as a reference work, not to be read, but to be treated as a cyclopedia or a dictionary. One can only digest small portions of this book at a time. Still, despite all criticism, Dohai's work is the most important in its field. It is an absolute must for everyone interested in the history of British art, aesthetics, and thought. In the foreseeable future, there will be no substitute for this unique work of devoted scholarship.

Gerhard Charles Rump
Kunsthistorisches Institut
der Universität Bonn


Of all American architectural journals between 1911 and 1925, The Western Architect of Minneapolis, under the editorship of Robert Craig McLean and with the advice of William Gray Purcell, was the most consistent supporter of the Prairie School. The importance of The Western Architect (1900–1937) combined with its rarity has made it a prime candidate for reprinting. This has been undertaken by H. Allen Brooks, the acknowledged authority on the Prairie School, and the University of Toronto Press, selecting the more important material to put in book form.

Included are articles on the work of Walter Burley Griffin, Purcell, Feick & Elmslie, Purcell & Elmslie, George W. Maher, Spenser & Powers, Guenzel & Drummond, John S. Van Bergen, Tallmadge & Watson, Barry Byrne; and on the Merchants Bank of Grinnell, Iowa, by Louis Sullivan, and the Woodbury County Courthouse in Sioux City, Iowa, by William Steele and Purcell & Elmslie. Frank Lloyd Wright is limited to a small pictorial article on his City National Bank and Hotel in Mason City, Iowa, and a short memoir on Sullivan. To this material, Brooks has added a short introduction and a brief biographical sketch on the architects.

Naturally, there will be some quibbles with the written works Brooks has chosen. Basically, he has included all the major articles on Prairie School architects and the more lengthy accounts of individual buildings, excluding those that appeared in scattered issues on only a page or two. That the 1913 article with plans and views of Wright's Taliesin is missing is unfortunate, since it is the later Taliesin with inaccurate and misdated plans and photographs that inevitably appears. Wright's relative absence, though, is the fault of Robert McLean, who early developed a personal and professional enmity toward him. Of all the major Prairie School figures, only Wright did not receive a survey of his work in The Western Architect. Other omissions by Brooks that could be questioned are scattered buildings by major figures and some of those by lesser figures outside the immediate orbit of the Prairie School, but indicating its influence, such as Trost & Trost, C. J. Wolfe, and Parker Berry. Also several works by the younger generation, John Lloyd Wright and Bruce Goff, are noted in the introduction, but not reprinted.

In addition to the buildings republished, scholars and enthusiasts will welcome the articles themselves, filled with the polemics of the period. Purcell was the most prolific contributor, writing on his own work, and also on Griffin and Spenser & Powers. All of the writers adopt the mystical stance of Sullivan and the relation of democracy to architecture, or as is stated by Maher: "The progressive movement in architecture is nothing more or less than the simple advancement of architectural thought keeping pace with the thoughts and lives of society to whom it ministers and democratic architecture is the result."

More important is the quality of the physical package. Handsomely bound on good quality stock, it is an elegant production. The photographs, however, are another matter. Some loss of sharpness in halftone photographs is to be expected, especially when reducing from 10 x 9 1/4 to a 15 x 10 1/4" format. Unfortunately, a consistent quality control has not been maintained; numerous photographs are blurred or have been washed out. In general, the typeface and drawings are well produced, though there are instances of a shift in intensity within a single page. These are serious detriments, yet they are only too common in most republishing efforts. Still, this is an important book, and the University of Toronto Press is to be commended. Clearly, such reprints need to be supported, not only for the Prairie School, but for a much wider area.

Richard Guy Wilson
Iowa State University


Shortly before his suicide in 1667, Borromini took the architectural drawings which he had set aside for publication and burned them. Yet he conducted the operation with less than his usual thoroughness, and allowed an extraordinary graphic testament to survive. Between five and six hundred drawings passed from the hands of the architect's nephew into the 324-volume topographical atlas assembled by Philipp von Stosch in the early eighteenth century, and from there in 1768 into the Vienna Hofbibliothek and later into the Albertina. Friedrich von Bartsch once toyed with the idea of giving the atlas away, but eventually settled for soaking the drawings off their mounts and for a thorough job of miscataloguing. Pollak and Hempel both grappled with the vast mass of unpublished material in Vienna, and Egger envisaged a full catalogue, but Thelen's goal is even more ambitious: to reunite all known Borromini drawings into a single critical corpus, of which the volumes under review comprise the first and smallest installment. Eighty-five drawings (seventy-one in the Albertina, six in Windsor, five in Berlin, two in the Uffizi, and one in the Vatican) cover the early period from Borromini's arrival in Rome in 1619 to the beginning of his independent career as architect of the Sapienza in 1632. They are arranged chronologically, with some concession to the principle of grouping studies for the same project together. The difficulties of reproducing faint graphite lines are overcome in superb full-sized facsimiles which are sometimes more legible than the originals, and which possibly convey a warmer, more parchment-like tone. Thelen himself apologizes for the two unsuccessful color plates (c. 15, 38), and for the reproduction of one lost drawing from an old photograph (c. 23). He deplores all inscriptions and with a graphologist's assurance identifies the handwriting of Maderno, the nephew Bernardo, Stosch, and Bartsch; he dates the architect's own script down to the decade (c. 6, 75–82).

Thelen plans two further installments of the Corpus. One will treat the period between 1632 and 1660, which covers principally S. Carlino, the Oratory, the early S. Ivo projects, the Lateran, and the Carpegna and Falconieri palaces. Detailed studies of S. Ignazio, of the campanili of St. Peter's, and of Virgilio Spada's rôle in the papal administration are also promised. The final installment will deal with the period 1660–1667; the Lateran tombs, the later S. Ivo drawings, S. Andrea delle Fratte, and the Propaganda Fide. It will contain numerous appendices: a table of watermarks, comparative handwriting samples, photographs of related architectural drawings, transcriptions of all important documents, and new information on the history and structure of the Stosch atlas. The present volume already includes a few documents pertaining to the early period. The most important is half of the 1665 life of the architect by his nephew, while others relate to Borromini's house, the date of his arrival in Rome, his name and family. When complete, the stately volumes of the Corpus will form a massive stretch of bedrock on which the history of Roman baroque architecture can be raised.
The stylistic range of the eighty-five drawings in the present volume is extremely wide; it reflects the variety of functions the drawings served as well as the rapid personal evolution of Borromini’s technique. Quick sketches, sometimes jotted on the folded pieces of paper that Thelen christens “pocket sheets” (C 57), alternate with meticulous presentation drawings in Maderno’s official workshop style (C 35, 23, 34, 36–38, 42–45, 63, 67, 72). Every stage in between is represented: pencil elevations ruled over the faint incisions of a stylus, with an occasional free-hand flourish (C 10, 13, 19, 33, 41, 47, 48, 52, 60–64) then designs redrawn with a fine steel pen (C 43, 44, 46, 55, 73) and shaded with delicate layers of wash (C 24, 39, 72). A few drawings simply record extant buildings (C 6, 25, 26, 74–84). Many are straightforward projects, done to convince (C 15) or dissuade (C 37, 66) a patron. And some represent a complex overlapping of types: c 22 copies an outlaid project of Maderno’s to demonstrate a new project for the installation of the Ponta Santa in St. Peter’s. C 25 is a simultaneous record of an ancient capital from the Pantheon, a project for its replacement, a working sheet for the stonemason, and a page destined for a scrapbook.

Borromini’s great contribution to architectural draftsmanship is the graphic presentation drawing. Pencil had entered Italian workshops in the last third of the sixteenth century as a shop technique for copies, sketches, underdrawings, and projects not destined for outside circulation. Borromini soon realized the expressive advantages of pencil unembellished by ink or wash: it was open to permanent revision (C 40, 48, unlike C 25, 38); variants could be shown without resort to flaps (C 22, in contrast to C 23); spontaneous freehand details were less likely to be submerged (C 18). Graphite was ill-suited for rendering light and shadow, but Borromini soon evolved a disciplined convention of shading in fine short strokes (C 7, 27) that culminates in immensely plastic forms like the doorway of C 49, where the hatch strokes veer imperceptibly toward a vanishing point and establish the viewer’s eye level. The graphite style seems to undergo a transformation following Maderno’s death in 1629 (C 47, 48): tectonic forms are rendered with an even more intense discipline, and a new freedom pervades the handling of detail. These are the months of direct collaboration between Borromini and Bernini: the architect’s drawing style seems to burst into full maturity under the sculptor’s influence.

Although it is the crisp graphic technique that arrests the modern eye, the finished drawings in ink and wash were probably more treasured in their own day, and often stayed from the architect’s files to pass, via patrons or connoisseurs, into collections now in Windsor, the Vatican, and the Uffizi. Often the drawings travelled under assumed names, and Thelen brings many back into Borromini’s oeuvre by producing the original preparatory studies (C 11–13, 22–23, 35–36) or by finding traces of Borromini’s pencil on the sheets themselves. Some complex drawings evoke unusually subtle attributions. On the preparatory study for Urban VIII’s tomb in St. Peter’s (C 36), Thelen assigns the architectural framework and the upper coat of arms to Borromini, but the five statues to Bernini, along with the sarcophagus lid and the cartouche on the pedestal. A pencil study (C 35) establishes Borromini’s role beyond the shadow of a doubt, while the jittery, quill-pen lines of the figures, the use of wash and highlight to model limbs, and the metamorphosis of Death’s wings into the volutes of the sarcophagus lid are glimpses into the sculptor’s very different world of form. Not in his most Berniniesque pen-and-ink style (C 24, cherub of C 39), nor in his essays in the grotesque (cornice of C 48, C 83) is Borromini’s line ever so fast and loose. Yet the cooperation between the two artists must have been unusually close; the finished drawing, thanks largely to Bernini’s final layer of wash, is a work of harmony.

For all the novelty of his attributions, Thelen’s aim is to probe beyond questions of style and to reconstruct the entire context in which a drawing was produced and used. Scales and perspectives are the subjects of two of his more brilliant forays into the uncharted territory of baroque workshop procedures. He correlates the scales on the entire series of drawings for the Palazzo Barberini and finds that they fall into two distinct groups (C 43, pp. 55ff., fn. 2). For early projects, the paper format is the dominant factor: the design simply fills up a given sheet, and when the scale is added at the end, it need bear no integral relationship to the actual building. For the later working drawings, on the other hand, an onca of the scale usually translates into 2, 3, 4, 5, or 10 palini on the site. Easily divisible relationships like these were necessary for a drawing to be of practical use: a workman could read measurements from it, and the architect was saved the trouble of inking in every dimension (C 45).

Thelen’s commentary on the Baldacchino drawings is a study in “proportion in perspective.” Borromini’s role was to judge the effect of the Baldacchino in the cavernous space of the crossing of St. Peter’s. He made a number of perspective studies (C 68, 69) from carefully chosen viewpoints and superimposed them to form a composite wide-angle image (C 70) in which the Baldacchino could be compared to the giant order of the church. It turned out to be too low, so Borromini raised it by adding a huge entablature block over each column that was exactly proportional to the entablature of the crossing (C 72). Detailed equations accompany every step of Thelen’s argument and the figures which Borromini jotted all over the drawings confirm his calculations with decimal point accuracy.

Although Thelen lays the basic groundwork for a study of Borromini’s use of perspective, there are some implications that he does not draw. The typical drawing from Maderno’s workshop, for example, is an orthogonal elevation with small aberrant details like niches and consoles rendered in perspective (C 11, 13, 14, 22, 23). One palace façade (C 15) presents the original spectacle of a basically orthogonal drawing with fifteen separate vanishing points for the upper row of windows and two more for the roof. Borromini later streamlined the convention (C 42, 48) and eventually turned this minor workshop mannerism into something really interesting. His design for a fireplace in the grand salon of the Palazzo Barberini (C 31) shows two side volutes that slant mildly inward. The fireplace is drawn in perspective, and the spectator’s viewpoint fixated at a distance (which can be calculated by the method shown on C 71) of sixty palini from the wall. This is exactly the point where the two volutes converge and where, to judge from old Alinari photographs, the papal throne formerly stood. The fireplace was designed for a single privileged spectator, but was unfortunately “classnized” in execution, forfeiting all its dynamism and silencing the ingenious reference to the patron. Borromini again departs from a strict orthogonal convention in the drawings for Urban VIII’s tomb (C 33, 36), where the niche is rendered in perspective to test the effect of Urban’s statue in space. It is a small step from this simple graphic device to the perspectival tricks of Borromini’s own architecture, like the niche at the center of the Oratory façade.

The twenty-nine drawings for the Palazzo Barberini (C 15, 40–67) form the longest series in the volume devoted to any single building. Borromini was the draftsman but the drawings embody ideas from Maderno, Bernini, Cortona, and a coterie of learned amateurs advising the patron. Imitation of the Farnese is the leitmotif of Barberini imagery, dominating the palace projects as it dominated Urban VIII’s tomb. The final scheme for the façade, a three-story loggia between projecting side wings, is modeled on the river front of the Palazzo Farnese. Michelangelo’s old project for a U-shaped façade may not have been completely forgotten: the Maggi map recalls it, and new drawings by Cortona seem to provide the missing link between the two buildings (text fig. 52, Uffizi A 2166, with Barberini bees; A 2267 is an unpublished variant with a five-bay, two-story loggia). Even after construction began, the Barberini façade continued
to evolve; in the few months that separate c. 42 and c. 48, the third story was raised dramatically in height and its detail modelled more closely than ever on the Farnese. After Maderno’s death Bernini became architect in chief and collaborated actively with Borromini to produce designs like the salone door (c. 53–54) and even the famous façade windows flanking the top story of the loggia, which are usually attributed to Borromini alone (c. 52, p. 64, fn. 11). Thelen dissects the roles and mentalities of both artists with unnerving precision. Bernini’s main preoccupation is to adapt organic, sculptural forms to their setting, and his sense of architectural form is largely decorative. Borromini, in contrast, emancipates his forms from bond-age to the wall; they shape the space around them and lead a dynamic existence in it.

In 1630 the artistic unity of the Barberini team began to disintegrate. The cellar rooms at the east side of the palace were turned into a full-fledged story; a carriage road was cut through the basement; and a series of haphazard additions began to clutter the skyline of Maderno’s garden façade. Thelen traces the decline to a rupture between the two joint patrons, Taddeo and Francesco Barberini. The former opened a new entrance in the north façade and appropriated Cortona as his architect (c. 62–64, p. 76, fn. 13); the latter retained Bernini for his quarters in the opposite wing. Caught between competing factions, and perhaps incapable of an intimate collaboration with Cortona, Borromini withdrew in early 1631. For a time he continued to send suggestions, such as a sketch on how to unify the increasingly chaotic skyline (c. 57), but the advice was ignored, and his old team fell into clumsy misinterpretations of the drawings that he had left behind (c. 58, 59).

Beyond the suggestions and corrections of previous reviewers, three of Thelen’s interpretations still seem open to dispute. He identifies c. 19 as a project for the façade of Vignola’s unfinished church of S. Anna dei Palaferieni and sees it as an early document of Borromini’s vertical tendencies and a step in the direction of S. Agnese. The major difficulty is that the façade of S. Anna was built up to the level of the architrave in 1575, as Lewine has convincingly shown. If the drawing is really a project for S. Anna, it counsels alterations that border on destruction and complete rebuilding. c. 19 may have been originally inspired by S. Anna, but for the moment its destination remains unknown.

Thelen’s discovery that a well-known project for S. Ignazio (c. 32) is really by Borromini creates more problems than it solves. Thelen is impressed by the numerous columns that intersect the side aisles. He views them as members of a complex space-shaping system which has roots in Vignola, Michelangelo, and Maderno, but which already shows Borromini well on his way to S. Carliano. However, several details point toward a much less exalted reading of the sheet. It seems to be a reversed copy of an original plan which showed the church free-standing on the right, but abutted by the new wing of the Collegio Romano on the left. This adjacent building made side windows impossible, so cupolas were chosen as the means of lighting the aisles. The pairs of columns are a device used to reduce the side chapel bays to near squares underneath the circular cupolas.

The only other way to avoid an unarguably squatter oval would have been to widen the nave, which in fact later happened. Whoever the author of the original plan may have been (the Jesuit architect Grassi is still a candidate), he drew heavily on Maderno’s ideas. In making his copy, Borromini reversed the original, but then may have used it as a master sheet to produce further copies which were in turn reversed; the unusually clumsy grid of stucco incissions which covers the drawing gives some idea of the mechanical process used. The ink plan of the church and Collegio (next fig. 19), which Thelen attributes to Grassi and dates to 1627–1629, is only a routine Chigi drawing of about 1659; the provisional wall which it shows between the nave and choir was not even built until the early 1640s.

Finally, a series of six drawings at the end of the volume (c. 75–80) depicts column or pilaster bases in St. Peter’s and several Roman temples. Borromini later added inscriptions that identify all but the last drawing (c. 80), and although Thelen tries to link it with an antique prototype, it really comes from the garden loggia of Raphael’s Villa Madama. Both the dimensions and the fragmentary inscription confirm this identification. Thelen may be quite right in dating the whole series to 1627–1628, but at some later point new scales were added to each drawing that shrunk the pilaster width down to five (c. 75–79) and then to four and one-third palmi (c. 79–80). It is possible that all six classical models were taken up again for consideration in 1665 when Borromini was designing the pilaster bases in the chapel of the Propaganda Fide. When the choice eventually fell on c. 80, Borromini was quite aware that he was dealing with a motif by Raphael. He had just changed the attribution of the Villa Madama in a guidebook written by his friend Martinelli: “fu fabbricato con disegno [added by Borromini]: di Rafaello d’Urbino] e pittura di Giulio Romano” (Roma ornata, 1660–1662, fol. 343).

The first installment of the Corpus has produced fifty-one unpublished drawings, demonstrated Borromini’s rôle in nearly twenty projects where his participation has not been suspected, and thrown entirely new light on the evolution of his graphic style. In his remarks on Barberini patronage, on the rôle of perspective in the Baldacchino drawings, and on the practice of architecture in a seventeenth-century firm, Thelen has enlarged the frontiers not only of knowledge but of method. If he has uncovered so much for the early Borromini, for the period of mere apprenticeship, one can only wonder what he will find for S. Ivo and S. Carlino.

JOSEPH CONNORS
University of Chicago

Rudolf Wittkower, Palladio and Palladianism, New York: Braziller, 1974, 244 pp., $2.25 illus. $2.20.

The earliest essay in this book is called “Pseudo-Palladian Elements in English Neoclassicism.” First published in 1945, it was written earlier still, and was, I think, Wittkower’s first assault on the muddled vapors which passed for architectural history in England before the wars (the American Fiske Kimball was the only writer who had attempted a serious investigation of Palladianism). I well remember the impact of the paper, which, to many of us, was the first demonstration of the Wittkower method. He took two elements in the style we called “Palladianism” and pursued their antecedents. He showed that the “Venetian” window, as used by Scamozzi and on very rare occasions by Palladio, was one thing and as used by Campbell, Burlington, Kent, and their followers, quite another. He showed that the “bossed” column or architrave had nothing whatever to do with Palladio, and passed into English architecture from Peruzzi through Serlio to Inigo Jones. This kind of analysis, with its surgical dexterity and refinement, was a revelation at the time, and the essay is still essential reading for any student of English Palladianism.

No less important in the same context were the essays on “Lord Burlington and William Kent” (1945) and “Lord Burlington’s Work at York” (1954). The first made a clear distinction between Burlington’s intellectual, “staccato” way of composing and Kent’s more decorative approach; the second reappraised the York Assembly Rooms, designed in imitation of Palladio’s version of Vitruvius’s “Egyptian Hall,” confirmed Burlington’s authorship, and showed that this neglected building was “probably the most severely classical building of the early eighteenth century in Europe”—something which nobody in York or anywhere else had noticed.

Wittkower’s interest in English Palladianism was naturally linked to one of its main contributory sources—Inigo Jones. The essay on “Inigo Jones: Man of Letters” (1953) is another seminal study. Here Wittkower, working with a pair of dividers, showed Inigo