

tion, connected the east and west Corridors parallel to and some thirty meters to the north of the library of Sixtus V.

Redig de Campos writes modestly in his introduction that the volume is intended only to be an initial general sketch of some future exhaustive and definitive monograph. While he draws liberally (always noting the source) from the guides of Taja, Chattard, and Strong; from Pastor, from published studies of portions of the buildings; from architectural drawings, prints, inscriptions; and from archeological examination of the buildings themselves, the author is careful to note he has not done any original archival research, nor attempted to compile a complete bibliography. It is clear, however, that (as director of the Conservation and Restoration Laboratory of the Vatican Museums) he has assisted in much of the recent archeological work done on the Vatican Palace (his published accounts have appeared periodically over the last twenty-five years) and is abreast of the significant literature on the palace. The book is, therefore, a pithy survey of the building history of the palace. Greatest emphasis is placed on the building campaigns of Nicholas V, Sixtus IV, Julius II, Pius IV, and Gregory XIII.

The author is primarily interested in the construction of the palace, only including decoration when it forms part of the architecture. As a result, while the decorative programs are mentioned, discussion is limited. Even so, there is occasional discussion of iconographic programs and of innovation and achievement in painting. An unpublished frieze (painted, according to the author, by a follower of Pisanello) dating from the time of Nicholas V turns up in one such discussion (p. 49).

There are six plans that detail the chronological development of the palace but the twenty perspectives make even clearer the additions of the major construction campaigns. Sections would have been helpful, especially of the main palace and its additions to the west and east. The 133 black-and-white photographs are reproduced never smaller than half-page, and the volume includes eight color plates. The Italian is economical and limpid. An English version would be useful to many.

Already a valuable survey, this study would have been of even greater importance if the author had been able to give more attention to the services of the palace such as the kitchens, bakeries, latrines and baths, as well as to water supply and sew-

age disposal (in all portions of the palace), and the locations of stables and carriage houses, all of which are necessary and occasionally a determining factor in the form of a major palace complex.

HENRY A. MILLON

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *Rococo Architecture in Southern Germany*, London and New York: Phaidon, 1968, vii+428 pp., 218 illus.+36 figs., 1 map. \$20.

Eberhard Hempel, *Baroque Art and Architecture in Central Europe*, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965, xxiii+370 pp., 32 figs., 200 pls., 4 maps. \$20 (The Pelican History of Art).

I

It is difficult to compare two works of such differing scope, yet both of the above are important contributions to the study of Central European Baroque and Rococo, and both provide long-awaited new syntheses—especially needed in English—of the vast amount of scholarship that has appeared since Max Hauttmann's pioneering volume (1921) on south German church architecture from 1550 to 1780 and Hans Rose's *Spätbarock* (1922), an equally fundamental study of European secular architecture from 1660 to 1760. Professor Hitchcock limits himself to the first two thirds of the eighteenth century and to southern Germany, whereas Professor Hempel attempts a broad overview extending from 1660 to 1780 and from the Rhine eastward through Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. He also includes sculpture and painting independent of buildings, whereas Hitchcock studies these arts only as elements of *Gesamtkunstwerk*.

As their titles suggest, Hitchcock and Hempel differ considerably in their interpretation of Baroque and Rococo, and thereby in their approach to eighteenth-century architecture. For Hitchcock it is primarily a Rococo creation (that is, in southern Germany) and it developed from just before 1720 to the end of the 1760s. For Hempel the Rococo is limited to the period 1740–1780 (in Central Europe as a whole) and it is merely a fourth and final phase of nearly 200 years of Baroque art. On the contrary, Hitchcock argues strongly for detaching Rococo from its Baroque precursor, for southern Germany as the scene of the development of a truly Rococo archi-

ecture (as against the purely ornamental style that evolved in Paris), and for the brothers Asam as the most important German originators of the Rococo as he defines it. None of these considerations appears in Hempel, whom Hitchcock faults as, writing in Dresden, having “much more to say about architects active in Saxony and in Poland of considerably less ability” (p. 90).

These differing conceptions of Rococo deserve further consideration, but first a description of the general plan of the two books is in order. Hempel opens with a thirty-five-page chapter full of interesting observations on the historical-social background, religious foundations, the status of the artist with respect to guilds, academies and patrons, and the importance of ornamental forms. The main body of his text partitions Baroque art into four chronological divisions: The Heroic Age (1600–1639), The Years of Recovery after the Thirty Years War (1640–1682), The Baroque Period (1683–1739), and Rococo and its End (1740–1780). Each of these divisions is further segmented into eleven or twelve geographical sections, two of them with subsections on architecture, sculpture, and painting. Such a rigid scheme makes it nearly impossible to follow a continuous idea or development, so that the book as a whole is one to be read by the index. Indeed, there is no other way to find out about artists who lived long and travelled widely, as many of them did.

Hitchcock is chiefly interested in individuals. In his preface he states that “the history of styles, their recognition and their morphology are always controversial, and . . . stylistic history is generally less useful than the study of the work of particular artists considered in their own particular contexts.” *Rococo Architecture in Southern Germany* (hereafter referred to as RASG) opens with a brief but brilliant introduction and then proceeds to its five main topics: The Asam brothers, Johann Georg Fischer of Füssen, the Schmuzers (Johann, Franz Xaver, and Joseph), Peter II Thumb, and “The Limits of Rococo: The Work of Johann Michael Fischer and J. B. Neumann.”

Hitchcock's seventy-page essay on the Asams is reprinted (with emendations) from two articles in *JSAH* (October 1965 and March 1966), while the much briefer one on the Schmuzers was published in the *Art Bulletin* (June 1966), and that on Peter II Thumb in the Rudolf Wittkower *fest-schrift*. The essay on Johann Georg Fischer of Füssen (1673–1747), written in honor of

the seventieth birthday of Richard Krautheimer but published here for the first time, is the first full-length study of this strangely neglected architect. (Hempel gives him a single brief mention.) Hitchcock has convincingly elevated Fischer's church of St. Katherine at Wolfegg and the closely related Franciscan convent church at Dillingen to positions of importance, whereas only his early St. Michael's at Bertoldshofen has heretofore received much notice. He has also found in J. G. Fischer an architect for Maria-Steinbach, the finest of the south German churches for which we have no record of authorship. Hitchcock's attribution—initiated long ago by Max Hauttmann—makes great sense in his overview of Fischer's career. I can only suggest caution in also including the façade, completed several years after Fischer's death. It looks closer to me to the work of Hans Adam Dossenberger, as in the façade of the Theklakirche at Welden (1756–1757).

These chapters were originally conceived under the general title of *Studies in Rococo Architecture*, together with an eighty-page essay on the brothers Johann Baptist and Dominikus Zimmermann, published earlier in 1968 as a separate volume. For the present book Hitchcock has written the introductory chapter and the concluding one on J. M. Fischer and J. B. Neumann, but he refers the reader to the Zimmermann monograph as an essential part of the overall study of his subject. Taken together, the two books cover, in the author's opinion, "most of the significant aspects of the architecture that can be considered Rococo in southern Germany." I shall discuss this claim later.

Even a cursory glance at Hitchcock's text, his thirty pages of notes, and his impressive index will show that he has managed to include an impressive array of works by artists who are not his main concern—whether in multiple side allusions or in longer divagations. This procedure, together with Hitchcock's highly complex style, makes for taxing but heady reading, yet, just as his convolute sentences finally do parse, so his volume as a whole ends up as a triumph of synthesis, analysis, cultural history, biography, genealogy, and even (despite the author's protestations) of stylistic morphology. Fortunately, the publishers of *RASG* have given it an appropriately luxurious format and superbly reproduced black-and-white plates. (While color is an absolute essential to an understanding of this architecture, most color plates are

fraudulent and the relatively few good ones are readily available in popular works on the subject.) Hempel's plates, though smaller, are reasonably successful. His four maps, conveniently placed at the beginning, are so studded with place names that they are difficult to use. Hitchcock's very legible double-spread—extending from the Rhine east to the Austrian border and from the Main south to St. Gallen and Innsbruck—is unfortunately buried at the rear, but its marginal coordinates, referred to in the place-index, allow quick location of any site in question.

II

Returning now to these scholars' interpretations of Rococo, I find a disconcerting lack of definition on the part of Hempel as against Hitchcock's laudable resolve to transpose the Rococo experience into verbal terms. For Hempel, Rococo is primarily a *period* and any characterization of it emerges almost accidentally; for Hitchcock it is an *artistic entity* initiated by certain individuals, further developed by others, varied and even reacted against by still others. Hitchcock makes a clear distinction between its genesis in France as an ornamental invention and its development in Germany as an architectural style. Its keynote is progressive destruction (actual or simulated) of Baroque tectonic expression, and for this reason the churches are rightly considered more significant than secular buildings. In this approach Hitchcock follows (but I think not sufficiently) Bernhard Rupprecht (*Die Bayerische Rokoko-Kirche*, Kallmünz, 1959), whose important conclusions are summarized in Sedlmayr and Bauer's article on Rococo in the *Encyclopedia of World Art* (xii, 268).

In his extensive coverage, Hempel obviously has little opportunity to indulge in architectural analysis. Nevertheless, there are moments that suggest that on occasion his eye may be more sharply attuned than Hitchcock's. For example, in comparing the exterior of Effner's Preysing Palace in Munich (1723–1728) with Lukas von Hildenbrandt's Daun-Kinsky Palace in Vienna (1713–1716), Hitchcock finds the resemblance "certainly very close"—and bases his claim on the presence of tapered and panelled pilasters and of concave-pointed pediments over some of the windows, while admitting that Effner's attic windows are cut into the main entablature (p. 8). For Hempel (p. 183) "a comparison shows how ornamental Effner's style had become. In-

stead of pilaster strips he used ornamental bands, and he reduced the entablature to a minimum. A love of ornament was common to both men . . . but their approach was clearly different." Hitchcock's Plate 9 and Hempel's Plate 52 (B) may be consulted to resolve this disagreement, not an unimportant one because the crucial question of German originality is here at stake.

Despite such moments of illumination, however, Hempel is more concerned with multiple listing of historical examples than with intellectual clarification. For Hitchcock, as I have indicated, Rococo is not a period but an evolution which began in Paris at least five years before the Régence (1715–1723). An even earlier patron of the new fashion than the Regent himself was his mother, a Wittelsbach from another branch of the family that ruled Munich—Elizabeth Charlotte von der Pfalz, Duchesse d'Orléans. This important observation is made on Hitchcock's first page of text. The Parisian impact appeared in Germany slightly before 1720 (notably in the Paris-trained Joseph Effner's garden pavilions for the Nymphenburg Palace), and it was soon crossed by influence from Viennese variants on Parisian style—hence Hitchcock's comparison of the Preysing and Daun-Kinsky palaces, referred to above. In the main, Hitchcock consistently and properly calls such examples proto-Rococo, while he as properly calls the first major works of the Asams (notably Weltenburg, 1716–1718) pre-Rococo, since everything about them is opposed to the Rococo and their main orientation is Bernini-Baroque. With great skill he shows how the Asams developed in a Rococo direction during the 1720s and 1730s, notably at Einsiedeln, Osterhofen, and in the total renovations of the Cathedral of Freising and the abbey church of St. Emmeram at Regensburg. The chapter on the Schmuzers (along with the volume on the Zimmermanns) is crucial for understanding the development of German Rococo as an *architectural* style, even though all these artists were trained as *stuccoists* at the Bavarian school of Wessobrunn. The period extending from about 1730 into the 1760s—from François Cuvilliers' Ahnengalerie in the Residenz to the end of the careers of the Zimmermanns, the Schmuzers, and Peter II Thumb (who began to approach the Neo-Classical in his last major work at St. Gallen)—is clearly presented as the time of Rococo's "high florescence." During the first half of this period Johann Georg Fischer of Füssen (1673–1747) intro-

duced, as Hitchcock convincingly demonstrates, several elements basic to German Rococo architecture: oval(ized) plans, curved corners, broad coves around flat ceilings, and delicate continuous patterns of raised ornament. On the contrary, Hitchcock believes that Johann *Michael* Fischer and J. B. Neumann were essentially tectonic Baroque architects, their Rococo effects being mainly restricted to ornament overhead (“Baroque below, Rococo overhead”)—and always carried out by other artists frequently not even under the architect’s direction. (Neumann had nothing to do with the decoration of *Vierzehnheiligen*.) Thus, in their different ways, the two greatest architects of southern Germany’s Rococo Age emerge as Baroque, or at best “Baroque-Rococo.”

III

Much more could be said in praise of Hempel and Hitchcock, but I wish now to consider, further than in the few brief indications already given, what seem to me to be errors of omission or commission.

My criticism of Hempel must be limited to the discontinuity and the lack of emphasis accruing from its unwieldy plan, and—in the spirit of Wagner’s Beckmesser—to certain small points. Hempel’s cut-off dates for his four main divisions of Baroque are not explained, and one must accept them as simply chronological conveniences. Nevertheless, they do not always work. Baroque architecture in southern Germany unquestionably began with the Jesuit church (St. Michael’s) in Munich, and so it is with Hempel, as with everyone else. But the date is 1583–1597, and thus “The Heroic Age” clearly began before 1600. The next great step taken in Munich was the Theatine Church (1663–1671), designed by the Bolognese architect Agostino Barelli. Hempel is correct in stating that the dominant influences were the Theatine Church in Rome (S. Andrea della Valle) and the Cathedral of Salzburg, but it is also possible that architecture in Bologna itself is relevant to the problem. (G. Passavant’s recent monograph on the architect, Domenico Egídio Rossi, active in Vienna and Rastatt and also a Bolognese, is highly convincing on direct influence from Bologna.) On the positive side, Hempel has performed a service in stressing the influence of Henriette Adelaide of Savoy, the anti-German wife of the Elector of Bavaria, who first attempted to enlist the services of Guarino Guarini for this church. Had Guarini accepted, Ba-

varian Baroque architecture would surely have taken an altogether different course. (For more information on this point, see N. Lieb, *Münchener Barockbaumeister*, 1941, p. 13.)

In the spirit of Beckmesser, Hempel might be faulted for spelling the name of an important Austrian architect as Brunner (p. 102 and index) rather than the preferred Prunner; for clichés like “the innate German love of decoration, which is the expression of a powerful urge to play” (p. 9); for questionable generalizations like “as opposed to the Italian Baroque, which frequently appears uncouth and shows unmistakable evidence of decline when compared with the styles of preceding centuries, the Central European Baroque retains greater freshness, is less inclined to exaggeration . . .” (p. 15); and for Germanisms like “the Baroque, not even now by any means exhaustively studied” (p. 20).

In like spirit, Hitchcock must be faulted for locating Ellingen “southwest of Dinkelsbühl” (p. 7) and Rott-am-Inn “across the border from Austria” (p. 197); for prematurely killing off J. M. Fischer in 1763 on page 14 whereas he properly expires in 1766 on page 224; and for confusing (p. 83) the big new full-relief stucco over the high altar at the upper level of the *Asamkirche*, representing St. John Nepomuk in glory, with a painted *Assumption* by T. C. Winck (1738–1797), who did in fact paint a *Cleansing of the Temple* for the left wall of this church in 1794. The *Assumption* to which Professor Hitchcock refers (it is modern and not by Winck) was temporarily placed at the upper end of the church soon after the war as a filler for the destroyed end wall, but in 1961 I watched a craftsman erecting the new stucco altarpiece *in situ*, and on inquiry I was told that it was based on a relief in the Baroque Museum in Vienna. In 1966 I saw it again, completed. Dr. Erika Hanfstaengl has kindly confirmed for me that it is still there.

IV

To return to more serious matters, I should first point out that despite Hitchcock’s extraordinary tour-de-force in touching on so many persons and places, *RASG* has some gaps, even in “the significant aspects of the architecture that can be considered Rococo in southern Germany.” While it is doubtful that yet another “sleeper” like Johann Georg Fischer of Füssen awaits his discoverer, there are many lesser architects, like J. M. Fischer’s prolific Bavarian fol-

lower L. M. Giessl, who went through a development worth studying and arrived at a style that was not only modestly original but more sympathetic to local taste. In the general Munich area, Giessl’s small parish churches (such as Starnberg, Perchting, Inning, Seehausen) have a charm not found in Fischer’s churches of similar size (such as Unering, Bergkirchen, Bichl, Sigmertshausen)—architecturally superior as Fischer’s undeniably are. Since the example of Giessl can be multiplied many times in many regions, this undercurrent of German Rococo is indeed “significant.” It provides that wealth of *creativity in depth* which makes the whole subject as endlessly fascinating as French Romanesque or French Gothic as they are revealed in the volumes of Robert de Lasteyrie.

Professor Hitchcock’s approach to the style he calls Rococo is “not inductive, from supposed principles to more or less perfect examples, but deductive.” This procedure helps him avoid doctrinaire pronouncements, but it also results in no very clear definition. He is convincing in his many discussions of these architects’ anti-tectonic impulses as found both in structure and in the use of ornament, and he rightly stresses the influence of a still powerful medieval component which is especially notable in the many commissions completely to renovate a Romanesque or Gothic church without greatly changing its plan or even its structural system. (Joseph Schmuzer’s Rottenbuch and Ettal, and J. M. Fischer’s *Zwiefalten* are spectacular examples.) Unfortunately, however, Hitchcock fails to give sufficient attention to *interior lighting*.

The brotherly team of Cosmas Damian and Egid Quirin Asam moved with gathering momentum from dark to light, for example, from the Bernini-Baroque of Weltenburg to the proto-Rococo (if not the Rococo) of Freising Cathedral. This aspect of their evolution is at least as important as those to which Hitchcock has given such meticulous attention. Towards the end, in the church of St. John Nepomuk at Munich, there is a retrogression—as Hitchcock does not fail to point out—and even if the controlling reasons lie in the exceptional location of the “*Asamkirche*” on a city street flanked by tall houses, the darkness of this church is perhaps the chief sign of its conservatism. Hitchcock’s near omission, therefore, of the Asam’s still later Ursuline convent church at Straubing comes as a surprise. In the original *JSAH* articles

Straubing is mentioned only briefly in a footnote, together with the Sakramentskapelle in the southerly apse of Freising Cathedral, and both are described as works by Egid Quirin begun in 1738 and *not* representing “a further development of Egid Quirin’s architecture.” This note is repeated at the end of the text of *RASG* (p. 87) without further discussion. It needs amplification.

The Ursuline church at Straubing was begun in 1736, not 1738 (see E. Hanfstaengl, *Die Brüder Asam*, p. 59) and since Cosmas Damian lived until 1739 we may suppose that he contributed to its design even though the documents tell us only that Egid Quirin submitted the plan and invited his brother to paint the frescoes. Furthermore, Cosmas Damian’s younger daughter had been educated at this convent and the older one was about to take her vows there. The cornerstone was laid in 1736, the façade was completed in 1738, and Cosmas Damian went to work on the main fresco, which was finished after his death by Egid Quirin. Whether the general plan was a joint effort or Egid Quirin’s alone need not concern us here; the important point is that it is nothing less than the capstone of a development which both brothers had been following for at least fifteen years. As Erika Hanfstaengl has pointed out, Straubing is all but a fully evolved Johann Michael Fischer central-space, one generated from a system of interlocked ellipses and, like Fischer’s, brilliantly lighted, here from all four sides.

The Sakramentskapelle at Freising, for which the date 1738 is correct, could be studied to the same effect. Hanfstaengl (*op. cit.*, p. 48 and pls. 56–57) considers it the work of both brothers, not of Egid Quirin alone, and she emphasizes the spiritual, transfigured character of the sculptures—these, as always, being by Egid except for one figure that betrays the hand of an assistant. I might add that the angels are unusually elongated, almost approaching Ignatz Günther’s elegant Rococo proportions. More important, the oval lantern sheds a brilliant overhead light while the altar is bathed in the golden rays of an amber-glassed circular window. Nothing could be further removed from the masked half-light from the oval cupola at Weltenburg, and in the whole architectural *oeuvre* of the Asams the only comparable brilliance of lighting effects occurs at Straubing itself.

Thus, if I am not mistaken, the brothers Asam ended up even more Rococo than

Hitchcock says they did. In like manner, Johann Michael Fischer—despite his Baroque power and the specifically Baroque forms of his below-cornice structures—would end up more closely allied to his Rococo contemporaries if Hitchcock had paid more attention to his lighting. “Baroque beneath, Rococo overhead” is a clever phrase, but the effect of Fischer’s huge windows has been missed. One of the most remarkable in this respect is the church of Berg-am-Laim, on the eastern edge of Munich. Here great lights are daringly cut right through the pendentive supports of the central space, and then by a stroke of genius contrasted with smaller stucco reliefs of similar shape (representing the Church Fathers) in the lower choir space, which gets a strong side-lighting. None of this is mentioned in Hitchcock’s much too brief account of one of Fischer’s acknowledged masterpieces.

Professor Hitchcock kindly mentions (p. 175), but then rejects, my suggestion of the term “Barococo” to describe not only the architecture of Johann Michael Fischer but more generally the character of the whole south German development. He argues that “such a coinage would logically exclude much fine work in Germany that is as completely anti-Baroque as the secular interiors of the French Rococo were demonstrated by Fiske Kimball to have been.” Like all students of the field, I am indebted to Hitchcock for his definitive demolition of Fiske Kimball’s bland assumption that François Cuvilliers derived his Amalienburg *Spiegelsaal* directly from Boffrand’s oval salons in the Hôtel de Soubise. (The full development of this point will be found in the Zimmermann monograph.) Nevertheless, if we consider Cuvilliers’ *whole* career, as Hitchcock unfortunately does not, even this Walloon-born, Paris-trained, and most deeply Francophile of the Munich architects did not remain untouched by Baroque influences. The Amalienburg itself, a fairly early work of 1734–1739, is already more “Germanized” than the still earlier interiors of Lustschloss Falkenlust (in the gardens of Brühl) and—as Hitchcock has so clearly demonstrated—it is relatively lush if we compare it to French design of its day. (I recall a remark there by a visiting French *archéologue* to the effect that “cela n’a pas le vrai esprit classique.” Indeed it has not!) If we turn now to the end of Cuvilliers’ career, the best example, of course, is his Residenztheater in Munich (1751–1753). Hempel calls it “the greatest masterpiece of the Ba-

varian Rococo” (p. 19), but Hitchcock, in a work on south German Rococo, only mentions the lost ceiling that J. B. Zimmermann executed for it. The ornament of the theater makes the Amalienburg seem positively diaphanous. It is far richer, more plastic, more emphatic on weight near ground level through the use of Atlantid gallery and loge supports. Flanking the proscenium are the same massive freestanding columns that Hitchcock invariably calls Baroque when J. M. Fischer uses them.

“Barococo”—my partly facetious coinage—was seriously intended to describe a creative amalgamation of two styles: Roman-Viennese Baroque and Parisian Régence-Rococo. This mixture not only differed radically from both of its ingredients but it was also marked by a *simultaneous development in two directions*, that is, the predictable one from Baroque to Rococo and a totally unexpected one from Rococo to Baroque. The latter trend is by no means missed by Hitchcock; indeed it plays a considerable role in his interpretation of J. M. Fischer and J. B. Neumann, among others. But he does miss it in Cuvilliers, and to some extent again in his monograph on the Zimmermanns. While he finds Dominikus Zimmermann more Baroque at Günzburg (1736–1741) than in his earlier pilgrimage church at Steinhausen (1727–1733), he does not follow up this suggestion in discussing Dominikus’s final triumph at Die Wies (1746–1754). Here the ornament is as heavy and luxuriant as it is in the exactly contemporary Residenztheater, and this effect is underscored by much squatter proportions than those of Steinhausen, and by the presence of large figures near eye level—again comparable to the Residenztheater. Hitchcock fails to make use of what could have been his most telling argument for Die Wies as a Rococo interior: the much more brilliant lighting Zimmermann has provided by spacing the interior supports further apart than at Steinhausen and by narrowing the aisle around the main oval. I am forced to conclude, as Hitchcock so rightly does throughout *RASG*, that the career of no good architect was, or is, unilinear. Such a conclusion, however, lends support to my argument for “Barococo” as a descriptive term.

My quarrel with Hitchcock’s brilliant achievement is mainly one of emphasis on the significance of certain late works by some of the major architects of the time. If we consider the near-Rococo end of the Asams at Straubing and at the Sakraments-

kapelle of Freising together with Cuvilliers' relatively Baroque end at the Residenztheater and Dominikus Zimmermann's at Die Wies, we have a clearer total picture than the one Hitchcock has given us. The south Germans brought two diverse styles into an original creative unity, and in the process drew much closer to one another than their own beginnings could have possibly suggested.

S. LANE FAISON, JR.
Williams College

Ottavio Bertotti Scamozzi, *Le fabbriche e i disegni di Andrea Palladio*, introduction by J. Quentin Hughes, New York: Architectural Book Publishing Company, 1968, lvi pp. + four volumes in one (vol. I: viii + 128 pp., 52 pls.; vol. II: iv + 76 pp., 51 pls.; vol. III: iv + 60 pp., 52 pls.; vol. IV: iv + 80 pp., 54 pls.). \$20.00.

When first published, in 1776–1783, Bertotti Scamozzi's corpus of Palladio's architecture reflected a Neoclassic taste for the rich, yet severe style of Palladio's buildings. His architecture was considered normative in Venetia, England, and even Russia. Today, 200 years later, no practicing architect or aspiring patron would look to Palladio for inspiration; he has become the preserve of scholars.

The republication of Bertotti Scamozzi's corpus is a case in point. The original work, in four volumes, was one of the handsomest productions of northern Italy's printing presses. It was reissued in 1796 in four quarto volumes, still a very handsome book. Now it has been reissued a third time, in a form that would affront the gentlemen and architects who revered Palladio's work, but is sufficient to content the scholar. It is a one-volume, anastatic reprint of the 1796 edition, marked with all the sins of modern reprints that have made them anathema to bibliophiles and an imposition to bibliographers. The type is broken, the plates are muddy, and as an object it is simply unpleasant. It has a new title page, a new general index, and a ten-page introduction by a modern writer that succinctly compiles what is known and generally agreed about the architect today. The introduction offers no novelties, except perhaps the unargued and unpersuasive suggestion that such mannerism as we may detect in Palladio's architecture was the result of the frustrations of

old age—was a sort of petulance. Essentially, however, the book is the book Bertotti Scamozzi wrote and no more. Even so, it is a most useful addition to the architectural historian's shelf. The original publication can no longer be found at reasonable prices, and yet it remains the essential tool for every serious student of Palladio's work, since it illustrates in fairly accurate measured drawings every building Palladio built and a large number of the Palladian buildings of his time that have been attributed to him.

It goes without saying that the resolution of detail in the plates of the reprint is less good than in the original engravings. The loss of transparency in the darks, which is inherent in the process, swallows detail in many places, and creates excessively black shadows that eat into the margins of adjoining light areas. Scholars who wish to read measurements from Bertotti Scamozzi's drawings, thus, are still best advised to consult the original engravings. In time, even these will become outdated. The Italian Centro Internazionale di Studi Architettura Andrea Palladio has begun publication of a *Corpus Palladianum*, intended to run eventually to twenty-six volumes. Each will illustrate new measured drawings of Palladio's certain works that will obey a much higher standard of accuracy than those of Bertotti Scamozzi. Two have already appeared.

Until the *Corpus* is completed, however, Bertotti Scamozzi's work will remain the indispensable repertoire of plates, and the Architectural Book Publishing Company has brought it to us in a form that is within the reach of all serious students, and that serves all immediate reference purposes.

JUERGEN SCHULZ
Brown University

David Watkin, *Thomas Hope and the Neoclassical Idea*, London: John Murray, 1968, 316 pp., illus., 63s.

The art of the eighteenth century and in particular Neoclassicism has recently begun to receive the attention it deserves. What was previously brushed aside as cold, servile copying of the antique—the final ossification of the long-dead Baroque tradition—is now seen to be a period of contradiction, complexity, contrast, and great originality. Recent studies include David Irwin's *English Neoclassical Art*, Robert

Rosenblum's *Transformations in Late Eighteenth Century Art*, and Hugh Honour's *Neoclassicism*. Plans for the Council of Europe's 1972 exhibition on Neoclassicism are now in progress, promising an opportunity for a massive reexamination of the subject in visual terms.

David Watkin's book on Thomas Hope commands an important place in this recent revival of interest. Hope (1769–1831) was a central figure in the formation of Regency taste and in his own activities and interests we have a microcosm of the Neoclassical movement.

Born in 1769 into a family of wealthy Amsterdam bankers of Scottish origin and motivated by a strong desire to gain a place in English society, Hope's interests encompassed all the arts: architecture, painting, sculpture, costume design, furniture design, literature. At his town house in Duchess Street, London, and his picturesque country seat, The Deepdene near Dorking in Surrey, he created interiors to his unique taste. Watkin considers Hope and his myriad activities in depth from his important connection with the Greek Revival at Downing College Cambridge, the conception and creation of his own two houses, to his activities as a collector and patron, and as the author of *Household Furniture and Interior Decoration* (1807) and *Designs of Modern Costume* (1812). In reflecting Hope against the background of his time Watkin gives excellent accounts of, for instance, the early history of the Greek Revival in Britain and the theory of the Picturesque. His appendix chronology of the earliest examples of the Greek Doric order in England, France, and Germany in the eighteenth century settles many disputes and in itself makes the book indispensable for anyone studying Neoclassical architecture. (He does, however, get the date of the Doric columns at Castle Goring, Sussex, wrong. He dates these ca. 1791, admittedly tentatively, but recent research shows they cannot be before about 1808.)

In short, Hope is a superb subject and Watkin's book does him full justice. One hopes such a study will stimulate architectural historians to venture further afield in the future and examine patrons and tastemakers as fully as architects and buildings.

SANDRA MILLIKIN
Royal Institute of
British Architects