cock's more exclusively formal analyses and descriptions present to us. In the discussion of architecture in Saxon, for example, attention might well be directed to such matters as the Elector August's connections with the humanist Rüvis, the translator of Vitruvius, or to Gabriel Kalmendarck's advice on a Kunstskammer, or to other cultural contacts between Dresden and the Italian courts, from which many works of art flowed north. These concerns might have helped explicate the change in Saxon architectural patronage to a newer Italianate mode that is explained by Hitchcock (266ff.) only by reference to architectural precedents in Dresden and Augustusburg which do not seem close in design.

To judge from a formulation that Hitchcock uses, such observations might have seemed "hypothetical" to the author but are surely no less so than his own interpretative hypothesis that presents facts, dates, and descriptions, and accounts for stylistic change by visual comparisons, in a positivist narration that also implies an hypothesis about history. Admittedly, only a meager stock of concepts exists for dealing with problems of style in German art of the later 16th and early 17th century. Hitchcock's use of misleading terms such as "Manierism" and "Baroque" indicates that there is hardly even an adequate terminology for the stylistic phenomena of this era.

Nevertheless, there are several clues as to where historians can start to look for another approach to German architecture. Rüvis' translation and commentary on Vitruvius indicates that by mid-century Italianate ideas of decorum were also present in the intellectual world of Germany. Zimmer's study of the Augsburg Rathaus shows that these ideas were applied to architecture by the early 17th century. When at this time Joseph Heintz spoke of the decoration of the Neuburg Hofkirche, he did not use any of the language of architectural analysis that is employed by Hitchcock, but rather echoed the language of the rhetorical instruction he had received. He spoke of both the architecture and decoration of the church as "middle-style" (mittelmessig, as opposed to staatlich or schlecht) (see Jürgen Zimmer, Hofkirche und Rathaus in Neuburg a.d. Donau, Neuburg a.d.D., 1971, 87). A task for future scholarship is to determine what sorts of stylistic constraints led him to apply this particular stylistic discrimination to this building.


Thomas Dacosta Kaufmann
Princeton University


This is the most thoroughly researched and painstakingly documented work which has come to my attention in a long time. It records the material history of Lynchburg, Virginia, from 1752 until 1980—decade by decade after 1790—and supports that history with selective descriptions of the changing social and economic patterns which demanded, permitted, altered and demolished the city's built environment. Mr. Chambers is objectively catholic in his coverage, presenting the full spectrum of building types from tobacco factories to religious and civic monuments, and planning projects from reservoirs to shopping centers. That the majority of examples are residential is not surprising, or out of proportion, for the majority of buildings erected were residential, and the tides of taste, or reaction, were most sharply delineated in residential design. The illustrations of Lynchburg are in excellent relation to the text, and are what illustrations should always be, and frequently are not: illustrative of the subject being considered. The author's thorough research is nowhere better demonstrated than in the number and quality of the photographs, lithographs, woodcuts and maps with which his descriptions are visually documented. The quality of the publication, throughout, is unusually good including typography, lay-out, reproductions and textual organization.

Despite all of these excellent qualities, the book, as a whole, fails to hold the attention of the non-Lynchburg reader. Granted that it was primarily intended to record local material history, its focus is so parochial that the broader significance of Lynchburg's response to national, or international, trends in architecture is lost in a welter of specific local detail. The work is more of a catalogue—perhaps catalogue raisonné would be a fairer description—than a history. The reasons for this approach are explained by the last chapter, "Chapter XIX, Preservation," and by the aims of the organization which sponsored the book's publication, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities. However, it is regrettable that the exhaustive research which Mr. Chambers has done could not have resulted in a more generally significant and meaningful work.

Harold N. Coolege, Jr.
Clemson University


Ruskinian Gothic throws into vivid relief the problems of establishing architectural influence and of reconciling it with genuine originality, particularly when that influence is transmitted mainly through theoretical writings as John Ruskin's was. What forms can such influence take, and how does one differentiate among them? I submit that there are three basic types. The most obvious kind, the sort Ruskin claimed when he caricatured himself as a "respectable man-milliner" who recommends "the newest and sweetest thing in pinnacles," is that of suggesting stylistic motifs which un inventive architects then treat like copybook details. (Yet original designers may also borrow such materials.) Another type results from direct contact between theorist and student, through patronage, friendship, or collaboration, as evidenced in Ruskin's famous association with the illust re Oxford Museum project. The most significant kind, however, is that exerted through seminal works which revise modes of perception. Of Ruskin's Modern Painters, the novelist Charlotte Brontë said, "This book gives me eyes." The Seven Lamps of Architecture (1849) and The Stones of Venice (185 I-1853) must have had similar impact, enabling buildings to be viewed in new ways, their vocabulary of forms rethought, the effects of abstract elements like texture, color, and light freshly appreciated. Such enriched perception may well have been Ruskin's most important legacy, though it is also the hardest to document, especially since many of his ideas had been articulated earlier by less eloquent men. All these forms of influence operated in what Eve Blau aptly calls "the fascinating looking-glass world of Victorian architectural borrowing." But she has trouble deciding in this provocative study how they affected Benjamin Woodward.

Though Thomas Deane had since the 1820s enjoyed a prosperous Irish practice, it was not until about 1845 when Benjamin Woodward joined his office that the firm's designs became predominantly Gothic. The young Woodward, passionately committed to medieval art, would, in Blau's authorial view, make the firm "the earliest significant exponents of Ruskin's