ibility of reliance on select precedents" (p. 154); some designs (Eastover; the McCormick estate) drew too heavily on a single historical model; and the work of the 1920s depended too much on "his old answers" (p. 160).

Jencks rightly concludes that both Platt and Morgan are men of "sensible opinions" (p. xii), but I think Morgan misinterprets (p. 2) Thomas Tallmadge's 1927 comment on Platt: "... by 1910 houses had all improved to a point beyond which they have been able to go very little farther. ... The work done today shows little or no improvement on the work that Charles Platt, Delano and Aldrich, Albro and Lindeberg, and Howard Shaw did fifteen to twenty years ago" (Thomas E. Tallmadge, The Story of Architecture in America, New York, 1927, p. 268). Rather than suggesting the decline of Platt's reputation in the 1920s, Tallmadge was in fact arguing that the excellent houses of Platt and his peers around 1910 had not been surpassed by any recent residences.

One of the book's weaknesses is the lack of clarity in defining the architect-client relationship. Morgan writes that Platt "inspired in his clients' complete confidence in his total control of each commission" (p. 78), yet he also states that "the intentions of the patron' strongly influenced the choice of historical style (p. 104). Moreover, Platt is said to have designed with the interests and social position of his clients in mind: we are often told that his clients had high incomes and social status, yet the evidence is not laid out systematically so that we too can judge their financial and social status. Furthermore, it is sometimes said why a colonial design was appropriate for a particular client (a collector of antiques; a writer on the 18th century), but the connection between the design and the client's interests often is obscure. Did Sara and Franklin Roosevelt's interest in history and genealogy influence the design of their New York town houses? What was the nature of Thomas Cochran's "patriotic idealism"? (p. 191) in commissioning colonial revival buildings at Phillips Academy, Andover? In Morgan's defense, however, it should be said that little correspondence between Platt and his clients survives.

According to Morgan, Platt was selected to develop a wide-ranging plan for Andover because he was reputed to be "the country's best colonial revival architect" (p. 184). There are references to the colonial revival scattered throughout the book, but I missed any sustained discussion of Platt's relation to the revival, even though the influence of Italy is spelled out in some detail, as are Platt's differences with the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and the Gothic Revival. In one case Morgan greatly oversimplifies by writing that Platt "derived his philosophy of domestic architecture from a study of the Renaissance villa" (p. 130). His extensive use of colonial and Federal forms in country and city houses (beginning with his own Cornish house, 1890-1912) is not related to earlier colonial revivalists. Sometimes we are informed why clients wanted a colonial design, but we never quite understand why Platt admired the colonial.

Morgan thinks that Platt (whose mother was a Connecticut Cheney) inherited the "simplicity and restraint" (p. 85) of the Cheney family's character—should we believe then that he also inherited a taste for colonial architecture? Or was he drawn to the simplicity and economy of the colonial, combined with its classical roots? Or did its appeal have something to do with regionalism? Morgan proposes on the one hand that Platt "only rarely used local building materials or suggested a regional historical pattern in his buildings" (p. 69), while on the other he indicates just such patterns in several specific buildings (pp. 29, 128, 183) and the general tendency for brick Georgian houses to be located in the East "perhaps due to a sense of regional appropriateness" (p. 104). Like Royal Cortissoz, Morgan seems to prefer the Italian-derived designs as more complete expressions of Platt's pure taste, and so he slighted the role of the colonial revival.

In a few instances our wish for additional analysis or information (for example, a list of book and periodical references to Platt) is partly met by footnotes referring us to Morgan's 1978 dissertation. Our frustration at having to turn to the dissertation is not so strong, however, as our gratitude that the Architectural History Foundation has seen fit, through this very good book, to lift a major American architect out of undeserved obscurity.

WILLIAM B. RHoads
State University of New York College at New Paltz


It will never be a best-seller, but Tatman and Moss's directory of Philadelphia architects may inspire a new level of sophistication in exploiting research tools for local and regional architectural history in the United States. Theirs is the third compendium of city architects in North America, after similar directories of architects in New York City and Quebec City, and in terms of complexity and information it is the most impressive of the three. It covers more than 1,200 architects who worked in Philadelphia from the early 18th century to around 1930. The list of architects and their works was culled from the collection of one million items in The Athenaeum in Philadelphia. Moss and Tatman, who are the librarian and architectural curator, respectively, of that elegant and learned institution, worked for four years on the project. Financial support came from The Athenaeum itself and from the Tools Program of the National Endowment for the Humanities. As the editors claim with pleasure, 90 percent of the information here has never been published. Their principal sources were newspapers, blueprints and drawings, office records, and archival material in the University of Pennsylvania. As news of the project got around, descendants of certain Philadelphia architects gave or sold a quantity of drawings and documents to The Athenaeum, so the project not only recorded architectural history, but made it.

The result is a treasure trove for the architectural history of Philadelphia, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware and a major help for research elsewhere in the country. For each architect, the dictionary includes a well-written career summary, a list of works (not flawless, but generally quite accurate), locations of drawings and office records, and bibliographic sources. The dictionary provides the most complete listing available for the works of such nationally prominent designers as Frank Furness, Thomas Walter, John Notman, John
Haviland, William Strickland, George Howe, Horace Trumbauer, Theophilus Chandler, John McArthur, Samuel Sloan, Wilson Eyre, and Isaac Hobbs. William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Robert Mills, and Joseph-Jacques Ramée also appear in brief entries on their careers while they were residents of Philadelphia. The heroes of the book, however, turn out not to be the national stars of the profession but the sturdy foot soldiers: the architects of modest reputation whose restaurants, apartment houses, and churches make up the overall fabric of Philadelphia's streetscapes. Here certain patterns of information emerge that go beyond particular buildings to the wider city. We find William Hoffman and Paul Henon building about 50 movie theaters in the 1920s and 1930s, while other architects specialized in row houses, American Legion halls, or gas stations. Even certain patterns of patronage become evident, such as the dozens of houses in different areas of Philadelphia that one Andrew D. Cash ordered from Thomas Walter from the 1830s through the 1850s.

These last examples show how a fairly banal list can yield surprising results. Were it properly cross-indexed, one could use the book to compile a list of Philadelphia building types, to trace the growth of suburban neighborhoods, or to determine patterns of investment by building speculators. Unfortunately, the Biographical Dictionary is totally lacking in cross-indexing. It was sacrificed, the editors tell us, along with source references for each job and an introductory essay on the Philadelphia school. These are all significant losses, but the absence of even a simple index is an especially serious handicap for scholars wishing to use the book. My own research on the urban history of Pittsburgh required several days digging in Tatman and Moss to ferret out Pittsburgh buildings by Philadelphia architects. I discovered about 100 buildings, nearly all of which had previously been unattributed to any architects—a worthwhile find, but at an absurd price. A second volume of indices may be produced later, the editors say, but it would have been simpler, cheaper, and more effective to supplement or even to replace the present volume with a set of floppy diskettes and let users cross-index the book for themselves. The Biographical Dictionary is a fine compendium of information, but it is not a real book; if ever a case could be made for replacing books with data bases, this is it.

FRANKLIN TOKER
University of Pittsburgh


Known to all those interested in American architecture as the accomplished and pioneering designer of the Bank of Pennsylvania, the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Baltimore, the Hall of Representatives (and other parts of the national Capitol), and as the engineer responsible for the Philadelphia Waterworks, Benjamin Henry Latrobe (1764–1820) was also a tireless traveler, a dedicated diarist, an inquisitive naturalist, and, as this volume amply indicates, a draftsman and watercolorist of more than passing interest.

Latrobe was an architect and an engineer, but the drawings and watercolors that date from his years in America (1795–1820) cover a much wider range of subjects than we might have expected. He drew and painted homes and public buildings, towns and cities, all to be expected of an architect, and bridges, lighthouses, and roadways that must have excited him as an engineer. But, equally important to Latrobe and actually predominating in both his sketches and finished studies, are landscapes, genre scenes, and detailed scientific studies of fauna and flora. The varied subjects have been classified in Carter's introductory essay as the landscape, man and man's work in the landscape, accounts of daily life or genre, and natural history (botany, zoology, and genealogy). Latrobe's quality is uneven and, not surprisingly for an architect/engineer, his figural studies reveal his lack of purely artistic training. Nonetheless, even the genre pieces are valuable in providing documentation of the era and its people.

The actual format of the book is divided into four unequal parts. Carter's brief but excellent essay is itself divided between a biography and an analysis of Latrobe as a traveler, diarist, and naturalist. It succinctly discusses his importance as an architect and engineer and makes a strong case for Latrobe's premier position as a traveler/commentator. Brownell's somewhat larger essay is a thorough and pointed study of Latrobe's drawings (including watercolors). He, too, divides his essay into parts, starting with a brief description of Latrobe's process and concluding with brief comments on his evolution as an artist and on his place in the history of American graphics.

The bulk of Brownell's essay, and the important critical contribution of the book, is a discussion of Latrobe's work in terms of a tripartite division between "the Picturesque, the Neoclassical, and the Sublime," categories that the author finds relevant to Latrobe's architectural projects as well as to his art. Brownell is successful in documenting the Neoclassical influence, particularly that of John Flaxman, and in raising the issues of the Picturesque and the Sublime, but he is less convincing when he tries to indicate the relationship between the latter two forces and Naturalism. Also, he asks for an act of faith in accepting his conclusion that Latrobe exercised a double standard of fidelity. Brownell might indeed be correct in his opinion that the existence of two differing views of the same subject and the deviation from fact in one of them is to be understood in terms of the artist's intent to draw one as a mere site record and the other as a Picturesque composition. He does not, however, convince us of the correctness of this