sufficient to ensure an appropriately "urban" diversity of function. It is misleading to stress Denmark's more intensive urbanization than Norway's or Sweden's without mentioning that the latter two lie, in great part, at the climatic margin for grain cultivation and therefore required considerably larger hinterlands to support non-productive urban populations. Moreover, Sweden's late urbanization was strongly influenced by the demographic and political repercussions of the Great Northern War and, to a lesser extent, the War of the Hats.  

I would equally deplore the constant abstraction made of the repercussions of the industrial revolution on the social, economic and functional character of cities. To discuss the industrialization of Vienna, after 1850, as marking "the definite end of an era that had built organic cities and towns as the expression of the union of the individual and communal will of their inhabitants" (p. 85) not only relegates the concept of a History of City Development to a nostalgic search for an idealized past—idealized to the extent that no mention is made of the myriad of social struggles that were fought in the towns, and were usually caused by the abominable living conditions of that vast majority who could not aspire to the privileges of the burghers—but ignores the processes by which the "historical city" was transformed into the "modern city." Moreover, it is doubtful whether one can legitimately identify a specific point in time when such an important transformation takes place. Vienna was already a thriving industrial center some seventy years before 1850, and its government is castigated by Dr. Gutkind for constructing the Ringstrasse and sacrificing "the harmony of scale and of intricate space relations" in favor of "the emerging abstraction of bigness." This criticism, in any case, has little relevance in light of the need brought about by industrialization for sewers and water supply, for bylaws to forestall the unsanitary housing into which sewers and water supply, for bylaws to forestall the unsanitary housing into which the growing population was being housed as a result of the rapacity of private developers.

Indeed, the weakness of this volume is due not only to its undue emphasis on physical form (it is difficult to be convinced by Dr. Gutkind's assertion that "architecture and city building are one") but to its superficiality of treatment. While the former represents the author's point of view, the latter is the consequence of the immensity of the subject he has chosen to treat. It is inevitable that an effort to "examine the evolution of cities in all regions of the world" can yield little but a catalogue of disparate facts, and one cannot help but agree with Oscar Handlin's plea that we need fewer studies of the city in history than of the history of cities. However useful a general theory of the city may be, only the detailed tracing of an immense range of variables, in context, will illuminate the dynamic of the processes [of urban development]. We can readily associate such gross phenomena as the growth of population and the rise of the centralized state, as technological change and the development of modern industry . . . But how these developments unfolded, what was the causal nexus among them, we shall only learn when we make out the interplay among them by focusing upon a city specifically, in all its uniqueness.

The approach suggested by Handlin may, in time, reveal the causality between environmental circumstances and historical trends—whether the urban setting tends to pre-set those social, economic, political, and functional events that are of concern to planners, or whether they, in turn, cause specific urban patterns. I would argue that urban historical surveys can have but the remotest academic interest unless they are designed to further our knowledge of such causal relationships. 

FRANÇOIS C. VIGIER
Harvard University


That art historians have until now largely ignored the material assembled by Hermann Bauer in this study of utopia and its relationship with art makes it difficult to assess the validity of his conclusions or even to summarize his thesis without repeating most of his main ideas. Briefly, he has shown how a concept of utopia grew out of late mediaeval theological, artistic, and political thought in Italy and quickly developed into a mode of thought about political and social organizations which was subsequently conveyed through various artistic media, primarily literature, painting (and its concomitant artistic theory), and architecture (and its concomitant architectural and urban theory). The book is an important contribution to architectural historical studies insofar as it indicates the richness of the material available for interpretation; but it is nonetheless somewhat misleading in that the author leaves us with the illusion that problems have been resolved when they have indeed only been raised. More importantly, the author seems to misinterpret some fundamental conceptions of Renaissance thought while perhaps overlooking or ignoring others.

A utopian conception in its fully developed form might be defined as a unified vision which includes (1) a carefully considered artistic theory or attitude towards art integrated with (2) a fully developed political and social structure conceived of as extant in (3) a locus independent of time, place, history, or accident. While Bauer nowhere gives this particular definition, he seems to assume it or a similar one as he traces the historical development of these three component elements. He makes it clear that no one individual combined all three elements into one utopian conception, but that each utopian thinker devoted some attention to each one of these elements. He also makes quite clear that utopian thought was by no means the exclusive preserve of any one form of art—philosophers such as Thomas More and Tommaso Campanella were as responsible for the development of utopia as were preaching friars, architectural theorists, and Louis XIV.

To recount the main outline of Bauer's thesis: In the first few chapters he traces the emergence in Tuscany, during the decades surrounding 1300, of a conscious attitude towards the civitas as a secular institution ordered by art. He shows that paintings and architectural and urban projects were made and interpreted as representations of what scholastic philosophers called ordo; political documents speak of the city as ordered like heaven and political actions reproduce or protect that order; preachers, particularly Fra Giordano da Rivalto, speak of the city
as visibly representing a heavenly order. The author interprets this evidence to mean that by about 1330 in Tuscany a visible civic order had come to have both analogic and didactic meaning. In addition to equations of the visible to the otherworldly and of the visible and artistically ordered city to theological and historical paradigms of order (Rome, Jerusalem, Paradise), Bauer states that equations were made between the scholastics’ ordo and the new artists’ pulchritudo, between pulchritudo and utilitas, and eventually between ordo as an attribute of God’s creation and concinnitas as an attribute to be applied to artists’ creations according to Alberti’s theory of art in the fifteenth century.

The Tuscan city, Bauer continues, had become a visible representation of a higher sense of order than earthly things had previously been thought capable of representing. From sometime in the fourteenth century on, individuals began to believe that while on earth they might partake of that higher order. Arcadia was sought in Tuscan villas, and Thomas More drew an idyllic picture of a government located nowhere which men might adapt to their pattern of life elsewhere. Utopia was a didactic representation in literary form of a life of personal virtue within a political order. What More did in literary form Alberti had already spoken of as the function of art in his theory sketched out in his De Re Aedificatoria. Alberti’s contribution therefore was crucial in the development of the utopian ideal: He formulated and propagated the central conception of western art, that beautiful and pure forms mean beauty and perfection; Alberti was the first modern writer to believe that through art it is possible to create a better world.

Alberti in the visual arts and More in literature are, according to Bauer, the first to show that a utopia is essentially a didactic representation; so long as it is possible to invent an art which will persuade individuals to live a utopian existence it is not necessary to go the next step—to attempt to found a utopia. Alberti more than Thomas More represents the full-blown hedonistic ideal which says that a happy life on earth is possible in the well-ordered, pure, and virtuous political and social structure of the secularized city. The individual can become his own priest, judge, and educator. These three social functions of the modern individual are already found in Alberti’s thought; order is earthly and secular, and paradise reigns on earth.

Architect that he was, however, Alberti never integrated the image of the buildings or of the city which these buildings constituted in his treatise with his realization that visual art has a didactic potential; that social, secular virtue is central in an individual’s life; and that political and social institutions follow paradigmatic models. Alberti’s architecture as described in his treatise, and as constructed in his practice, is unrelated to his utopian conception. Only his choice of classical forms to create an environment of arcadian antiquity indicates that he thought the architect capable of contributing to the utopian idyll. Classical architecture, for Alberti, provides only a hieroglyphic symbol of utopian order, not an environment for arcadian existence. Classical architecture is removed in time and carries with it timeless truths; it tells the truth about utopian existence by lying, that is, by indicating that such existence now is impossible. Alberti and Erasmus share in common Lucian’s lesson that to lie is to tell the truth and to tell the truth is to lie. Only the poetry of Alberti’s utopian image, especially as told in his Momus, tells truth; only as literature did Alberti’s utopia have real existence. Alberti’s literary heir, Filarete, was the first to combine the image of a physical city which follows classical standards with an ideal political and social structure based upon utopian considerations.

Filarete’s Sforzinda of 1462–1464 is the first city with a fully integrated utopian structure. Its citizens are strictly regulated in their social and political actions because in utopia order must be maintained. It is a radial, symmetrical city because of the timeless, hieroglyphic character of geometric forms. And its form is precisely sketched down to its finest and most mean detail in order to show how completely realized the city is. Yet Sforzinda’s program is even more removed from reality than is Alberti’s because it is a poetic conception, an invention of genius, or an invented art (erfundene Kunst) derived from the genius through fantasizing rather than an intellectual art (erzacher Kunst) derived from literary and philosophical models as Alberti’s had been. It stands independently of time and history because its political organization is derived from the ancient knowledge of an ancient king revealed through golden books miraculously discovered in the course of construction.

Sforzinda points up the dilemma which Bauer feels existed when a perfect geometric order for architecture was integrated with an ordered social and political system, both of which exist independently of time and of place. Alberti and Thomas More did not discover the integration of a social and political structure with an appropriate architectural environment; Filarete, having invented such an integration, could not establish it in time and place and perpetuate its existence. Subsequent utopian thought floundered on a different part of the dilemma. Architectural thinkers toyed with geometric structures for cities and ignored the political structure. Examples are Francesco di Giorgio’s fortification treaties, Leonardo’s diffuse and pregnant ideas, and the abstract schemes of Dürer and of Giorgio Vasari the Younger, all of which Bauer would, rightly I think, like to call examples of the concept of the “schematized ideal city” to separate them from ideal cities proper, or those schemes which attempt to resolve the full utopian integration. The utopian program itself, as commonly defined by More’s book, entered the domain of the philosophers and romance writers who largely ignored the architectural and urban environment. Francesco Colonna and Rabelais extended the romance of Filarete’s “poetry” into more mature literary forms whose utopias enjoy greater timelessness and universality than anything proposed by the early Renaissance; Giorgio Vasari founded art history by removing real people into the timeless context of perfect individuals somewhere (or nowhere) in history. At the beginning of the seventeenth century a new element was introduced which heightened the poetic sense of utopia—the artistic image of utopia was transformed into a mnemonic image of the universe, and painting and architecture were pressed into its service. Campanella’s City of the Sun exploits all that the utopian tradition had offered, and reduces the visual arts to pedagogic tools and symbolic world mirrors which support the poetic society of the city. Mnemonics became the basis of a didactic world-city-state realized in poetry alone.

From Campanella, Bauer moves effortlessly to Louis XIV, who made his state into a theatrical and unreal city of the sun by quite concrete and real means, and then to the eighteenth century, which replaced the didactic concept of art with art as aesthetic (or which made the aesthetic appeal of art its didactic content), and finally to the present strife between Marxism and Liberalism. These last pages are diffuse and intangible; they imply more than they con-
clude and they stand as personal speculations without the support of scholarly method. The author requests that they be excused because he is preparing another study on these topics. This reader is quite willing not only to excuse but to overlook them.

Those, then, are the more important parts of Bauer's exposition of an extremely engaging topic. There is little doubt that the book breaks new ground but it has, perhaps for that very reason, some disturbing elements. Some, such as its organization, could easily be corrected in future editions; the author's ideas might follow one another in a more systematic fashion. (It would also profit from better proofreading; there are numerous misspellings and many incorrect footnote citations.) These corrected, however, it would still remain a work with insufficient research; a survey, perhaps, rather than a study. Bauer has trusted too fully too few authors whose own quotations from English sources he takes directly, adding to their misspellings and thereby alarming the reader and forcing him to wonder whether he read more than his secondary sources offered. He would seem to have investigated only a few utopian tracts (there exist vast numbers of sixteenth-century Italian utopian treatises which are all but uninvestigated by architectural historians) and few of the fundamental works which deal with Renaissance thought. Two illustrations pertinent to architectural history will make this clear.

Bauer believes that Alberti continued the trend of the Trecento and "secularized" and "aestheticized" the city by attempting to order it according to secular, aesthetic considerations. Professor Wittkower's study of Renaissance architectural principles suggests, however, that the basis of what Bauer would call Renaissance aesthetics is far from secular. Yet that study is not cited and apparently was not consulted. The direction of Renaissance studies now seems to be in tempering the Burckhardtian conception of a secular Renaissance with a deeper respect for the sacred element in Renaissance thought. Had Bauer explored Alberti's place in Florentine humanism more thoroughly he perhaps would have seen a sacred element both in Alberti's theories of art and architecture and in Florentine secular thought during that period. He might have recognized that Alberti's architecture is rather didactic. He would, then, have seen that Filarete imitated Alberti's conception of didactic architecture and reproduced at Sforzinda a vastly weakened utopian ideal first formulated by Alberti.

By taking into account that Alberti made the city a sacred structure dedicated to promoting virtue Bauer might have seen that Julius II and Bramante attempted to make Rome a modern sacred city and that Sixtus V and Carlo Maderno actually did, at least in part. And the correctness of Bauer's definition of a utopia would not have been disturbed; the Rome of the sixteenth-century popes is perfectly described as a utopia in Bauer's sense by Martin Luther in An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility. Bauer's three criteria—geometric, architectural symbolism; rigorous political and social organization; universal existence independent of time, place, and history—are recognizable there and in many other concrete architectural proposals which Bauer overlooked. But to see them one must cease to attempt to find an increasing "secularization" and "aestheticization" in every new thought of the Renaissance.

The second illustration is also an "Alberti problem." While writing the De Re Aedificatoria Alberti wrote Momus, an allegory on creation. Bauer proposes that in these works Alberti represented the architect as a demiurge of a philosophically planned state, responsible for the founding of a political structure and for the design and building of the physical city. In both cases, however, it appears that the architect is only an administrator of plans formulated by others; the architect is not given a free hand as Bauer would have it. In the architectural treatise a council of elders establishes for the state the best forms that possibly can be, and the architect follows the program they establish as he builds the physical city. The architect is a demiurge only in the sense that he takes materials from nature and models them according to perfect forms which arise in his mind and are deprived of all material. Bauer correctly perceives that there is but a shade of difference between Cicero's orator (Orator, ii, 7–iii, 10; incorrectly cited on page 43, note 47) and Alberti's architect, but he is quite wrong when he adds Machiavelli's good ruler (Discourses) to their company. Machiavelli's republican chancellor has inherited the power of the councils in Alberti's architectural treatise and of the consuls Cicero defended; he will continue to direct Alberti's architect and to emulate in his speech Cicero's orator.

Bauer adopts this position apparently because he lacks sympathy with Cassirer's The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy and with subsequent studies by others which derive from it. Yet these studies, which clarify the role of the maker and of the artist and the concept of creation during the Renaissance, should not be ignored in a book of this type, for the problem touched on here was a central one during the Renaissance, and these studies have assumed tremendous importance in Renaissance historiography. The author's thesis would have been clarified and strengthened if he had indicated his disagreement with the ideas expressed in them or if he had incorporated them into his own study. As it is, by largely ignoring the complex problem of the meaning of "invention," "creation," and "genius," he gives the illusion that there is no problem or that he has solved it. He has not solved it; he has instead misled the reader into thinking that the Renaissance architect is a demiurge for states as well as for cathedrals.

He also misleads the reader by a fallacy of historiography which unexpectedly intrudes itself into an otherwise thoughtful study. Attention should be drawn to it because it is not an uncommon lapse in studies of architectural history. Bauer considers Filarete an early exponent of the Chicago school's slogan that form follows function; Alberti, he adds, did not comprehend this idea but instead became ineffectually bogged in his practice by his attempt to pattern his efforts after ancient architectural practice. Bauer says that Filarete, and not Alberti, gave proper attention to sound requirements of sanitation and to the invention of the proper geometric configuration for each particular building type. Bauer, by imposing Chicago-school standards (which he misinterprets) upon early Renaissance architecture has failed to see how thoroughly functional both architects were in their forms. Both designed a physical structure based upon the functional requirements imposed by their political and social structures. Alberti actually outlined two types of city, one a republican city, the other a principality, and proposed a different physical form and different building types for each. The pattern of Alberti's principality became Filarete's Sforzinda.

These three criticisms, however, are a bit beside the real point; they are worth raising because of the value of the ideas in the book. The author clearly defines what a utopia is, how the visual and literary arts have rendered that conception, how utopias are made use of, and how the relationship between art and the concept of utopia has
varied through a major period of recent European history. If the book is too short, the treatment of problems too cursory, and the scholarship too meager, we must acknowledge that new material has been surveyed; a field of investigation has been opened up and many questions have been raised which in the future will perhaps be explored in greater detail by those who have been stimulated by this provocative survey.

CARROLL WILLIAM WESTFALL
Amherst College

Richard P. Dober, Campus Planning, New York: Reinhold, 1964, 305 pp., illus. $25.00

In the four years since Mr. Richard Dober concluded his research for Campus Planning, the need for academic facilities and the difficulties of planning the expansion of campuses have increased sharply, fulfilling the prophecy that led Mr. Dober to prepare this timely and comprehensive book. Campus Planning is a reliable resource for clients and architects who must cope with the enlarging populations and expanding functions of colleges and universities. A workmanlike outline succeeds in collating information about all aspects of the campus, including programming, instructional facilities, libraries, museums, research centers, housing, dining services, athletic facilities; and he does not forget circulation and parking. No trustee, educational administrator or campus architect could fail to find in the wealth of illustrated plans some clues to solutions for problems on his own campus.

Even as recently as twenty years ago, discussions about college architecture were set in the controversy between the advocates of traditional architecture and the champions of modern architecture. Campuses were resilient against modernism. The pressures of modern programs, modern scales and recent budgets beat against the resilience, but, undoubtedly, the case for modern architecture was won by the examples of modern architecture itself. Twenty years ago, there were not more than three examples of good modern design on American campuses; today, not only are fine academic buildings numerous, but most of the innovative, refined, and memorable modern buildings have been built for colleges and universities. Thus, Campus Planning deals with important documents of American taste, and mere mention of a few—Kahn’s Richards Medical Center at the University of Pennsylvania, Saarinen’s Stiles and Morse colleges at Yale, Pei’s Earth Sciences Building at M.I.T., Kump’s Foothill College, S.O.M.’s University of Illinois campus at Chicago, Yamasaki’s Wayne State University, Rudolph’s Jewett Art Center at Wellesley, and Johnson’s Science Quadrangle at Yale—indicates that colleges and universities have gone to serious, talented architects. For their commissions, the architects have to thank a few educators and trustees: notably, President Griswold of Yale and Presidents Killian and Stratton of M.I.T., and one of the few regrets about Mr. Dober’s book is that the role of such sponsors (and the disappointments of many of them over architects’ failures) are not indicated.

Campus Planning, which is organized into three sections devoted to historical background, building types, and campus planning, is of special interest to the architectural historian for the following five contributions:

First, it uses and thereby suggests a historical-philosophical approach to architecture. The architectural program for an American campus, which is a unique amalgamation of English, Scottish, German and, more recently, research and entrepreneurial ideas, is explained in terms of educational programs, and each building type is introduced by quotations from educators’ writings. There are few documents more capable of unfolding the program and, thereby, offering historians an insight into what architects designed to enhance or thwart a program.

Second, Mr. Dober declares himself in favor of preserving fine historical architecture, and one short section devoted to the problem, as illustrated by the renovation of Richardson’s library at the University of Vermont, gives historians some indications of attitudes and achievements in preservation.

Third, Mr. Dober undoubtedly found that the documentation of campus history was fragmentary at most colleges and universities, and the absence of reliable accounts of architecture, except for an occasional essay at Harvard or Cornell, is the more surprising because campus architecture, even when it is of indifferent quality, does offer students a first-hand encounter with buildings, and many opportunities to practise historical-critical methods that are essential to the training of historians.

Fourth, Campus Planning, in its scope, exhibits the planning process for whole institutions and for each building type with a comprehensiveness that demonstrates the wide range of questions historians must confront in their examination of modern architecture.

Fifth, implicit throughout Campus Planning is the possibility that the book itself may inspire the preparation of better campuses. Historians have often been effective in advocating fine design, and some have actually alerted their own colleges. There is no better ally available than Mr. Dober’s Campus Planning, which, for helpful example and precept, deserves to stand on each college president’s bookshelf.

ALBERT BUSH-BROWN
Rhode Island School of Design


The author claims that his study differs from the usual art-historical investigation insofar as it is mainly concerned with the meaning and significance of the ornament rather than its stylistic development (although, of course, he also inquires into its origin). However, this far-reaching claim amounts to no much more than a justified rejection of a purely formalistic approach. Taking style in its wider sense, comprising content as well as form, it is still "stylistic development" with which this book is concerned.

It is divided into two parts of equal length. The first deals in some detail with the origin of the rocaille in France, the second almost exclusively with its outstanding accomplishment in Germany. Naturally, Bauer covers in the first part the same ground which had been dealt with so authoritatively by Kimball. But there are differences and these are significant. In the first place, the development in France is Kimball’s sole objective, whereas for Bauer it is of interest only as the source from which Germany drew and as the initial stage of a style from which valuable insight into the character of the rocaille can be gained. The second fundamental difference is that Kimball treats of decorative art as a whole including its influence on architectural development, whereas Bauer not only limits his study to an examination of the rocaille, but restricts it further by consider-