us say no more about the Mafia-like bands of Italian architects, but: “Germans as a whole came to be despised as incapable of exercising intelligence of self-restraint” (p. 13). This may have been believed in some circles, but Guicciardini much admired the German soldiery. These kinds of statements should be located somehow. Elsewhere Duffy says of French Protestants: “From there (Lyons) a host of heretical townships, with their stark and smelly little chapels, extended ... through Languedoc” (p. 107). I don’t understand this line for a number of reasons, not the least of which is my general impression that Protestants tended to take over Catholic churches, whitewash them and punch out the stained glass.

Perhaps all Germans came to be despised by the mid-16th century. (At least we should be told the name of someone who said it.) Perhaps, too, the most obscene language of the “soldier’s home” is novelistic license? Duffy gives no special signs of being, personally, a racist or a mad bomber and yet, for me, his descriptions and characterizations step just over the line into a kind of parody of war. Military history broadly and military architectural history in particular have at times suffered from the old soldier fancy and in this respect Duffy’s book does the field no good.

The second book under review is quite different. It is a trilingual dictionary (German, French, and English) and part of a series. (Already published are: 1) Burgen und Feste Plätze 2) Literarische Geräte, Kreuze und Reliquiare der christlichen Kirchen 3) Bogen und Arkaden 4) Paramente und Bücher der christlichen Kirchen 5) Treppen und Rampen 6) Gewölbe und Kuppeln.) In preparation are: 8) Das Baudenkmal 9) Bauernhäuser und Fachwerkbauten.) All definitions are given in German and there is an index in the three languages that allows one to find equivalents and the main definition. It is an excellent idea, essential for translators, useful for students and scholars. No dictionary I know of could give conveniently the German or French for “approach trench,” “artillery rampart,” “river-barrage,” and “hollow traverse.” Dictionaries of this sort are notably hard to check, of course, but in my use of it I have found no errors. Collaborating with the authors were Quentin Hughes, Hellmut Pfliger, and Philippe Truttman.

There are some limitations. It is to be regretted that the editors of the series did not choose to include Italian or Latin. In the field of fortifications, particularly, so many words have their origin in these languages, and, given the historical importance of Italian architects and military engineers it would have been helpful to have included a fourth language, at least.

Since the definitions of the terms are only given in German, many readers may turn to the illustrations for help. This presents a problem. The great tradition of Duden books with their clear line drawings and multilingual keys seems to have been forgotten. There are a number of cases where a reader may end up with the word in English, French, and German but have no idea what it means for the illustration provides no clue. (See, for example, “Kernwerk” or “reduit,” p. 67; “Auschlussbatterie” or “annexed battery,” p. 54, fig. 54; “Ausfalltor” or “sally port,” p. 42, fig. 43.) More and better illustrations drawn for the book would have been useful.

More problematic, but no less important is the fact that fortification terminology is not, by any means, a fixed matter. The dictionary is stronger as a descriptive rather than as a historical tool. A word as simple as “bastion” (p. 30) is thought to be understood by all. But in Italian at least, bastions are not always what we think of as bastions. A note in the Archivio di Stato, Siena refers to a plan by Baldassare Peruzzi, ca. 1529, to put “bastioni a tutte le porte” (“bastions at all the doors”). Now it is clear from all other material that no such plan was ever envisaged. What was done was to put bastions at some of the doors, cut new embrasures at others, re-point the brick work in other locations—in short, to redefine the walls and the doors. This point is supported by Angelo Angelucci, Documenti inediti per la storia delle armi da fuoco italiani, Turin, 1869, p. 301, note 187, who says quite simply that to build bastions—“bastonare”—does not always mean making what we would call bastions. Granted that my sources are Italian and the dictionary has concerned itself with three other languages and cultures, I cannot believe that it was only in Italy that such variations occurred. Still, one can not do everything and as a descriptive tool for specific arguments this dictionary is far more useful than, say, the Pevsner-Hourican Pelican Dictionary of Architecture.

Nicholas Adams
Lehigh University

The Building of Renaissance Florence, an important book for interdisciplinary Renaissance learning, is a synthesis of rich material accumulated from his earlier studies and from widely scattered published and unpublished sources and documents used by Goldthwaite for further research. It is formulated along the lines of classic economic theory, namely supply and demand. Part I deals with Demand, synonymous with patronage, and Part II deals with Supply, synonymous with the construction industry that existed to satisfy the demand of wealthy patrons for new buildings. The buildings themselves are not treated by Goldthwaite, and are not meant to be treated as art objects, questions of architectural style are not considered in detail, and the Renaissance in art is explained chiefly in economic terms. The book is, and is indeed subtitled, an economic and social history in which the author’s intentions include tracing “the process by which money was channelled into the economy by way of the construction industry,” describing the complex development of that industry in Florence, and investigating the “phenomenon of conspicuous consumption as the wider context in which architecture, in the final analysis, must be seen.”

The Introduction is a survey of building activity in Florence and of the architectural development of the city from the 13th through the 16th centuries. Since this subject is covered in myriad studies of Florence, Goldthwaite wisely keeps his survey brief and uses it to underscore his interest in the dramatic extent of the demand for new buildings and in the enormous wealth available to be spent on their construction. The sources of that wealth, and the economic situation in Renaissance Florence that permitted prodigious and conspicuous spending on luxury goods and private building, are among the subjects discussed in the two chapters of Part I (“Demand: the Patrons”). Goldthwaite admits that his interpretation of the economic situation in Chapter One, “The Werewithal to Spend: The Economic Background,” is “highly tentative.” Although the author’s thesis must be left to an economic historian to assess, it can be summarized as follows: the vast sums spent on building and art in 15th-century Florence were made possible by an economy of exceptional health flourishing in an atmosphere of political stability; the strength of both the cloth industry and the commercial and banking sector provided the economy with its powerful center; confidence in this economy was expressed by the huge sums invested in luxury arts; those investments encouraged the development of a luxury arts sector of the economy that was able to meet all the demands made on it, so no wealth was lost to foreign markets for luxury goods; a demand for increasingly skilled craftsmen to produce the luxury goods meant an investment in the “most basic factor of production—human capital itself,” and “in the final analysis, this is what the Renaissance was about.” The Florentine economy of the 15th

RICHARD A. GOLDTHWAITE

Richard A. Goldthwaite’s interest in Florentine Renaissance architecture developed out of his studies of the private wealth of Florentine families in the 15th century. While examining account books belonging to important merchant and banking families, he became aware of the extent of expenditures for family-sponsored architectural projects, notably in the case of the Strozzi and their monumental palace. He thus began to apply his skills as an economic historian and interpreter of documents to the exploration of familial and institutional patronage, building accounts, construction practices, and the social function of the great palaces of early Renaissance Florence.

Richard A. Goldthwaite’s The Building of Renaissance Florence, an Economic and Social History, is an important book for interdisciplinary Renaissance learning, is a synthesis of rich material accumulated from his earlier studies and from widely scattered published and unpublished sources and documents used by Goldthwaite for further research. It is formulated along the lines of classic economic theory, namely supply and demand. Part I deals with Demand, synonymous with patronage, and Part II deals with Supply, synonymous with the construction industry that existed to satisfy the demand of wealthy patrons for new buildings. The buildings themselves are not treated by Goldthwaite, and are not meant to be treated as art objects, questions of architectural style are not considered in detail, and the Renaissance in art is explained chiefly in economic terms. The book is, and is indeed subtitled, an economic and social history in which the author’s intentions include tracing “the process by which money was channelled into the economy by way of the construction industry,” describing the complex development of that industry in Florence, and investigating the “phenomenon of conspicuous consumption as the wider context in which architecture, in the final analysis, must be seen.”

The Introduction is a survey of building activity in Florence and of the architectural development of the city from the 13th through the 16th centuries. Since this subject is covered in myriad studies of Florence, Goldthwaite wisely keeps his survey brief and uses it to underscore his interest in the dramatic extent of the demand for new buildings and in the enormous wealth available to be spent on their construction. The sources of that wealth, and the economic situation in Renaissance Florence that permitted prodigious and conspicuous spending on luxury goods and private building, are among the subjects discussed in the two chapters of Part I (“Demand: the Patrons”). Goldthwaite admits that his interpretation of the economic situation in Chapter One, “The Werewithal to Spend: The Economic Background,” is “highly tentative.” Although the author’s thesis must be left to an economic historian to assess, it can be summarized as follows: the vast sums spent on building and art in 15th-century Florence were made possible by an economy of exceptional health flourishing in an atmosphere of political stability; the strength of both the cloth industry and the commercial and banking sector provided the economy with its powerful center; confidence in this economy was expressed by the huge sums invested in luxury arts; those investments encouraged the development of a luxury arts sector of the economy that was able to meet all the demands made on it, so no wealth was lost to foreign markets for luxury goods; a demand for increasingly skilled craftsmen to produce the luxury goods meant an investment in the “most basic factor of production—human capital itself,” and “in the final analysis, this is what the Renaissance was about.” The Florentine economy of the 15th
century is a difficult subject, and the author’s controversial interpretation substantially conflicts, as he acknowledges, with the idea held by a number of political historians of an economy far from buoyant, essentially static, and drained by taxation for military purposes.

Chapter Two in Part I, “The Reasons for Building: Needs and Taste,” closes the portion of the book devoted to Demand. It is an informative essay about Florentine building as an expression of civic pride and patronus status, and about the social function of palaces, with material gathered from Goldthwaite’s previous studies and from recent extensive historical and art historical literature on Medieval and Renaissance Florence. No new theories about patronage, palaces, or Florentine urbanism are advanced, and ideas about those subjects, which have already been scrutinized by others, are inevitably repeated. To architectural historians who specialize in Renaissance studies, the material may seem familiar, but this is a minor objection and does not constitute a serious impediment to an appreciation of Goldthwaite’s ability to provide a good summary of secular architecture in context, and of his mastery at assimilation and synthesis.

Part II (“Supply”) consists of a staggering amount of information about Renaissance construction practices, labor, and the economics of building, compiled by Goldthwaite from documents and from the data that has proliferated on many aspects of this subject. Skillfully integrating a wide range of examples taken from both published and unpublished documents (frequently building accounts) as well as secondary sources, he has produced the first systematic study of the economics of the building industry during the Renaissance. This portion of the book could exist independently, as a companion to specialized studies elucidating features of Florentine economic history, industry, and accounting practices from roughly 1300 to 1550. Tables, graphs, and charts accompany this part of the text, which also includes a long section on bricks, lime, and kilns, that could be regarded as a “book-within-the-book.” Covering labor contracts, materials, guilds, craft guilds in countries other than Italy, wages, employment records, and the practice of architecture, inter alia, in five chapters, 19 subsections, and 12 sub-subsections, Part II is a substantive handbook on the building industry in Renaissance Florence that will have to be the starting point for any new studies in this area, and it is an admirable demonstration of Goldthwaite’s command of this kind of material.

Chapter Seven in Part II represents Goldthwaite’s contribution to a growing literature on one of the most interesting but elusive questions in Italian studies—the nature of the profession and practice of architecture in the Renaissance, particularly in the 15th century. In the short introductory section of this chapter, “Antecedents,” the author does not sufficiently credit the technical and artistic richness of Renaissance buildings, or the esteem as architects, whether they were called architects or not, in which the designers of those buildings were held by their contemporaries. This is a small protest, however, as the 14th century is not the focus of the book. Those portions of the chapter that deal with the training and employment of architects in the 15th century, and especially with the function of architectural drawings and wood models in the practice of architecture, contain important insights that go a long way towards answering questions that have vexed this subject. Goldthwaite persuasively traces the development of drawings and models as the “language” with which the Renaissance architect was able to communicate his ideas to both client and builder to a degree never achieved before the quattrocento. By using two pivots on which the arguments of the book eventually turn—the increase in demand for work, and the increase in critical artistic and technical judgment by patrons—he describes how the professional status of an architect progressed beyond that of mason-builder and craftsman. While this is not a new revelation to students of Renaissance culture, readers will appreciate the way in which Goldthwaite develops the thesis by examining the history of the craft tradition in Florence, the origin of the design talent of architects in their training in other arts, and of greatest interest, the importance of their conquest of the new science of fortification architecture for the advancement of their status in the profession.

The concluding chapter, “Results: Art and Architecture as Investment,” is a reprise of Goldthwaite’s ideas about the effect of building and decoration on the economy, and a summary of his view, as an economist, of Renaissance art: Florence was a marketplace catering to the desire of the wealthy for luxurious things; art was the dynamic production of high quality goods made by craftsmen in response to the intense “demand” and to the competitive environment for artistic commissions in Florence; and the individualism, self-esteem, high status, and new dignity of the artist that are associated with the Renaissance resulted from the appreciation of artistic talent by discerning consumers. He concludes that the movement of wealth through the art market was the force that generated the Renaissance.

Argued with clarity and authority, and supported by a mass of material, Goldthwaite’s interpretation is restricted to the idea of art as consumerism, and art objects as luxurious “extras” ordered from craftsmen by rich people to set themselves apart. While this may be appropriate for a study of the economics of the building industry, as this book primarily is, the author’s thesis will require eventually the kind of broadening and modification that come from taking into account other facets of Renaissance art and the conditions—socio-aesthetic and humanistic—that produced it.

The Conclusion is followed by five brief appendices with information about the value of the florin, guild statutes, workers’ wages, the price of meat, and illustrations depicting construction activity. The book provides an unexpected bonus in the illustrations, often overlooked details and backgrounds from larger works, that graphically and even charmingly depict working procedures and building materials used in the construction industry.

The greatest strength of The Building of Renaissance Florence lies in the extraordinary wealth of wide-ranging detailed information—of interest to specialists, scholars, and to lay readers—collated within a valuable study of the Florentine construction industry. The book will be most useful, in terms of further study, to historians interested in the economics of Renaissance building trades. Historians of art and architecture will not fail to respect it, and to discover in it, as they have in Goldthwaite’s other writings, ideas of value, and information of unquestionable importance with which to complement their understanding of the complexities of Renaissance secular architecture within the context of Renaissance society.

Isabelle Hyman
New York University

JAN VREDEMAN DE VRIES, Variae Architecturae Formae (Diverses formes d’architecture), Amsterdam: Van Hoeve, 1979, 49 illus. + small presentation fascicule in English and Dutch. $60.00.

The Van Hoeve editions of Amsterdam have fortunately undertaken to reissue in facsimile the work which was published in Antwerp before 1601 by Theodore Galle, after the projects of Jan Vredeman de Vries. The copy preserved in the Cabinet des Estampes in Antwerp served as model. In this Antwerp edition, there are 64 plates; the last 15, of an entirely different style, are not numbered (except in ink). These 15 plates have not been reproduced.

The 49 engravings comprising the present reissue are very different from the illustrations of the architectural books of other 16th-century artists, who are more concerned with details and with proportions. Vredeman de Vries is an innovator; he presents his models in a view of the ensemble which announces the modern idea of urbanism. It is therefore natural that his engravings have particularly influenced the conception of public building and of the city in all the towns bordering on the North Sea. Vrede- man himself collaborated in the construction of the city hall of Antwerp, built in 1562 under the direction of Corneille de Vriendt called Floris.

Because of the perspective views, Jan Vrede- man de Vries has made his art accessible to all; his engravings are perfectly understood by painters (he himself was a painter and maker of