the trained imagination and artistic insight of the architect. Ironically, the presumption of artistic authority entailed in the free adaptation of the styles led to an atomization of style that undermined professional authority. Where the "revival" architect exercised the authority of precedent within a framework of agreement as to overall stylistic character, the architect who had given up all pretense of historical accuracy not only claimed to know historical precedent but assumed responsibility for producing a hybrid style which was uniquely fitted to the specific task. As designers moved beyond the historical styles, they stepped outside the normative framework that had anchored architectural practice in a culture shared, in principle, by patron and architect. Not only was the architect's authority made vulnerable to lay criticism, but the distinctiveness of the architect's service was threat-

ened. This trend is evident in the attacks on the profession mounted in both the popular press and the trade journals, and in the practitioner's growing concern with the problem of "self-made" architects, and the need for discipline and restraint.[68]

Professional status and disciplinary tensions

Against the background of stylistic confusion in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, the main lines of tension in the discipline of design addressed more or less directly the tensions of professional autonomy and authority. The aesthetic dilemma of the nineteenth-century architect was to use the qualities associated with the historical styles to reveal the "character" of a building, and to combine "a clear 'fitness or purpose' with a visible artistic ideal."[69] Architects sought to strike a disciplined balance between free expression (of both the particularities of the commission and the architect's artistic vision), clarity (which depended on reference to stylistic conventions), and authority (which depended on the validation of those conventions). The problem was to articulate legitimated grounds for artistic creativity and the particular impositions of formal order. The collapse of the design ethic constructed on the basis of the revivals is evident in the articulation of new aesthetic concerns and efforts to establish new formal grounds for justifying design decisions.

These tensions were expressed most sharply in the division between the classical and the Gothic styles. By the 1840s, the Gothic revival had emerged as an important alternative to designing in the classical mode. Although the Gothic revival was never as widespread or important as the Greek Revival, it contributed in important ways both to the professional standing of the architect and to the development of architectural theory. In the context of the science of ecclesiology, a reform movement in the Anglican church that concerned itself with the problem of matching church architecture to symbolic and liturgical needs, the Gothic architect was able to justify design decisions on the basis of a direct relation between the forms of the church and the forms of worship, based on study of original Gothic buildings.[70]

Interest in the Gothic began "in eccentric diversions and wilful contrasts from classical norms" by romantic intellectuals and eccentric wealth, or as a doctrinaire commitment to Christian architecture, but

by the post-Civil War era the rhetoric of the Gothicists was being transformed into more general principles of architectural rationalism.[71] Proponents of the Gothic style argued for a fit between the form and function of a building, a natural harmony among structure, materials, architectural form, and the functional or symbolic purposes of a building – a relationship believed to have been characteristic of the great cathedrals. These principles could be turned against "scenographic" tendencies in design that encouraged an unprincipled application of ornament or purely visual imitation of historical buildings.[72] The Gothic styles offered a vocabulary of forms that were visually complex, flexible in application, symbolically rich, and functionally rational in relation to the structural requirements of the building. Gothic forms carried historical associations that were varied and vague enough to be used for a variety of purposes, and lent themselves to the production of varied, "picturesque" compositions. In place of historicism and an intellectualized aesthetic of association, the doctrine of the "picturesque" that emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century emphasized the feelings evoked by particular forms, and the immediate visual impact of architectural compositions. It attempted to ground design in a psychology of perception, justifying both particular use and deviations from historical styles.[73] Such ideologies of design were also concerned with creating a framework of justification that did not have to be shared by the architectural public. They suggested the possibility of design that could produce architectural *effects* independent of its reception by a cultivated-taste public.

By mid-century, it was an accepted truth that American architectural design was split by the sharp duality between the "gothic" and the "classical."[74] This division was not simply a question of commitment to different styles by different factions, but represented the articulation of two distinct modes of design, two very different ways of motivating the relation between architectural form and function. They constituted two different kinds of architectural "reality" – an architecture that sought adequate expression of underlying realities of structure and function (expressing the service to the client in a direct and individual response to the conditions at hand), and a formalism that represented a distinctively "architectural" reality.[75] These two modes of design represented the poles between which nineteenth-century architecture moved: a concern for responsiveness related to professional autonomy and the atomizing tendencies of a market for professional services, and a concern for formal order and historically validated principles related to

professional authority and discipline. The problem of a professionalized discipline of design was to strike a balance between these concerns.

In the middle decades of the nineteenth-century, practitioners struggled to institute some form of disciplinary control over design practices. Architectural practice was dominated by an eclecticism that made architects vulnerable to the whims of fashion, but efforts to articulate the underlying principles of eclectic practice only contributed to the atomization of style by emphasizing the expressive relation of form and function at the expense of conventional usage. It was in the context of continually disintegrating eclectic tastes and an expanding market that the impulse toward professional association, which had up until this point been limited to participation in local clubs and unspecialized intellectual circles, was given new urgency, new political impetus, and a new sense of mission. A self-proclaimed occupational elite attempted to regularize the market for architectural services through the organization of the American Institute of Architects in 1857. The problem of professionalization was to translate the earlier structure of occupational control, based on networks of elite patronage, into an institutionalized definition of the professional role.[76]

Professional organization, in itself, did not resolve the architects' problems, however. As an exclusive organization that sought primarily to mark the distinction between professional architects and pretenders, the A.I.A. had no real means of imposing order on the market. It could monopolize neither the practice of design nor the title of architect. Without a coherent framework of architectural judgment, it had no way of imposing practical discipline even on its own members, except with regard to competitive practices in the market. The elite practitioners who made up the membership of the A.I.A. were themselves most guilty of asserting their artistic creativity in eclectic design, even while denouncing "unprincipled" and "self-made" architects who gave in to the demands of their patrons for ornamental excess and display.[77] These architects drew most of the criticism from the public, for exceeding estimates and disregarding explicit instructions from the client in the name of artistic principles.[78] In 1876, a Professor Huxley at Johns Hopkins advised the trustees of the university:

> Whenever you begin to build, send for an honest bricklayer, and make him build you just such rooms as you really want; ... and a century hence, ... if you have a few hundred thousand dollars you don't know what to do with,

> send for an architect, and tell him to put up a façade.... Any other course will probably lead you into having some stately structure, good for your architect's fame, but not in the least what you want.[79]

In the 1870s, the architects' response to such criticism was to try to close professional ranks around an insistence on the centrality of trained artistic judgment to the architect's professional service.[80] Ironically, in the face of critical attacks on architects as a useless luxury, the artistic aspect of the architect's role was presented "as the highest and most distinctive of an architect's qualifications."[81] Against stylistic confusion, an emphasis on "correctness" was presented as an antidote to the ills of the discipline and the profession. Such standards, however, were difficult for most practitioners to sustain under extra-professional pressure to be practical rather than correct.

The difficulty of maintaining the architect's professional status, and of maintaining a market for architectural services, was due in large part to the difficulty of unifying architecture as a discipline encompassing the wide variations in the practical situations of architects – variations in size of practice, economic conditions, markets, etc. The traditional definitions of architectural refinement, re-emphasized by the defensive efforts of the 1870s, created a growing gap between those architects who could produce prestigious works and those who had to take on more mundane tasks to support a small practice. The divisions between east and west, local and cosmopolitan, elite and rank-and-file practitioners reflected a centrifugal diversification of architectural practice that left the would-be center without a hold on the periphery and threatened, in this way, to break up the social structure of professionalized architecture. There was no generalized ideology of design that could effectively link the small-town midwestern practitioner to the eastern big-city designer, or that could relate the monumental qualities of a city hall to the mundane qualities of a small cottage or an addition to someone's home. Such divisions came to a head in the formation of the Western Association of Architects in Chicago in 1884, in opposition to the perceived elitism of the A.I.A. and its unresponsiveness to the problems of architects not among the elite of the cities of the Eastern seaboard.[82]

It wasn't only criteria of design quality that were lacking, but the institutional supports necessary to produce and maintain a unifying ideology of design that would sustain such criteria in such widely varied practice. The discipline lacked an institutionalized core that could constitute the

distinctive values of professional design in a manner of practical relevance to a sufficiently wide range of practitioners. Without such a center structuring the professional labor market around an effective elite, the centrifugal tendencies inherent in the practice of design in the market would continue to disorganize the market and erode the authority and status of the architect.

III. The American renaissance

Throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, there was a growing core of architects either trained at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts or in the office of an Ecole-trained architect. Richard Morris Hunt, considered the dean of American architecture throughout the last part of the nineteenth century, was the first to study at the Ecole in 1846. Returning to New York, he ran a famous *atelier* where he trained many students who became successful, visible, and historically prominent architects in their own right.[83] The actual numbers of American architects attending the Ecole were never large. American attendance at the Ecole de Beaux-Arts reaches its peak in the years between 1897 and 1920. From an average of 2.8 Americans studying at the Ecole each year between 1880 and 1889, the average rose to 15 each year from 1890–1899, to 20 from 1900 to 1909, and fell off to 10 per year between 1910–1920.[84]

Although it remained small in absolute members, over the course of the latter half of the nineteenth century, this core of Beaux-Arts trained or influenced architects was able to constitute itself as an effective elite. They not only came to control key professional institutions, but managed to occupy both the practical and symbolic center of the practice of architecture in a way that organized the whole profession around them. As a result, in the last decade of the nineteenth century, professional authority and distinctiveness were reconstructed in terms of a disciplinary restraint based on the revival of coherent styles. The emergent ideal stressed the disciplined imposition of formal order as the architect's service to both client and society, resolving the balancing act between responsiveness and order in favor of distinctively "architectural" ideals and the architect's form-giving authority.

Beaux-Arts training was, from the beginning, a legitimated basis for distinction among American architects. Study at the Ecole was a highly prized opportunity to study the historical styles in European architec-

ture in actuality (rather than from books), and to be trained in the most fashionable interpretations of the styles. At the same time, it was related to social status going in and professional status coming out. Only those with sponsorship or independent resources could go, and an Ecole-trained architect had a practical advantage over other architects with regard to the claim to specialized knowledge.

Throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century, Beaux-Arts architects were the most socially well-positioned of the architectural profession – the social, if not financial, equals of the business elite among which they found their most important clients, and who were the key figures also on the boards and building committees of important cultural institutions.[85] Ecole trained or influenced architects also tended to occupy key positions in the profession. An Ecole background was especially characteristic of the early members of the American Institute of Architects (founded 1857). Although the lists of prominent architects of the late nineteenth century include many who had not received Ecole training, those who appear on the list of Americans who studied at the Ecole also appear with great frequency as officers of key commissions, as affiliates of various educational institutions.[86] In a sample of 114 "outstanding architects of all time periods," Noffsinger found that 5 were self-taught, 29 were trained in offices alone, 40 received both school and office training, and 30 attended the Ecole (in some combination with other forms of training).[87] The first specialized architectural magazine, "The American Architect," began publication in 1876 under the editorship of William Rotch Ware, an Ecole student. The Society of Beaux-Arts Architects (founded 1894) played an important role in the development of American architectural education; in particular, by supplying competition programmes and representatives on review committees.

The overall significance of this elite for the development of American architecture, however, was a question of their ability to provide the focal point for a relatively autonomous discipline. On the one hand, they came to represent an architectural order that was given public validation on the basis of their capacity to bring order to perceived social problems of the city, and their ability to give a particular practical specification to diffuse tendencies of late-nineteenth-century urban reform. On the other hand, they represented the pinnacle of an architectural order that was institutionalized in both the system of collegiate training and office practice.

Although there had been earlier buildings in the Renaissance style, the "first prominent harbinger" of the American Beaux-Arts movement was Richard Morris Hunt's Lenox Library in New York (1870–1874).[88] The Henry Villard houses (1883) by McKim, Mead, and White mark the point at which the "movement" really began to pick up momentum. Enthusiasm for the Villard houses not only created interest in the Renaissance styles, but seems to have been directly responsible for bringing important commissions to McKim, Mead, and White.[89] Throughout the 1870s and 1880s, prominent eastern architects responded to commissions from a growing commercial and financial elite with large office buildings, residences, and, increasingly, public buildings in Beaux-Arts styles. Against the background of this vogue, the Chicago Fair played a key role both in disseminating the taste for Beaux-Arts classicism, and in linking it to broader cultural concerns. The Fair sparked renewed interest in civic improvement and the White City became the formal expression of the City Beautiful movement.

The City Beautiful movement has proven as difficult for historians to pin down as any of the Progressive Era reform movements. Like many of those movements, it was composed of a number of convergent but nonetheless distinct tendencies. Petersen has identified three, each with its distinct historical roots and its own constituencies.[90] First, the Fair itself inspired a renewed interest in municipal art, and small-scale adornment of buildings and city streets with sculpture, murals, and stained glass. The founding of a Municipal Art Society in New York took place in 1893 under the auspices of Richard M. Hunt, one of the architects of the White City. The Architectural League of New York, an organization comprising both architects and interested citizens, helped to stimulate interest in civic improvement by holding design competitions and sponsoring public lectures on the "Plan of the City."[91] It was in this context that the label "City Beautiful" seems to have been first used by New York artists, architects, and critics.[92] By 1898, it had become current among the broader public. In that year, a convention in Cleveland organized the Architectural League of America, composed almost entirely of young architects and landscape architects. At the convention, there was great excitement over the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce's endorsement of a "group plan" for public buildings in that city. The League also formed a National Committee on Municipal Im-

provement and Civic Embellishments to encourage and give advice on public art to other cities.

A second component of the City Beautiful movement emerged from the interest in park development that had grown since mid-century. As early as 1856, New York had acquired 840 acres in upper Manhattan and held a design competition for its development into a municipal park. The competition was won by Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux. For the next twenty years, Olmsted was superintendent of the construction of what became Central Park. Between 1860 and 1890, many cities followed New York's example and created municipal park commissions. In the late nineteenth century, in the context of trends in social thought, parks were interpreted as an instrument for achieving both physical and moral health in the city, as a tool of moral education and social control.[93] In the 1890s, there was a renewed interest in park planning, reflecting this emphasis, and a turn to more ambitious and large-scale planning. The Fair, in the layout of which Olmsted played a central role, fired new interest in landscape architecture at an urban scale, and called attention to the efforts of landscape architects like Olmsted, Charles Kessler, and Charles Eliot. The park movement was shaped and sustained in large part by the developing professions of architecture, landscape architecture, and city planning.

The third component of the City Beautiful movement was a grass-roots interest in civic improvement that developed as a popular cause in small to medium-sized cities.[94] Inspired by English improvement societies, a publisher of floral and pet magazines in Springfield, Ohio, organized a conference out of which was created the National League of Improvement Associations, giving organizational focus to what had been a diffuse and highly localized movement.[95] The League's efforts were two fold: it acted as a kind of political pressure group to spur municipal authorities into action in providing services and utilities, and at the same time worked as organizer and propagandist to inspire civic pride and public cooperation. By 1901–1902, the League had begun to identify itself with the "mainstream" of Progressive reform. The second president of the League was Charles Zueblin, the Chicago sociologist. At its second convention in 1902, the League renamed itself the American League for Civic Improvement, and redefined its goals in more general terms, and, by the end of that year, created 14 advisory councils of nationally known "experts" in municipal art, municipal reform, social settlements, sanitation, and recreation.

Petersen emphasizes the small-scale and grass-roots origins of the City Beautiful movement as a pattern of activity sustained by thousands of small organizations. These efforts were stimulated and given organizational focus, however, by the professionals who could provide an effective means of coping with what might otherwise present themselves as inchoate public concerns and insoluble problems. Charles Mulford Robinson called the Chicago Fair a "great popular object lesson in the value of extensive cooperation," but it is evident that this meant the cooperation of architects, artists, planners, and landscape architects on behalf of the public interest to which they were entrusted to give form and substance.

> The pertinence of the dream, it may be said, was not even in the first place only for institutions. It was more obviously indeed for the subsequent expositions, all of which it has affected. Then its suggestion of permanent results was recognized most promptly and cordially by institutions. Next, and with a long forward – though entirely natural – step, comes the grouping of public buildings of town and city, and the development of a civic center. After that, and yet more thrilling and magnificent application of the example, came the appointment of an expert commission, representative of those fine arts that must be combined for the highest adornment of a city, to consider and propose plans for the improvement of Washington. At last there grows out of it a widespread demand for expert advice, by commissions or by individuals of professional training, regarding the artistic development of tracts and towns....[96]

The White City symbolized the possibilities for creating urban order through environmental reform, and it pointed to the means by which this order could be implemented: a mixed group of professionals able to give practical focus and specification to popular enthusiasm for urban reform.

Following the Fair, architects such as Richard Morris Hunt, Daniel Burnham, Charles McKim, and Stanford White continued to maintain national reputations for their work on highly visible and socially important projects. Yielding to the urging of the American Institute of Architects to provide a proper setting for public buildings in Washington, D.C., the Senate created a commission in 1901 to devise a comprehensive plan. They appointed Burnham and Olmsted, who in turn appointed Charles F. McKim and Augustus St. Gaudens.[97] This plan served as an example for other cities who engaged experts to prepare comprehensive plans. Burnham himself was responsible for plans for Manila, San Francisco, and Chicago, to mention only the most notable. Significantly, these efforts were supported by organizations that repre-

sented the same business elites who were the patrons of Beaux-Arts architecture. Burnham's plan for Chicago, for example, was sponsored by the Commercial Club.[98]

Bender and Taylor have pointed out the implicit and explicit urbanism of Beaux-Arts design, something that has been eclipsed by the fascination with individual buildings that has shaped much modernist criticism.[99] In its approach to large-scale planning problems, Beaux-Arts design can be understood as engaging modern problems and not simply retreating into historical fancies. This engagement is complex, however, and an analysis of the connection between Beaux-Arts design and social conditions at the turn of the century points away from a simplistic technological or economic reductionism and toward the mediation of the effects of economic and technological changes by the social organization of a professional practice of design. The link between Beaux-Arts design and Progressive era urban reform depended not on urbanistic impulses inherent in Beaux-Arts architecture nor its general "fit" with Progressive ideology, but more importantly on the historically articulated link between Beaux-Arts design and the social structure of professional architecture in the United States.

Examination of lists of work by the key Beaux-Arts architects reveals that the early blossoming of their careers depended on the patronage of commercial and financial elites centered in the major eastern cities.[100] With the economic and technological developments of the late nineteenth century, these elites became increasingly national in their operations and influence, with broad ramifications for the development of American cultural institutions.[101] The hegemony of Beaux-Arts design was closely and structurally linked to this nationalization of culture; as local elites operated more and more in a national arena, local architects were drawn into competition with an increasingly national professional elite.

Hofstadter has argued that Progressive Era reform movements were stimulated by the status anxieties of an older professional and entrepreneurial middle class, elements of which sought to regain political control and cultural dominance as they began to feel overshadowed by concentrations of wealth in the "new plutocarcy" and overwhelmed by immigrant masses.[102] Precisely because this "new plutocracy" accounted for a growing proportion of the patronage of architecture, architects experienced a kind of status anxiety not as members of an old and threatened middle class, but in more specific and practical terms. It was

not a question of the class background or affiliations of architects, but of their particular structural location as representatives of a discipline. All along, architects had depended on wealthy and powerful clients but sought to insulate the practice of design from the dictates of the client's taste. Reliance on the patronage of new and fluid elites increased pressure to construct independent grounds for practical autonomy and a distinctive cultural authority.

By way of its ties to the City Beautiful movement, of which the White City was a paradigmatic event, key architects were able to harness some of the popular energy of Progressive reform for their own purposes. The success of the White City, along with the participation of architects in civic improvement, served to link Beaux-Arts architecture both symbolically and structurally to the social and political aspirations of the Progressives. Ideologically, it represented a transformation of an elite cultural practice into a professional service that could speak to broader social and practical concerns; in this way, it effectively identified the architects' professional role, as represented by its elite practitioners, with the technocratic reform tendencies of the Progressive Era. At the same time, city planning and civic beautification became one of the focal concerns around which local elites organized, linking Architecture to the efforts of local business elites both to consolidate their social and political position in the city and to situate themselves in a national context. From the practical standpoint of a profession interested in opportunities for monumental building, this consolidation represented a consolidation of patronage for commercial, residential, and public architecture. This more organized pattern of patronage was mirrored in the ability of Beaux-Arts design to encompass the design of a wide range of building types. Architects were able to respond authoritatively to the varied building needs of the local elite, to anchor these responses in a coherent and widely validated body of practice, and, if the opportunity presented itself, to follow the chain of commissions into the same national markets as their clients.

The social position of the Beaux-Arts architects and the social significance of their designs validated both their professional status and the architectural order they represented. For a brief period around the turn of the century, public recognition and extra-professional status corresponded to the internal status structure of the profession. The widespread practical influence of Beaux-Arts design turned an elite cultural form into a form of mass culture, and provided both a sociological

anchoring and organizing framework for the professional practice of design.

Institutionalizing the discipline

Up to this point, the discussion has focused on the elite agents of the Beaux-Arts approach and their ability to link their particular notion of architectural order both to a broad cultural impulse and to the interests of specific agents. It is important, however, that it was not simply that a powerful elite happened to be the carriers of Beaux-Arts training or ideals. The Beaux-Arts approach was singularly fitted as a mode of design in its ability simultaneously to resolve problems of design and professional organization.

The methods of the Ecole offered several things the discipline needed. From a practical standpoint, the Ecole taught its students both a well-defined canon of historical styles and a rational method for applying it. An architect working in the Beaux-Arts mode began with the programme as given, and then moved from an analysis of the relationships between the functions described in the programme to an expression of these relationships in a "composition" that is both good and beautiful.[103] The process began with a *parti*, a simplified conceptual grasp of the problem and its solution. The initial sketches emphasized "the general, the most 'ideal' aspects of design before turning to its particularities."[104] From there, one worked toward an elaboration of the details of a design. "Goodness" lay in the economy and convenience of an arrangement of functions, while "beauty" depended on the imposition of a formal order based on proportional relationships between the parts of a composition, the containment of functional variety within a framework of axial symmetry, and on the visual arrangement of "good projecting and recessed elements, accented pavilions, emphatic or elegant silhouettes."[105] According to Draper, the Ecole offered "a command of the design method by which any problem, from a small house to an entire city, could be systematically solved, and fluency in the Classical language of architecture."[106]

The curriculum at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts included lectures and course work of various sorts, but the center of work at the Ecole was the *atelier*, architectural studios run by established architects. Students advanced through a series of clear steps to *diplome par le gouverne-*

ment by winning points or "values" in design competitions. Beginning work consisted mostly of *analytiques*, rendered plates of the classical orders and details such as standard door and window treatments (taken from historical buildings). Once advanced to "First Class," students were free to pick among the competitions offered in order to accumulate the necessary points. Each year there were 6 *esquisses* (sketch projects), 6 *projets rendu* (two-month projects requiring more elaborate presentation drawings), and any number of special competitions. The design projects were intended to teach the practical skills of design – drawing, rendering form and shadow, manipulating classical details – not the technical skills of construction or of actual architectural practice. There were few practical restrictions given in the programmes, which were generally for buildings of types rarely (if ever) encountered in ordinary practice.[107] They were intended, as Draper remarks, "to inculcate the universal principles of architectural composition."[108]

Nonetheless Ecole training offered a rational approach that allowed the architect to reduce any building problem to a common set of terms, and provided a well-specified vocabulary in which to formulate solutions that referred to an historically validated canon. It also offered a model of systematic design education that mixed historical scholarship and broad knowledge with practical skills in drawing and rendering, thereby creating a common body of knowledge and practices that could serve as the basis for a more standardized framework of architectural judgement and facilitated division of labor in the office. Its role in re-building the discipline is apparent in the growing influence of the Ecole model in American collegiate schools of architecture.

The system of collegiate training in architecture that emerged in the late nineteenth century was built along the lines of the Ecole model, adapted to fit the institutional setting of an American college. William Ware, an alumnus of Hunt's atelier, was given the task of developing the first American collegiate school of architecture at MIT (1865). By 1898, there were nine "courses" providing architectural training in the United States, seven as departments of engineering and two in departments of fine arts.[109]

MIT was unusual in the degree to which it was influenced very early on by the Ecole. In most of the early schools, design was given relatively little attention.[110] Architectural education tended, at first, to be a more or less direct reflection of the concerns of local practitioners, varying considerably from region to region. In the midwest, for example, there

was great concern over the problem of shoddy construction, and this was reflected in the organization of the curriculum at the University of Illinois. Illinois was the first to include a shop course to familiarize architectural students with building processes of framing, plastering, painting, bricklaying, stone cutting, casting, turning, carving, etc.[111] Much of the development of architectural education was shaped by the concern for ensuring an influx of skilled office assistants to the profession. The institutional autonomy of the academic wing of the profession, however, depended on an expanding emphasis on design. The early schools began as adjuncts of departments of engineering, only slowly working themselves free of the constraints this imposed. In this process, "design" gained increasing importance in the curriculum, taking up a greater percentage of the students' time and being introduced earlier in the student's academic career.[112] In this way, the interests of an emergent academic wing of the profession converged with those of elite practitioners. An Ecole-based approach to design gradually overwhelmed the concern for the practical aspects of building apparent in the early programs.

All of the schools founded between 1895 and 1920 sought Ecole graduates for their design faculties.[113] By 1912, twelve out of the twenty collegiate schools of architecture in the United States had Ecole graduates teaching design, seven of them French. Between 1898 and 1912, there was an increasing standardization in architectural education made possible by the adoption of the Ecole model. Even schools that had resisted the influence of the Ecole gave in to the pressures of competition between schools. Only five out of twenty didn't make use of the competition programmes distributed by the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design.

As the scale and complexity of building increased, the size and complexity of the organizations required to carry out the full range of architectural duties (from design, to working drawings and specifications, to the supervision of construction) also increased. By the late nineteenth century, successful architectural offices had become in many cases large and elaborate organizations requiring fairly well-developed technical skills of their staffs.[114] The office of George B. Post, for example, went from a small studio in which Post worked with two assistants in 1868, to an office with a staff of 60 by 1900.[115] By the time of McKim's death in 1909, his office had a staff of over 100. By 1912, Burnham had 180 employees, and branch offices in New York and San Francisco.[116] Weatherhead has noted that the standardization of Beaux-Arts classicism, combining a common stylistic language with highly developed

drafting skills necessary to "speak" it, fit in well with the needs of busy architectural offices.[117] It is not only a question of cutting design time by "cribbing" designs from the past; architects could turn over the development of a design to assistants, and leave the office staff to develop details and working drawings from rough sketches. Inventories of drawings from the offices of the period show that the drafting staff spent much more time on the details of the surface than a modern office.[118] Large projects were broken into component parts and different designers assigned to finish out different parts of a single building from rough sketches.[119]

The "practicality" of Beaux-Arts training is indicated by the development of the School of Architecture at Columbia University. The school was founded in 1881, instigated by one of the trustees who was a member of the Improved Dwelling Association and Sanitary Reform Society. His primary goal was to improve the professions's technical expertise, with particular regard to sanitary engineering. Originally they asked Richard M. Hunt to head the school, on the basis of his reputation as "the Father of High and Successful Architectural Education in this Country."[120] On his recommendation, the position was offered to William Ware.

The first curriculum reflected the technical bias of the trustees – professors of architecture would teach only design, while the engineering faculty at the School of Mines would teach the technical material. Gradually, as the faculty expanded, the curriculum was separated from the School of Mines and the technical engineering courses replaced with courses in drawing, geometry, design, and architectural history. By the fall of 1888, students were taking drawing in the first year, and by 1891 design instruction was introduced into the first year.[121]

Although influenced by the Ecole, Ware thought that the training at the Ecole put too much emphasis on drawing and draftmanship rather than composition and the "real" problems of design.[122] He stressed freehand drawing and broad historical scholarship rather than the technical skills of the Beaux-Arts draftsman, and the historical grounding of architecture in the liberal arts rather than its craft relationship to the fine arts. By the end of the century, this approach began to draw criticism as the work of Columbia students was downgraded in competitions when compared to the polished renderings and precise drawings of students from other schools. In 1894, three Ecole graduates were hired with the specific intention of improving the drawing skills of

Columbia students.[123] Another source of criticism was that although the design instruction involved a sequence of projects with progressively more complex programmes, these were criticized by the professors but not set up as competitions (with awards, etc.) in the manner of the Ecole. This seemed to critics to indicate a lack of standards in the school.

In 1902, the school was reorganized and made independent of the Faculty of Applied Sciences. A visiting committee was set up to review the work of the school and suggest reforms to bring its program into line with the demands of professional practice. The visiting committee was made up of alumni, prominent practitioners, and representatives of the Society of Beaux-Arts Architects (founded in 1894).[124] It is interesting to note that Beaux-Arts influence was strongly represented in all three categories. It was generally felt that Ware's approach had been too scholarly and not practical enough. Ware's emphasis on historical scholarship had created a program that "failed to meet the needs of the New York profession, whose commissions for complex projects created a need only for those architects with developed technical and drafting skills."[125]

In 1903, Ware resigned on the excuse of his poor health, but clearly also as the result of his failing reputation.[126] The position of head of the school was offered to McKim, and then to Carrere, both prominent figures in the "American Renaissance," but both declined. A. D. F. Hamlin, already on the faculty, was appointed in the interim. In the following years, Ware's successors transformed the program to look more like the Ecole.[127] The common theme underlying these reforms was an interest in bringing architectural education more closely in line with the conditions of practice. Beaux-Arts methods provided a framework for a simultaneous standardization of architectural education and office practice, oriented toward design in a way that supported the autonomy of both the academic wing and the elite practitioner as designer.

IV. Disciplining design

Up to this point, I have looked at the historical context and the institutional supports of Beaux-Arts hegemony. I have emphasized the success and public status of a professional elite, the construction of a system of architectural training modelled after the Ecole, the rational

character of the Beaux-Arts approach, and its fit with the practical exigencies of late-nineteenth-century office practice. An important issue has remained largely implicit, however. The key to the whole pattern lies in the discursive characteristics of Beaux-Arts design practice, which enabled the architect to translate the structural conditions of professional status into practical articulation of a relatively autonomous discipline.

By the end of the nineteenth century, there were two distinct tendencies in American architecture. One was the Beaux-Arts-inspired academic tendency. The other was the so-called "progressive" tendency. Insofar as generalization is possible, the progressive tendency was characterized by an interest in responsiveness in design: to the client's immediate needs, to the site, to modern social conditions. This tendency was to ground formal choices more directly in functional considerations, in the nature of materials, in the building crafts, or in the symbolic functions of buildings. A brief comparison of the two suggests the significance of Beaux-Arts design as an expression of the architects' professionalizing efforts.[128]

The writings of Louis Sullivan provide a dramatic formulation of the theory of "progressive" architecture. Although the ideas expressed in his writings were often inconsistent and self-contradictory, and the relationship between his ideas and his architecture complex, his views reveal some of the key tensions in this mode of design. In his well-known 1896 essay, "The Tall Building Artistically Considered," Sullivan outlined an approach to the problem of creating a new building type, a problem that he saw as the crucial aesthetic problem of the age. He begins with the observations that "it is of the very essence of every problem that it contains and suggests its own solution."[129] One has to begin, therefore, not with references to past architectural achievements, but with a detailed analysis of the problem – in principle, as if it had never been solved before.

> I assume now that in the study of our problem we have passed through the various stages of inquiry, as follows: 1st, the social basis of the demand for tall office buildings; 2nd, its literal material satisfaction; 3rd, the elevation of the question from considerations of literal planning, construction, and equipment, to the plane of elementary architecture as a direct outgrowth of sound, sensible building....

Only then can the question be "again elevated from an elementary architecture to the beginnings of true architectural expression, through

the addition of a certain quality and quantity of sentiment."[130] It is a quality of all things and a natural law, he argues, "that form ever follows function."[131] He contrasts the mode of expression that is "natural" and "organic" with other views: "Certain critics, and very thoughtful ones, have advanced the theory that the true prototype of the tall office building is the classical column, consisting of base, shaft, and capital... ." Others assume a "mystical symbolism as a guide, quote the many trinities in nature and art," or "hold that a design should be in the nature of a logical statement; it should have a beginning, a middle, and an ending, each clearly defined." Still others seek "examples and justification in the vegetable kingdom." In contrast, he proposes a justification for the (by then) conventional three-part composition of a tall building that is based on an isomorphism between form and function:

> Does this not readily, clearly, and conclusively show that the lower one or two stories will take on a special character suited to the special needs, that the tiers of typical offices, having the same unchanging function, shall continue in the same unchanging form, and that as to the attic, specific and conclusive as it is in its very nature, its function shall equally be so in force, in significance, in continuity, in conclusiveness of outward expression? From this results, naturally, spontaneously, unwittingly, a three-part division, not from any theory, symbol, or fancied logic.[132]

According to Sullivan, design should not be merely a question of composing elements, but of expressing an "organic" relation between the form of a building and the essential nature of a building problem. The dictum that "form follows function" is not the simple functionalism it appears.[133] The crucial quality of the high-rise building, for example, was that it was "lofty," and the design should express this fact in every aspect. "It must be tall, every inch of it tall."[134] Sullivan's programmatic functionalism was tempered by a sense that architecture should not only reflect social and technological conditions of a building problem, but actively express those conditions in a way that makes a particular kind of sense of them. Analysis of the Wainwright building, which Sullivan himself saw as marking "the beginning of a logical and poetic expression of the metallic frame construction,"[135] shows that it violated strict functionalist principles in a variety of ways. The base of the building, distinguished by its stone treatment on the façade, is two stories high, although the second floor contained offices and was not functionally an extension of the first floor.[136] Although the vertical piers are visually identical, only every other one encases a steel column that is part of the supporting frame of the building. The overhanging roof slab was heavy and not well suited to cap a steel-frame building. The heavily

ornamented cornice is difficult to justify as an expression of the mechanical equipment located on the top floor.[137]

In his *Kindergarden Chats*, Sullivan argues that "the real architect is first, last, and all the time, not a merchant, broker, manufacturer, business man, or anything of the sort, but *a poet who uses not word but building materials as a medium of expression.*"[138] The architect's function was

> to vitalize building materials, to animate them collectively with a thought, a state of feeling, to charge them with a subjetive significance and value, to make them a visible part of the genuine social fabric, to infuse into them the true life of the people, to impart to them the best that is in the people, as the eye of the poet looking below the surface of life, sees the best that is in the people... .[139]

Sullivan's approach to design was also a prescription for the role architecture was to play in society, and the role the professional architect was to play in modern culture. Given the expressive nature of architecture, what was to be the source of the system of expression? Sullivan's answer was that it was to be found, first, in the conditions of the problem, and secondly, in democratic culture, but the latter was to take shape in the artistic imagination of the individual architect. The architect must respond to popular feeling, and "cannot wholly escape this control."[140] At the same time, "the public itself can only partially and imperfectly state its wants."[141] The architect's function was to arrive at solutions to the problems of the day unencumbered by historical precedent, and to impose a distinctive style on these solutions. Architecture was to be part of a "culture of action," in which the artist/architect was to play a key role: whereas engineering was a "reaction" to external forces, architecture was to be regarded as "action" on them.[142] Architectural expression was not, however, to be achieved by "speaking a foreign language with a noticeable American accent." Governed only by "native instinct and sensibility" and the law "that form ever follows function," the architect is to "express in the simplest, most modest, most natural way that which it is in him to say," and "develop his own characteristic individuality."[143]

Architecture was not to dress up the purposes of the day, but to give natural expression to what was best in them and ideal form not only to buildings but to society itself. The architect was to play a key role in giving creative expression to the life and experiences characteristic of the modern age, but to do so by developing his individuality as an

artist. In an 1888 paper on "Style," Sullivan argued that "the style of an artist is in its essence and form the resultant of his identity and experiences," and that "style is ever thus the response of the organism to the surroundings."[144] Sullivan saw threats to this "democratic" culture in the architectural professions' tendency toward a "feudal" culture characterized by "materialism" and "estheticism."[145] On the one hand, he was concerned that the reduction of architecture to engineering would result in a loss of the subjective element of architecture as a realization of human desires and values; on the other hand, a reduction of architecture to formalism and design to mere composition would result in the loss of the essential connection of architecture to life.

Sullivan is a particularly significant and influential representative of a tendency that was emerging at the end of the nineteenth century, combining ideas about recent commercial architecture with a tradition of "picturesque" architecture that extends back to the 1840s. He gives theoretical articulation to a practical tendency with roots in the work of a number of architects practicing in the late nineteenth century. This is not only a question of modernist reconstruction, although the modern movement has given the progressive tendency a renewed significance. Even at the time, some architects recognized the basis of a new architecture, not just a new style, in this work.[146]

Frank Lloyd Wright, Sullivan's most influential student, provides another example of the progressive view of architecture. Wright's architectural tenets were expressed in a 1908 article entitled "In the Cause of Architecture":

> Primarily, nature furnished the materials for architectural motifs out of which the architectural forms as we know them today have been developed, and, although our practice for centuries has been for the most part to turn from her, seeking inspiration in books and adhering slavishly to dead formulae, her wealth of suggestion is inexhaustible.[147]

He suggested a return to that inspiration. On this basis, he formulated a set of propositions: 1) "Simplicity and repose are qualities that measure the true value of any work of art." The plan should be as simplified as possible. "Openings should occur as integral features of the structure and form, if possible, its natural ornamentation." 2) "There should be as many kinds (styles) of houses as there are kinds (styles) of people, and as many differentiations as there are different individuals." 3) "A building should appear to grow easily from its site and be shaped to harmonize with its surroundings...." 4) "Colors require the same con-

ventionalizing process to make them fit to live with that natural forms do; so go to the woods and fields for color schemes." 5) "Bring out the nature of the materials... ." Materials should be allowed to show their natural colors and textures. 6) "A house that has character stands a good chance of growing more valuable as it grows older while a house in the prevailing mode, whatever the mode may be, is soon out of fashion... ." The time of the uniformity of the great styles has passed with changing conditions of democracy that demand expression of the individual. Architectural forms "must be born out of our changed conditions, they must be *true* forms... ."[148]

The Robie house (1910) provides good examples of the way Wright sought to realize these tenets. The "organic" expression of structure and function, and of the relation of the house to its environment, relies not on stylized references to validated solutions but on an effort to reveal underlying, archetypal "truths." According to Jordy, the organization of the plan in terms of elements radiating from a central chimney "creates an architectonic analogy to growing things in nature."[149] The prominence of the chimney recalls the importance of the hearth as the center of domestic life, while the overhanging roof acts to "dramatize the sense of shelter."[150] On the other hand, the compositional elements are also "the archetypal components of architecture: 'piers,' 'roofs,' 'chimneys,' 'balustrades,' 'windows,' conceived as a simple geometry of planes, cubes, rectangular solids, and hipped slabs."[151] At the same time, the steel beams used to support the long interior spans and the cantilever of the overhanging roof are concealed. Thus the design is a formal composition, but abstractly expressive of the functions of a home. It reveals its "structure" not by a literal exposure of structural framing but through a composition of symbolic architectonic elements.

In contrast to functionalism or "organic expression," Beaux-Arts classicism offered a discipline with multiple levels of meaning and possibilities for justifying design choices; it referred not to structure, materials, or function, but to other buildings that established formal precedents for particular kinds of architectural expression. Gaudet, in his codification of the Beaux-Arts approach, distinguished architecture as an "art of creation" from the "arts of imitation." The truth of the arts of imitation is to be found in nature, but the truth of architecture is to be found in "conscience" that protects the architect from "the contagion of fleeting successes, from the tyranny of fashions, from the constraints of pastiche, from the mirage of irrational whims."[152]

McKim's Boston Public Library (1888–1895), for example, very neatly suggests the nature of Beaux-Arts discipline. The façade of the library was, as Jordy put it, "thrice-sanctioned."[153] It referred clearly to Henri Labrouste's Bibliotheque Sainte-Genevieve in Paris (1844–1850), to Leon Battista Alberti's famous San Francesco in Rimini (1447–1456), and, perhaps, to the more recent example of Richardson's Marshall Field Wholesale store in Chicago (1885–1887). In this building one can see an example of an approach to design that makes explicit use of historicist motifs yet puts strong emphasis on the visual and formal qualities of the building as an original composition by the architect. Jordy describes this as a "pictorial" approach to classicism in which the openings and decorative elements are "distributed over the surface more as a pleasingly abstract composition than as a metaphor of structure."[154] At the same time, it is still classicism – governed by reference to an historical canon and formal "correctness" rather than functional or expressive truth.

Both tendencies represent efforts to ground design choices rationally, but it should be clear that the rationality is quite different. Where progressive design stressed responsiveness, expression, and individual artistic vision, the academic ideal stressed the imposition of formal order within a clear and coherent framework of aesthetic conventions. This is not to say that the progressive architects never referred to other buildings in their designs, or that the classicists never attempted to express function. Rather, it is a question of the balance struck between responsiveness and formal order, and the particular way in which the relation between form and building task was grasped. The progressive mode turned on idiosyncratic efforts to distill archetypal truths, while Beaux-Arts design maintained a firm orientation toward conventional authority. Beaux-Arts design was guided by abstract principles of composition (symmetry, proportion, balance), and utilized the historical styles in a complex and esoteric manner. It enabled a level of abstraction necessary to articulate a practice in diverse sites, yet allowed clear reference to a canon of forms and disciplinary conventions governing their use. The problem with the progressive architects' attempts to develop a new responsive architecture was that their efforts remained highly individual and limited in application. They could be imitated, but not effectively generalized. Later received as anticipators of "modernism," they were too fragmented and regional to constitute either a unified canon of architectural forms or an effective elite – at least until a different sort of architectural abstraction was given the canonical referents of the International Style in the 1920s and 1930s.

"Honest" expression of materials or structure, an architecture that is "organic," and so on, can mean too many different things. Such "style" could be passed on through apprenticeship training, but lacking a canon of validated images, it could not constitute an institutionally grounded rhetoric that would support the whole discipline. A more coherent institutional setting would be required if the elements necessary for a transformation of the discipline were to crystallize.

In both modes of design, the medium of the architect is not that of the builder (stone and steel) but a rhetoric of style. Given this articulation of the architect's professional role, a tendency toward formalism appears as inevitable, built in to the structure of professional practice and the ideological organization of design. Williams has written of literature:

> "Medium" became the specific material with which a particular kind of artist worked. To understand this "medium" was obviously a condition of professional skill and practice... . But a familiar process of reification occurred, reinforced by the influence of formalism. The properties of "the medium" were abstracted as if they defined the practice, rather than being its means.[155]

For architects, the struggle has been to arrive at a practical reification of the medium that could be both ideologically validated and collectively sustained by the profession. Such formalism is a necessary basis of professional status, but needs to be validated by reference to an institutionally-anchored structure of justification. The autonomy of design depended on the architects' ability to construct a context of practice within which design could be self-referential and self-justifying, without direct recourse to grounds of legitimacy external to architecture itself.

The progressive attempt to construct a new mode of design represented the kind of fantasy of transparent representation that later plagued modernist design also – the fantasy of an architecture that directly expressed an underlying nature.[156] What was needed, however, was an interpretative context in which buildings referred to one another, within which a system of architectural signs could provide a conventional basis for architectural expression. The Beaux-Arts orthodoxy represented the construction and the institutional anchoring of such a framework. The Beaux-Arts approach put emphasis on the "Fine Arts" side of architecture and its association with high culture. It did so, furthermore, while rejecting the theories of the "picturesque" that based their aesthetic principles on what they took to be direct emo-

tional responses to architecture or the expression of structure or materials.[157] Instead it stressed the importance of the discipline achieved through a rigorous training in the classical styles. "Correct taste and power of designing form the keystone in the education of the architect...," according to the A.I.A.'s Committee on Education in 1881.[158] The explicit formulation of a rational method and a vocabulary of forms made possible a comparability in practice and a standardization in architectural education and criticism that helped to create a unified field of design by the turn of the century.

The Beaux-Arts regime managed to hold together a range of eclectic styles within a methodological framework of historical study, principles of composition, and a practical discipline of drawing. One could plan a structure according to functional demands, tastefully clothe the structure in architectural quality, and comfortably delegate the production of working drawings to draftsmen and junior partners. This framework was anchored, furthermore, in an alliance between an academic wing and a professional elite. Academic architecture was insulated from direct client pressures but responded nonetheless to the practical concerns of elite practitioners, with the result that certain architectural characteristics came to signify the order of professional design. Reference to this core of elite practice constituted the distinctive status of "architecture" and a context in which architectural intentions could be formulated and validated. This is not to say that architects operated within a general framework of common interests. Differences in the size and location of their practices created sharp differences and conflicting interests within the profession. The coherence and self-reproducing quality of the discipline depended on its capacity to organize and contain these conflicts. The achievement of the Beaux-Arts orthodoxy was simultaneously to provide a rational design method, a practical foundation for its routinization in organizations, a public boost to the social status of architects, and a coherent disciplinary framework within which a market for professional services could be sustained. It was elaborated and reproduced through the efforts of practitioners to locate particular commission in a practical field, to articulate the grounds of comparability between diverse projects, and to construct a structure of justification within which design could be presented as a rational process.

V. Conclusion

The formation of a professional discipline of design in the United States was not a foregone conclusion. It was a particular achievement carried out by particular agents, taking advantage of particular social and cultural resources to construct a coherent practice. As a strategy that organized the efforts of widely dispersed practitioners, however, this formation displayed a discernible logic. It was not simply a question of the impact of external constraints nor of the working out of the internal logic of particular architectural traditions, but of the specific ways the latter could be mapped on to the former by practitioners operating within certain immediate social and institutional contexts.

The Beaux-Arts episode is a particularly clear example of the dynamic of architectural development that resulted from efforts to maintain a discipline of design under changing historical circumstances. These efforts were shaped in fundamental ways by the social basis of the practice of architectural design as it first emerged in the United States. At the core of professional design, there has been a persistent tension between countervailing forces of eclecticism and discipline. The structure of the market produced a centrifugal tendency that eroded standards and disrupted the organization of the professional production of architecture. At their core, the projects typically associated with professionalization reflected a strategic counter-tendency toward a purification of disciplinary ideals, and away from unmediated reflection of the social conditions of practice.

Throughout the history of American architecture, these contradictory tendencies have produced an oscillation in the balance between the expression of formal ideals and responsiveness to the needs of client and society, each swing an expression of recurrent reforming tendencies in the profession. Discipline could be achieved only with effort against the tendency of individualized practice towards eclectic, idiosyncratic responses to particular local clienteles. Modernist criticisms of Beaux-Arts design (in the 1930s) and postmodernist criticisms of modernist design (in the 1970s–1980s) suggest that incorporation of various forms of responsiveness has typically set in motion a dynamic of stylization and a move toward abstracted formalism. It is no accident that postmodernist complaints with regard to the architecture of the modern movement echo the modernists' own criticisms of Beaux-Arts formalism.[159] This recurrent cycle of formalism and reform has been driven by tensions inherent in the disciplinary structure of professional

design, tensions that reflect the problematic nature of the profession's efforts to contain an awkwardly broad and culturally diffuse jurisdiction within a certain kind of social structure: a professional labor market.

The structure of professional status set up tensions that have been played out in the practices of design and that are evident in the patterns of development of architectural style. At each point in the history of the profession, the disciplinary effort to contain these tensions within a rhetoric of style has mediated the effects of large-scale historical developments originating outside the discipline. Demands and pressures from outside the profession elicit responses from individual practitioners, in pursuit of their function and their careers. These responses are what presents these pressures to the discipline as a whole as a problem of integration. Innovations have to be both ideologically and socially located before they become "significant."

As the discipline moves toward the abstract and "architectural," it moves away from problems that immediately concern clients but also from those that plague practitioners. The irony of the "American Renaissance" is that while allowing the profession to establish a clear identity and an authoritative jurisdiction, it came at the cost of the discipline's capacity to respond in coherent ways to the pressing social, economic, and technological problems that the architect had to confront as practical problems. The reception of European Modernism in the thirties can be understood as a response to dilemmas set up by the Beaux-Arts construction of the discipline. European Modernism offered precisely the same advantages as the Ecole model: a rational and unified conception of design that drew on contemporary "high" cultural aesthetic conceptions, a systematic approach to design education, an established language of form with the mystique of an avant-garde that could also be codified for broad diffusion of its principles (the "International Style"), and an elite of expatriate Europeans to focus its introduction into the academy (Gropius, Breuer, Moholy-Nagy). In addition, it offered something Beaux-Arts historicism could not: a final abstraction from history and a *modus vivendi* with industrial technology that was anything but submission to its pressures. It represented a final reification of the medium of architecture into a symbolic practice abstracted from cultural traditions, a final step toward the separation of the rhetorical framework within which the designer's intentions were formulated from the framework within which the users' experience might be interpreted. The dominance of Beaux-Arts design

in the American architectural profession was a crucial step in the transition from the eclecticism of High Victorian architecture to construction of a modern discipline of design – for sociological reasons. It represented a routinization of the charisma of eclecticism that was necessary for the construction of the social and institutional foundation on which a distinctive discipline could be sustained.

This analysis of the sociological determinants of the reception of Beaux-Arts architecture in the United States suggests some general consequences for a sociology of cultural production. In his essay, "Art as a Cultural System," Geertz argues that it is necessary to get away from a narrow focus on art as a specialized cultural institution, and to regard it in its broader cultural context.

> It is out of participation in the general system of symbolic forms we call culture that participation in the particular form we call art, which is in fact but a sector of it, is possible. A theory of art is thus at the same time a theory of culture, not an autonomous enterprise.[160]

Geertz's concern is to situate art as one manifestation of the seamless web of meaning that makes up a particular culture. Forms of art have power and purpose because of their connection (or their ability to make connections) to a general cultural sensibility that they participate in creating.

Although Geertz's general point is well taken, the location of art in the web of cultural meaning is not seamless. In fact, much of the meaning of artworks and the significance of art in general depend on particular arrangements of the seams between art and general culture, the particular ways that art stitches itself into the fabric of social life. In modern western societies, artists have developed specialized professional skills: techniques, notions of genre, stylistic conventions, and their own sensibilities related to specific techniques and materials. As Geertz points out, following the vivid example provided by Baxandall, artists rely on the perceptual and interpretative capacities of their audiences; these capacities reflect, derive from, and depend on skills and knowledge available in the broader culture.[161] Artists also rely, however, on the ability and willingness of their audience to apply these skills within an interpretative framework that *is* specific to art; it is this framework that grafts an additional level of significance, additional possibilities for the activation of meanings, on to the objects produced. Baxandall, for example, examines specific capacities for looking at pictures that were relevant to the institution of fifteenth-century painting, capacities that

emerged as part of changes in the relation between painters and patrons. Painters made use of what Baxandall refers to as "the period eye," but they worked *with* the capacities of the audience to produce a relatively specialized "taste" for paintings. "Much of what we call "taste" lies in this, the conformity between discriminations demanded by a painting and skills of discrimination possessed by the beholder."[162] Artists, as creative workers, co-opt cultural material and incorporate it into practices that make sense within the specialized cultural institution of "art."

As the institutional theories of art have made clear, the context in which art is interpreted includes the art world itself, in which specialized aesthetic practices are generated and sustained. This production of a distinctive body of practices has both an ideological and a sociological side: an art world is a "cultural enclave" in which works refer to each other within a specialized context of interpretation and producers can establish identity and reputations both among themselves and for a relevant public. These processes cannot be reduced to direct reflections of material conditions or simple instances of a culture-wide sensibility. If architecture can be seen as an expression of more general cultural sensibilities and in some way, as Geertz puts it, "inseparable from the feeling for life that animates it," this relation is mediated by historically specific forms of cultural expression and by specific institutional contexts that make these forms of creativity possible.

Sociological studies of art worlds have been either phenomonological in focus, zooming in on the art world itself, or they have tended to focus on contextual factors as a structure of external constraints. The tendency has been to view art worlds either from the inside or the outside. Many analyses, however, point to the importance of the boundary itself as a potential object of analysis and explanation.[163] Becker, for example, has proposed a view of art as "collective action," and has called attention to the importance of conventions in art worlds.[164] His focus is on the way people in art worlds use conventions to communicate with their audiences and to organize cooperation within the art world. Becker also notes that aesthetic values are closely tied to structures of status in art worlds, that conventions both enable and constrain artistic production as they are built in to institutionalized structures, suggesting that this dual communication might be seen in more structural terms.[165] His discussion of the distinction of "art" and "craft" focuses attention on the social construction of the distinction as a "folk" category used to identify kinds of work within art worlds, and he

uses changes in usage to give the notion of an art world a historical dimension.[166]

From a more macro-structural perspective, Mukerji has argued in favor of recognition of continuities between fine art and commercial culture, and focuses attention on the way the discontinuities between the two are constructed, using the example of the transformation of film from industrial production to art work in the United States. She provides an illuminating discussion of the both the ideological articulation and social bases of the discontinuities of art, craft, and industrial design.[167] Where Becker's analysis emphasizes the use of conventional understandings as part of the organization of art work, Mukerji focuses on contextual conditions that stimulated and made a redefinition of existing objects possible in the American film industry.

A third alternative is to focus on the boundary itself as a social production, and on the specific way that a relatively autonomous field of cultural production is produced as practitioners actively situate themselves within broad structures of constraint and opportunity. In the case of science, Gieryn has noted that "as sociologists and philosophers argue over the uniqueness of science among intellectual activities, demarcation is routinely accomplished in practical, everyday settings... ."[168] He focuses on the "boundary work" carried out by scientists: "the attribution of selected characteristics to the institution of science ... for purposes of constructing a social boundary that distinguishes some intellectual work as "non-science." Boundary-work appears empirically, for Gieryn, in the explicitly invoked ideologies of science. Boundary-work, however, can also be seen as implicit in any practice, in the conventions that define and sustain it. The "attribution of selected characteristics to the institution" can be seen not only in explicit ideological claims made to the public, but in the work itself, in the articulation of stylistic codes that signify the status of any particular work by signifying the claimed characteristics of the institution. This communication is carried on most significantly among practitioners, who must collectively sustain the rhetorical structure that makes their work possible.

The boundaries that articulate art worlds are not produced simply by intentional definition (although there are such efforts) or by being explicitly defended when attacked; they are actively reproduced in and through the practices in which the constitutive conventions of the cultural form are manifested, and by the way in which these practices are

structured by their institutional situation.[169] It is this practical articulation of a boundary, furthermore, that is the point at which the intersection of culture and social structure can be examined.

Sociological studies of culture commonly focus on material or social structural constraints on the production and distribution of particular cultural objects. Studies of the "production of culture" typically look at the work of artists as productive labor like any other, at cultural productions as objects that are produced, sold, distributed. Some have suggested that these effects are mediated at the level of aesthetic codes, by the specific forms of cultural production.[170] I suggest that this mediation can be located not in reified forms, or in the codes and conventions that define them, but in form-giving practices in which these codes are activated, as they are situated and organized within particular, historically formed fields. Analytical focus is shifted from the production of particular *objects* to the production of a *structure of justification* within which the practice of giving significance to objects can be sustained as a form of expert authority.

The social production of an "architecture" (or any cultural form) is a form of collective action organized within a structure of constraints. Creative workers produce not only cultural objects of a certain kind, but at the same time collectively produce and reproduce the immediate practical contexts in which their productions can be registered as meaningful. In other words, they produce and reproduce a certain kind of cultural capacity: in this case, practices of design through which certain kinds of formal order can be imposed on the built environment. A sociology of art as cultural production might, therefore, focus on the specific ways in which materials drawn from the more general culture are organized into distinctive practices within specific art worlds, and the ways in which these practices contribute to the reproduction of the "semi-autonomous field" that makes them possible.[71] In examining the production of culture at this level, the key questions focus not on the constraining effects of social and material conditions, but on the way a particular cultural practice is organized within the limits and according to a logic determined by specific social contexts.

The key problem of an art world is the problem of autonomy. Artists and art worlds need the social and cultural space to develop and maintain the standards and conventions of their art. They must be able to define their own problems and seek appropriate solutions within the operative structures of justification. At the same time, they have to

maintain some controlled connection with broader social contexts, if only to maintain the flow of material and symbolic resources. The structural problem of relative autonomy of an art world is reflected in the works themselves, in the tension between reference to external structures of meaning and legitimation and the self-referential qualities of a distinctive field of practice. This tension is manifested particularly clearly in architecture, because of the limitations on its autonomy created by the need to respond to the functional dimensions of most building tasks and by its generally public nature.

The case of architectural design suggests ways in which creative workers' construction of a system of occupational control, within a particular market context, are linked to the substantive construction of the nature of the work.[172] This process might be analyzed historically by focusing on the formation of a discipline, and the way a particular culture of production, manifested in a rhetoric of style, is implicated in a system of occupational control. Such a perspective integrates analysis of the structural context of resources and constraints with an analysis of the processes of actively constructing a practice that makes sense within this context. In this way, one can bring into focus the structural determination of a cultural form without losing grasp of the active, creative, and historically contingent dimensions of cultural production.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Tom Gieryn, David Zaret, William Corsaro, Frank Dobbin, Allen Grimshaw, Gary Alan Fine, students in the workshop on Cultural Sociology at Indiana University, and the Editors at *Theory &Society* for comments and criticisms on versions of this paper. More generally, many of the ideas in this article reflect a substantial intellectual debt owed to Harrison C. White. Some of the research on which this paper is based was supported by NSF Award no. SES 8008658 (Harrison C. White, principal investigator).

Notes

1. Poem quoted in Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses & Moral Order in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 270; Louis Sullivan, *Autobiography of an Idea* (New York: American Institute of Architects, 1924), 325.
2. Alan Gowans, *Images of American Living, Four Centuries of Architecture and Furniture as Cultural Expression* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 366.

3. This assessment of the importance of the Fair for the popularity of classical architecture is common in the histories of American architecture. For example, see Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1977), 324; Sigfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture, The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 393–96. For a discussion of the effect of the Fair on the careers of its architects, see Thomas Hines, *Burnham of Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976). For a discussion of its relationship to Progressive era reform, see Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses & Moral Order in America 1820–1920.*
4. William Rainsford wrote: "If things looked dark in New York, there was another city whose white, classic loveliness stood, for one summer...." Cited in Boyer, *Urban Masses & Moral Order*, 182. Manieri-Elia provides a summary review of the contemporary assessments of the Fair and its significance in "Toward an "Imperial City": Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement," in Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia, and Manfredo Tafuri, editors, *The American City. From the Civil War to the New Deal* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), 36–44.
5. See Ralph Adams Cram, *My Life in Architecture* (Boston: Little Brown, 1936), 262. See also Henry Van Brunt, "The Columbian Exposition and American Civilization," in William Coles, editor, *Architecture & Society, Selected Essays of Henry Van Brunt* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1969 [1893], 305–318.
6. See Thomas Tallmadge, *The Story of Architecture in America* (New York: 1936) 211–212.
7. There were some critical responses to the Fair, the most notable being the response of Montgomery Schuyler, the well-known architectural critic. See, for example, his "Last Words About the Worlds Fair," *Architectural Record* 3 (January-March 1894), reprinted in Leland M. Roth, editor, *America Builds: Source Documents in American Architecture and Planning* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983), 427–439. For a discussion of the notion of the "lost cause," see Dimitri Tselos, "The Chicago Fair and the Myth of the Lost Cause," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26 (1967), 259–268.
8. Again, these are orthodox assessments found throughout the body of architectural writing. Aside from the standard histories from a modernist perspective, such as Giedion or Hitchcock, one can find more detailed and critical versions of this view in William H. Jordy, *American Buildings & Their Architects: Progressive & Academic Ideals at the Turn of the 20th Century* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1972); or Vincent Scully, *The Shingle & the Stick Style. Architectural Theory and Design from Downing to the Origins of Wright* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971).
9. See Gowans, *Images of American Living*, 389–394.
10. Lewis Mumford, "The Chicago Fairs," *New Republic* 65 (January, 1931), cited in Mario Manieri-Elia, "Toward an "Imperial City": Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement," 41.
11. Louis Sullivan, *Autobiography of an Idea*, 325.
12. Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture. The Growth of a New Tradition*, 393. This impressive synthesizing history of modern architecture, originally published in 1941 and based on lectures given in 1938–39, is now in its fifth edition, and its ninth printing.
13. Scully, *The Shingle Style*, 113.
14. Burnham appointed five eastern firms: Richard Morris Hunt (New York), George

B. Post (New York), Peabody & Stearns (Boston), McKim, Mead, & White (New York), Van Brunt & Howe (Kansas City). The Chicago firms were: Burling & Whitehouse, Jenney & Mundie, Henry Ives Cobb, Solon S. Beman, Adler & Sullivan. The eastern firms were given the central buildings of the Court of Honor, while the Chicago architects were assigned less central structures. Their first decision was to restrict themselves to a uniform classicism and a common cornice height. See Hines, *Burnham of Chicago*, esp. chapter 4. The sense of betrayal has been heightened by the fact that Burnham himself had been one of the early pioneers of Chicago commercial architecture, and by the fact that he not only gave American architecture into the hands of the eastern elite, but moved in a direction counter to the original intentions of his partner (John Root, the consulting architect for the Fair who died in 1891), and apparently sacrified Sullivan in the bargain. After Root died, Charles Atwood was taken on the replace him. See Hugh Dalziel Duncan, *Culture & Democracy* (Totowa, N.J.: The Bedminster Press, 1965), ch. 37, for a discussion of Root's plan.

15. Sullivan, *The Autobiography of an Idea*, 325–326.
16. See Thomas Bender & William R. Taylor, "Culture and Architecture: Some Aesthetic Tensions in the Shaping of Modern New York City," in William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock, editors, *Visions of the Modern City*, Proceedings of the Heyman Center for the Humanities. (Columbia University, 1983), 189.
17. For example, the problem of the skyscraper makes little sense outside of a context in which the economies of urban real estate drive building heights up, and the technologies of structural methods and mechanized elevators make it possible to build marketable floor space farther away from street level. See, for example, Carl W. Condit, *The Chicago School of Architecture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964). See Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture & Utopia: Design & Capitalist Development* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976), for an attempt to relate architectural development to capitalism.
18. Cited in Manieri-Elia, "Toward an "Imperial City": Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement," 40.
19. See Boyer, *Urban Masses & Moral Order;* Manieri-Elia, "Toward an "Imperial City": Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement"; Leland M. Roth, *A Concise History of American Architecture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), ch. 6.
20. See Manieri-Elia, "Toward an "Imperial City": Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement"; also John Burchard and Albert Bush-Brown, *The Architecture of America* (Boston: Little Brown, 1961). Burchard and Bush-Brown argue that to blame the popularity of Beaux Arts design and the turning away from new ideas on the Fair "and not on the national disposition is to put too much faith in a minor event" (255). See, also, Duncan, *Culture &Democracy.*
21. Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 394.
22. Ralph Adams Cram, looking back at the 1890s from the vantage of the early 1930s, wrote that "this new and noble architecture was generated wholly apart from any popular clamor nor was it the unconscious expression of a burgeoning new life. It was created outside the orbit of current living and was deliberately imposed on basic indifference and incomprehension, and "put across" by the power of fashion." (*My Life in Architecture*, 262.)
23. See discussion of the W.A.A., below.
24. For a general discussion of the notion of the structural fit between the discursive characteristics of a practice and its institutional setting, see also David Brain,

"Structure and Strategy in the Production of Culture: Implications of Poststructuralist Perspectives for the Sociology of Culture." *Comparative Social Research* 11, edited by Craig Calhoun (in press).

25. This argument goes beyond the scope of the current essay. It is presented in detail in a forthcoming book.
26. See George Dickie, *Art & the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975); Arthur C. Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981). Howard Becker provides a review of this perspective in *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
27. Dickie, *Art & the Aesthetic*, 174–179.
28. According to Dickie: "the aspects of a work of art which belong to the aesthetic object of the work of art are determined by the conventions governing the presentation of the work" ibid., 147.
29. Danto, *Transfiguration of the Commonplace*, 164.
30. Danto suggests that art makes use of the audience's interpretative capacities in much the same way as classical rhetoric: it uses a device like the enthymeme, which leaves a logical gap in what is said for the audience to fill in what is, in context, obvious – either entailed as a logical conclusion or as an unstated premise. *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace* 170–172. The rhetorical power of the work lies in its ability to make the spectator participate, if only for a moment, in a particular way of seeing.
31. According to Danto, "art *is* a language of sorts, in the sense at least that an artwork says something, and so presupposes a body of sayers and interpreters who are in position, who define what being in position is, to interpret an object. There is no art without those who speak the language of the artworld...." See Arthur Danto, "Artworks & Real Things," 322–336 in *Aesthetics Today*, edited by Morris Philipson and Paul J. Gudel (New York: New American Library, 1980), 334.
32. See Sally Falk Moore, "Law and Social Change: The Semi-autonomous Field as an Appropriate Subject of Study," *Law and Society Review* (Summer, 1973), 719–746. For this idea of a field of practice, see Pierre Bourdieu, "The Specificity of the Scientific Field and the Social Conditions of the Progress of Reason." *Social Science Information* 14 (6), 19–47. This dimension of his notion of cultural capital has been largely neglected.
33. DiMaggio has recently developed an idea of artistic genre as social categories. See Paul DiMaggio, "Art as Classification," *American Sociological Review* 52 (1987), 440-455. For an historical discussion of the use of the notion of "style" in nineteenth-century American architectural discourse, see Sadayoshi Omoto, "The Queen Anne Style & Architectural Criticism," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 23 (March 1964). Omoto finds increased attention to the idea of "styles" in both popular and professional press. "... without an identifying label, the building was nothing; but with an adherence to a style and an appropriate stylistic appellative, the building was suddenly transformed into meaningful architecture" (30).
34. For a discussion of the function of lawyers as "translators," see Maureen Cain, "The General Practice Lawyer & the Client: Towards a Radical Conception," in Robert Dingwall and Philip Lewis, editors, *The Sociology of the Professions*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 109–118. Cain suggests that lawyers function to translate client problems into terms that render them susceptible to solution

within a certain ideological framework, and thereby help to support a certain kind of social order.

35. Roger Scruton, *The Aesthetics of Architecture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979) 201–202.
36. See Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).
37. For a discussion of the diversified structure of professions, see Elliot Freidson, *Professional Powers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
38. See Harrison C. White, "Where Do Markets Come From?," *American Journal of Sociology* 87 (3) (1981), 517–547.
39. See Talbot Hamlin, *Benjamin Henry Latrobe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 146–148, for a discussion of Latrobe's struggles with the builders in Philadelphia.
40. The earliest efforts in the classical revival mode were the work of imported designers, trained and experienced in the European tradition: Benjamin Latrobe, Stephen Hallett, Joseph-Francois Manin, Maximilien Godefroy, George Hadfield, and John Haviland. See Hamlin, *Greek Revival*, 23.
41. See Andrew Saint, *The Image of the Architect* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 76.
42. James Gallier, cited in Saint, *The Image of the Architect*, 77.
43. These drawings were not yet detailed working drawings of the sort found in modern offices, intended to guide every aspect of the building process. Since most construction was still guided to a large extent by the craft traditions of the building trades, drawings were required mostly for specifying the appearance of the building.
44. See "Evolution of the Builder," *Architectural Record*, Great American Architect Series (July 1986), 110-111.
45. Upjohn, Everard, *Richard Upjohn, Architect and Churchman*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), 31–35.
46. The careers of Ithiel Town and Alexander Davis provide a good illustration. Town began as an apprentice carpenter, became a successful builder/architect, and entered into practice with Davis, who had been trained as an artist at the Antique School in New York and developed a reputation as an architectural illustrator and "composer." See Roger Hale Newton, *Town & Davis, Architects* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942).
47. For a discussion of the concept of an occupational internal labor market, see Robert Althauser and Arne Kalleberg, "Firms, Occupations, and the Structure of Labor Markets: A Conceptual Analysis," in Ivar Berg (editors) *Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets* (New York: Academic Press, 1981), 119-149.
48. Hamlin, *The Greek Revival*, 74. See Agnes Eleanor Gilchrist, *William Strickland, Architect &Engineer* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1969).
49. Town and Davis made particular efforts to employ student draftsmen who would actually pay certain amounts for the opportunity to learn the profession. The architects who are known to have passed through Town and Davis's office as draftsmen constitutes an impressive list. See Newton, *Town & Davis*, 96; also, Hamlin, *Greek Revival* 144. Everard Upjohn, *Richard Upjohn*, 154, discusses the case of young men seeking office training who would work without pay.
50. Newton, *Town &Davis*, 89–90; Hamlin, *Greek Revival*, 139; William H. Pierson, Jr., *American Buildings & Their Architects Technology & the Picturesque, the Corporate & the Early Gothic Styles* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1980), 298.

See, also, Harris, Neil, *The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years 1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 109–115.

51. See James Marston Fitch, *American Building, The Historical Forces that Shaped It* (New York: Schocken Books, 1973), for a discussion of the combination of imported traditions and local building materials. Gowans, *Images of American Living*, 175–224, provides a good discussion of the "classical mind" that dominated the architecture of the colonial period.
52. See Talbot Hamlin, *Greek Revival Architecture in America* (New York: Dover Publications, 1964).
53. Alexander B. Callow, Jr., "The City in the Era of Manifest Destiny," in Callow, editor, *American Urban History* (New York: Oxford University Pres, 1973), 105.
54. Blake McKelvey, *American Urbanization: A Comparative History* (Glenview: Scott Foresman & Co., 1973), 16–17.
55. Richard C. Wade, "Urban Life in Western America, 1790–1830," in Callow, editor, *American Urban History*, 111, 120.
56. Hamlin, *Greek Revival*, 24.
57. This was often the purpose of the architect's library. The library was used not only as a source of references in design, but as a source of references used in consultation with prospective clients, and as a source of validation of the architect's judgments. Gowans, *Images of American Living*, 294. See Newton, *Town & Davis*, for a discussion of Town's renowned library.
58. Cited in Gowans, *Images of American Living*, 287.
59. "Architecture in the United States," *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. XVIII, July 1830, 20, cited in Pierson, *American Buildings and their Architects*, 126.
60. Hamlin, *Greek Revival*, 116.
61. Hamlin, *Greek Revival*, 335–336.
62. Even the most well-known of Greek Revival architects worked in other styles, sometimes at the request of a client but also in search of an architectural treatment that would appear appropriately responsive to the specific task. It was taken as a sign of Latrobe's solid professional training that although his reputation was primarily for Greek buildings, he was able to produce an admirable Gothic design on demand. Hamlin, *Greek Revival*, 31–32. Architects like Town and Davis drew freely from the historical styles, several examples of which are available on the town green in New Haven – a classical revival Capitol that mixed Greek and Roman elements, and two gothic churches, one related to conventional building and the other drawing on a mixture of sources. See Pierson, *American Buildings & Their Architects*, for a discussion of Town's eclecticism.
63. For this distinction between eclecticism of taste and eclecticism of style, see Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration* (New York: Payson & Clarke, Ltd., 1929).
64. See Gowans, *Images of American Living*, 334–336; for discussions of the post-Civil War generation, see also Deborah S. Gardner, "The Architecture of Commercial Capitalism: John Kellum and the Development of New York 1840–1875," (Ph.D. Diss. Columbia University 1979), and Paul R. Baker, *Richard Morris Hunt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980).
65. For evidence of the amplification of eclectic tendencies, see Bainbridge Bunting, *Houses of Boston's Back Bay: An Architectural History 1840–1917* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1967), 172. Bunting's close study of the development of the Back Bay reveals the extent to which its architectural character was determined by the

profession rather than by technological or economic exigencies, as the self-conscious academic styles of the 1860s gave way to more "self-assertive" expression in the 1870s and 1880s.

66. Manufacturers began promoting cast-iron as a building material around 1840. See James Bogardus, *Cast Iron Buildings: Their Construction and Advantages* (1856), excerpted in Roth, *America Builds*, 68–74. Architects and builders were wary of it as a structural material, but found it useful for applying cheap quantities of repetitive ornament. In the 1860s, a method of planing stone surfaces and incising a design was devised as a way of ornamenting stone. The development of power saws, flathes, and jigsaws made possible the mass production of lumber in standardized sizes an the mass production of architectural ornamentation in wood. See Bunting, *Houses of Boston's Back Bay*, esp. 122–123.
67. The practice of engaging builders directly was common enough throughout the late nineteenth century for it to appear as a constant complaint in the professional press. See Gwendolyn Wright, *Moralism & the Model Home: Domestic Architecture & Cultural Conflict in Chicago 1873–1913* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
68. Wright, *Moralism & the Model Home*, esp. 46-50. Also Gardner, "The Architecture of Commercial Capitalism," for a detailed study of the case of one of these "self-made" architects.
69. Wright, *Moralism & the Model Home*, 56.
70. Pierson, *American Buildings & Their Architects* vol. 1, pp. 152–153.
71. Gowans, *Images of American Living*, 304. See also Scully, *The Shingle Style*, and Peter Collins, *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture 1750–1950*, (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1965), for extensive discussion of rationalist and functionalist tendencies.
72. These principles were turned with particular energy on what was considered to be "sham" construction. Ware and Van Brunt's Memorial Hall was criticized, for example, for their use of wooden vaulting in the interior, a form that was based upon and appropriate for stone construction methods. "The Critic of Memorial Hall," *American Architect* 1 (1876), 71.
73. "Picturesque" takes on a specific critical sense in the mid-nineteenth century, best characterized by Andrew Jackson Downing, one of the major proponents of this aesthetic. "Now the two expressions in nature most suitable for imitation," he argued, "lie in Beauty's flowing, graceful outlines; and in the irregular, spirited forms of the Picturesque." (*A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* [New York, 1844], cited in Roth, *America Builds* 133). In contrast to the orderliness of classical Greek styles, the "picturesque' was typified by the irregularity and asymmetry of Gothic ruins, expressive of the passage of time and a rich history.
74. When the American Institute of Architects was founded in 1857, there was heated debate as to whether the medallion of the Institute would include a representation of classical or gothic architecture. The classicists won out.
75. Gowans refers to a distinction between "Academic realism" and "organic reality." *Images of American Living*, 363–365.
76. This is, of course, a familiar story in the process of professionalization. See M. S. Larson, "Emblem & Exception," *Professionals and Urban Form*, ed. Blau, La Gory, and Pipkin, 63. The point here, however, is not simply that architects had to translate their earlier status professionalism into occupational professionalism,

but that they had to construct a new structure of occupational control based on a disciplined practice.

77. See Gardner's discussion of the case of John Kellum in "The Architecture of Commercial Capitalism."
78. In 1857, Richard Upjohn was accused of extravagance in his designs by a journalist who referred to this as "upjohn-ing" a church. Upjohn, *Richard Upjohn*, 140–141. Richard Morris Hunt frequently exceeded estimates or disregarded clients requests, and was sued several times. (See Baker, *Richard Morris Hunt*).
79. "Professor Huxley's Architect," *American Architect* (October 1876), 330.
80. Wright has referred to this strategy as one of "defensive conservatism" (*Moralism and the Model Home*, 49).
81. *American Architect* (1876), 330.
82. The central goals of the W.A.A. were: the institutionalization of rules on competitions; a share in government commissions; and a system of state-sanctioned architectural licensing. These efforts were conceived to protect local architects from competition not only with practitioners on the borders of the discipline, but from the prestigious core who had a tendency to win competitions and snare the most lucrative and architecturally significant commissions. See Saint, *The Image of the Architect*, 90–91.
83. In the first five years alone, his students included Henry van Brunt and Charles Gambrill (1854), William R. Ware and Frank Furness (1857), and George B. Post (1858), all of whom figure prominently in American architectural history. Baker, *Richard Morris Hunt*, 30, 102.
84. James Philip Noffsinger, *The Influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts on the Architects of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1955), 106–110.
85. This is plainly evident in the biographies of any of the prominent architects of the late nineteenth century, who tended to come from substantial middle-class families, and to enter architecture after a liberal education. See, for example, Paul Baker, *Richard Morris Hunt*, for a detailed look at the social world of the Beaux Arts architects.
86. Gardner, "The Architecture of Commercial Capitalism," 329; Noffsinger, *The Influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts on the Architects of the United States.*
87. Noffsinger, *The Influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts on the Architects of the United States*, 87.
88. Jordy, *American Buildings & Their Architects* vol. 3, 393n.
89. Ibid., 318.
90. Jon Petersen, "The City Beautiful Movement: Forgotten Origins and Lost Meanings," *Journal of Urban History* vol. 2, no. 4 (August 1976): 415–434.
91. Ibid., 418–419.
92. Ibid., 419. In March of 1898, Charles R. Lamb, a New York architect who was active in New York art circles, called for the city to realize "the dream of the idealist, the CITY BEAUTIFUL." (Cited in Petersen.)
93. See Boyer, *Urban Masses & Moral Order*, 235–237.
94. Petersen, "The City Beautiful Movement," 422–423.
95. Jessie Good, one of the League's organizers, described the associations' efforts: "No task is too great for these associations to undertake. They will direct the digging of anything from a sewer to a flower bed. They will order down your front fences and order up electric lights with equal sangfroid. Water flows at their

command. They create sentiment in favor of ornamental backyards and tidy alleys. Indeed, they offer you prizes for the prettiest back yard and the neatest alley." Cited in Petersen, "The City Beautiful Movement," 423.

96. Charles Mulford Robinson, *Modern Civic Art, or the City Made Beautiful* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903) 35.
97. For a detailed account of the activities of the Macmillan Commission, see Glenn Brown, *Memories 1860–1930*, 259–352.
98. See Daniel H. Burnham & Edward H. Bennett, *Plan of Chicago*, editor Charles Moore, published by the Commercial Club, Chicago, 1908. The plan was drawn up and published at the expense of the Commercial Club, and distributed to schools as a civics text. See also Thomas Hines, *Burnham of Chicago*, for details of Burnham's work following the Fair.
99. Bender & Taylor, "Culture & Architecture," 189–191. Manieri-Elia has pointed out that the Reliance Building and the Flatiron building share an urbanistic orientation – toward the street and surrounding structures, rather than standing as an isolated tower. (Manieri-Elia, "Toward an Imperical City," 72–73.)
100. See, for example, Diana Balmori, "George B. Post: The Process of Design and the New American Architectural Office (1868–1913)," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* XLVI (December, 1987).
101. See Peter Dobkin Hall, *The Organization of American Culture, 1700–1900. Private Institutions, Elites, and the Origins of American Nationality* (New York: New York University Press, 1984).
102. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Vintage Books, 1955).
103. Julien-Azais Gaudet, *Elements and Theories of Architecture* 4 vols. (Paris, 1901–04), translated and excerpted in Roth (ed.), *America Builds*, pp. 323–334. Gaudet's four volume work was a codification of the principles of the Ecole, and replaced Blondel's *Cour d'architecture* (1771–1777).
104. Donald Egbert, *The Beaux-Arts Tradition in French Architecture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1980), 12.
105. Gaudet, in Roth, editor, *America Builds*, 331.
106. Joan Draper, "The Ecole des Beaux-Arts and the Architectural Profession in the United States: the Case of John Galen Howard," in Spiro Kostoff, editor, *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 221.
107. See Egbert, *The Beaux Arts Tradition French Architecture.*
108. Draper, "The Ecole des Beaux Arts," 231.
109. Weatherhead, *The History of Collegiate Education in Architecture*, 62.
110. Weatherhead writes: "Drafting and specifications for construction were emphasized and design was little more than the preparation of well-studied working drawings. From an aesthetic standpoint it consisted of exercises in the application of the totally unrelated, popular, and romantic "styles" to practical plans for common American buildings" ibid., 69–70.
111. Ibid., 39.
112. Ibid., 69–70. Weatherhead gives a detailed chart comparing the different schools on the basis of hours spent in courses on design, history, mathematics and construction, drawing, and general subjects, and the distribution of courses over a four-year program.
113. Noffsinger provides a table showing the schools founded before 1895, and the year when an agent of Ecole influence can be shown to have been present at the school:

1865	MIT	1868
1867	Illinois	none
1871	Cornell	1896
1873	Syracuse	1893
1876	Michigan	1876
1880	Columbia	1881
1884	Columbia University	1895
1890	Pennsylvania	1893
1895	Armour Institute	1895
1895	Harvard University	1895

114. Bernard Michael Boyle, "Architectural Practice in America 1865–1965 – Ideal and Reality," in Spiro Kostoff, editor, *The Architect: Chapters in the History of a Profession* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 313–316.
115. See Diana Balmori, "George B. Post: The Process of Design and the New American Architectural Office (1868–1913)," 348.
116. See Boyle, "Architectural Practice in America 1865–1965," 313–314.
117. "Everywhere plans for diversified structures followed in rapid succession through the busy American offices. In their highly professionalized organizations these offices tended to become mere plan factories. It was far easier to select a "crib" from some time-tested historical example and to adapt it to a modern situation than it was to attempt to evoke a design out of the intrinsic conditions of the problem at hand." Arthur Clason Weatherhead, *The History of Collegiate Education in Architecture in the United States* (Los Angeles: Weatherhead, 1941), 87.
118. In the office of George B. Post, 107 of 237 drawings were done at full size, only 30 at a scale of 1/4″ to the foot, three at a scale of 1/8″ to the foot (which are more typical of modern offices). See Balmori, "George B. Post: The Process of Design and the New American Architectural Office," 351.
119. Scully, for example, argues that McKim's shift to classicism, in contrast to his earlier "Shingle Style" work, represented a compromise of design values in the face of the practical pressures of a busy office. (*The Shingle Style*, 141–2.) Schuyler, a contemporary critic who defended Sullivan's architecture in the face of the classical wave, published a satirical advertisement in the *Architectural Record* that suggested that classical architecture could be almost mass-produced.
120. Stephen Bedford, "The Founding of the School," in Richard Oliver, editor, *The Making of an Architect 1881–1981: Columbia University in the City of New York* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1981), 10.
121. Steven M. Bedford & Susan W. Strauss, "History II: 1881–1912," in Oliver, *The Making of an Architect*, 23–24.
122. David DeLong, "William R. Ware & the Pursuit of Suitability," in Oliver, *The Making of an Architect*, 18.
123. DeLong, "William R. Ware & the Pursuit of Suitability," 17.
124. The practitioners on the visiting committee included: George B. Post, Charles F. McKim, Cass Gilbert, William Mead, John Carrere, Walter Cook, P. Sawyer, H. R. Marshall, and W. H. Russell. It is worth noting that the Beaux Arts influence was not limited to the portion of the committee formally representing the Society of Beaux Arts Architects (4 members). Nine out of 15 alumni members can be found listed in Noffsinger as having studied at the Ecole. Four out of the 9 practitioners studied at the Ecole, and Post studied in Hunt's atelier (Bedford & Strauss, "History II," 37–39).
125. Ibid., 37n.

126. Delong, "William R. Ware and the Pursuit of Suitability," 17.
127. The reforms covered four main points: (1) The four-year organization of the curriculum was eliminated, replaced by a system of requirements calculated in terms of points (as at the Ecole). (2) Courses were modified to shift the emphasis to design and drawing, oriented directly to office practice. (3) An alumni association was founded to take an active part in the school. Leading architects and artists were invited to speak and fourth year design work was judged by a jury of three that included two outside practitioners. (4) An effort was made to approximate office conditions in the design training, including the institution of competitions and a system of ateliers. See Bedford & Strauss, "History II," 42.
128. Ideally, one might want to use photographs or drawings to illustrate these two tendencies. The object of explanation isn't simply visual form, however, but visual forms considered within a discursive context. As Baxandall notes, "We do not explain pictures: we explain remarks about pictures – or rather, we explain pictures only insofar as we have considered them under some verbal description or specification" (Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention. On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, 91). In this case, we are concerned with the particular ways discursive qualities are imposed on architectural form. Although discussing the visual character of these design tendencies, it is therefore not inappropriate to focus on related discourses about architecture.
129. Louis Sullivan, "The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered," in Roth, editor, *America Builds*, 341. Originally published by *Lippincott's Magazine* 57 (March 1896), this essay was republished by *Inland Architect and News Record* (1896), *Western Architect* (1922), and *The Craftsman* (1905).
130. Ibid., 342–343.
131. Ibid., 345.
132. Sullivan, "The Tall Building Artistically Considered," 345.
133. Jordy, *American Architects & Their Buildings*, 99.
134. It must do what Paul Goldberger argues Sullivan was in fact able to do in the Wainwright Building: the design must be uniquely fitted to the expression of height and verticality. According to Goldberger, "the Wainwright is not merely tall; it is *about* being tall – it is tall architecturally even more than it is physically." Paul Goldberger, *The Skyscraper*, quoted in Twombly, *Louis Sullivan*, 293.
135. Letter to Claude Bragdon in 1903, quoted in Twombly, *Louis Sullivan*, 284.
136. Ibid., 289.
137. These observations are made by Jordy, *American Architects & Their Buildings*, 90.
138. Louis Sullivan, "Kindergarten Chats," originally published in *The Interstate Architect and Builder* 2 & 3 (February 16, 1901 through February 8, 1902), excerpted in Roth, editor, *America Builds*, 354.
139. Sullivan, "Kindergarten Chats," quoted in Jordy, *American Architects & Their Buildings*, 178.
140. Sullivan, "Kindergarten Chats," in Roth, *American Builds*, 338.
141. Sullivan, "Characteristics and Tendencies of American Architecture," in Roth, *America Builds*, 339.
142. Jordy, *American Architects & Their Buildings*, 171.
143. Sullivan, "The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered," in Roth, editor, *America Builds*, 346.
144. Ibid., 217.

145. See Jordy, *American Buildings & Their Architects*, 172.
146. See Robert Twombly, *Louis Sullivan. His Life & Work* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), for a discussion of the Architectural League of America.
147. Frank Lloyd Wright, "In the Cause of Architecture I," [1908] reprinted in *Frank Lloyd Wright, Selected Writings 1894–1940*, edited by Frederick Gutheim, (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1941), 31.
148. Ibid., 35–36.
149. Jordy, *American Buildings and their Architects*, 197.
150. Ibid., 199.
151. Ibid., 204.
152. Gaudet, in Roth, editor, *America Builds*, 326–327.
153. Jordy, *American Architects & Their Buildings*, 343.
154. Ibid., 334, 341–342.
155. Raymond Williams, *Marxism & Literature*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 160.
156. In this respect, historians of modernism are quite right to see a kind of nascent modernism in the work of architects like Richardson, Jenney, Sullivan, and Wright. The modern movement shared this fantasy of an architecture that emerged naturally from the conditions of the building problem. The continuity between nineteenth-century progressive architects and the modern architecture of the twentieth century was constructed retrospectively, however, as architects sought to anchor modernist design in an American past. Reinterpreted as part of the modernist reconstruction of the discipline in the twentieth century, nineteenth-century progressive tendencies helped to highlight those particular aspects of European modernist design that were suited to American conditions, and to filter out the political and ideological baggage that conflicted with the professionalism of American practice.
157. Gaudet, *Elements & Theories of Architecture*, in Roth, *America Builds*, 333.
158. Cited in Weatherhead, *The History of Collegiate Education in Architecture*, 39.
159. It is striking that the recent criticisms of modernist architecture focus on its academic sterility and its failure to accomplish precisely the responsiveness to modern conditions that it promised. See, for example, Brent C. Brolin, *The Failure of Modern Architecture*, (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold & Co., 1976). For a more popularized criticism of modern architecture, see Tom Wolfe, *From Bauhaus to Our House*, (New York: Farrar Strauss Giroux, 1981). The literature within the architectural profession criticizing modernist design is extensive.
160. Geertz, "Art as a Cultural System," in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology*, (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 108–109.
161. Michael Baxandall, *Painting & Experience in 15th Century Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).
162. Ibid., 34.
163. White has tried in recent work to introduce the notion of an "interface" to the study of social organization. See, for example, Harrison C. White, "Where do markets come from?," see also Thomas Gieryn, "Boundary-work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists," *American Sociological Review*, (vol. 48, 1983) 781–795.
164. See Howard S. Becker, "Art as Collective Action" *American Sociological Review*, (vol. 39, no. 6), 767–776. A more extended discussion of Becker's perspective is available in his book, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

165. See Becker, "Art as Collective Action," 773–774.
166. See Becker, *Art Worlds*, chapter 9.
167. See Chandra Mukerji, "Artwork: Collection and Contemporary Culture," *American Journal of Sociology* (vol. 84, no. 2, 1978), 348–365.
168. Gieryn, "Boundary-work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-science," 781.
169. Another concrete example of this might be the empirical case that is the focus of Diana Crane's recent book, *The Transformation of the Avant-Garde* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987). By analyzing the ways different styles of painting have been associated with the notion of the "avant-garde," Crane has focused analytical attention on the articulation of art and society, on the way the construction of boundaries is rooted in concrete artistic practice, and on the problem of what seems to be the threatened boundary of "art" as avant-garde practice.
170. For a concise review of this argument, see Janet Wolff's discussion of "aesthetic mediation" in *The Social Production of Art* (New York: New York University Press, 1984), 60–66.
171. For an illuminating discussion of this concept, see Sally Falk Moore, "Law and Social Change: the Semi-autonomous field as an Appropriate Subject of Study," *Law and Society Review* (Summer 1973), 719–746.
172. This conception of the construction of a discipline might be applied not only to other areas of artistic production, but to other professionalized occupations. See Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*, (New York: Basic Books, 1978); Gaye Tuchman, *Making News. A Study in the Construction of Reality* (New York: The Free Press, 1968), see esp. chapter 6; Robert Faulkner, *Hollywood Studio Musicians*, (Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1971); Todd Gitlin, *Inside Prime Time*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985).