Masthead Logo

Smith ScholarWorks

Art: Faculty Publications

Art

12-1993

Reviewed Work(s): The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture by Reinhard Bentmann, Michael Müller, Tim Spence and David Craven

John E. Moore
Smith College, jmoore@smith.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.smith.edu/art_facpubs

Part of the Architecture Commons, and the Arts and Humanities Commons

Recommended Citation
Moore, John E., "Reviewed Work(s): The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture by Reinhard Bentmann, Michael Müller, Tim Spence and David Craven" (1993). Art: Faculty Publications, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
https://scholarworks.smith.edu/art_facpubs/8

This Book Review has been accepted for inclusion in Art: Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Smith ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@smith.edu

SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Advancing Knowledge, Driving Change

Review
Reviewed Work(s): The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture by Reinhard Bentmann, Michael Müller, Tim Spence and David Craven
Review by: John E. Moore
Source: *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Dec., 1993), pp. 499-503
Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the Society of Architectural Historians
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/990878
Accessed: 09-07-2018 15:51 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://about.jstor.org/terms

JSTOR

Society of Architectural Historians, University of California Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*

This content downloaded from 174.62.219.112 on Mon, 09 Jul 2018 15:51:37 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

talented assistants, but there is no question that the basic concept was his in every case. The task of his associates was to carry it through. Furthermore, site supervision was tight. It is probable that the same conditions remained for the buildings done after his return to Oregon. After 1974 he could pick and choose the really interesting projects, and he evidently did not want to operate a large office. But what about the large production of the middle years, when Belluschi was building all over the country and acting as a design consultant to a large variety of firms? To this observer the work is generally more uneven and disappointing than that of the early and late periods. Clausen has some difficult problems to untangle.

It remains to be noted that the appendix contains a handful of essays by Pietro Belluschi and that there is a short bibliography. A list of street addresses for these buildings would have been helpful. In every other respect this book is excellent.

LEONARD K. EATON
Otter Rock, OR

EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE

REINHARD BENTMANN and **MICHAEL MÜLLER,** *The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture,* Tim Spence and David Craven, translators; with a foreword by Otto Karl Werckmeister, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey, and London: Humanities Press, 1992, xvii + 176 pp., 24 illus. $39.50.

In 1970 Reinhard Bentmann and Michael Müller coauthored a book entitled *Die Villa als Herrschaftsarchitektur: Versuch einer kunst- und sozialgeschichtlichen Analyse* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp). The success of their endeavor can be gauged by the appearance of two subsequent editions—the first in 1971, with a fourteen-page, footnoted afterword, the second in 1979, with another six-page afterword without footnotes. Tim Spence and David Craven have apparently translated the second edition, whereas the third edition gives the fullest exposition of the development of the authors' ideas over time, and includes both references to subsequent literature and an appendix of seventeen photographs.[1] The readers' debt to the translators is demonstrated by the title itself, *The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture,* which includes a deft rendering of a compound German word.

In his introduction, David Craven explains why the work of Bentmann and Müller lay untranslated for so long, writing that "the mainstream artworld establishment in the United States . . . was one of the most conservative of any country in the world" (xi). Yet he does not address the problem inherent in translating—into *American* English for an indeterminate audience—a *German* book, whose authors assumed a degree of familiarity, on the part of their educated readers, with the vocabulary of Marxist analysis. It is not quite enough for Craven to put a phrase like "critical consciousness" within quotation marks, because there is no guarantee that American readers will understand the theoretical underpinnings of the phrase (21). Nevertheless, the efforts of Spence and Craven serve as a tardy corrective to an insidious American provincialism, and for that reason alone are worthwhile.

Bentmann and Müller's typological study is everywhere enriched by the authors' reconstruction of economic and political structures. For them, a properly "historical critique" turns on the unraveling of the mythic and mystical explanations that a power elite fashions to explain, justify, maintain, and naturalize its position (125). In documenting the genesis of a villa culture in sixteenth-century Venice, the authors have achieved revelatory results.

Drawing widely from contemporaneous accounts and from modern historical studies, Bentmann and Müller demonstrate how the Venetian haute bourgeoisie came to invest large sums of money in the acquisition of property on the mainland, a process which had begun in the fifteenth century and already "clearly reflected colonialist and imperialist ambitions" (11). It was accelerated when the geopolitics of European trade changed in the 1530s, resulting in the loss to Venice of much of its former economic dominance in the Mediterranean. The subsequent intensified agricultural development of large tracts of previously fallow land served the dual purpose of providing grain for a cash-poor Venice and new work for a large and diversified urban artisan class whose livelihood was materially affected by the decline in trade. These changing economic relationships were intellectually rationalized in the writings of figures such as Alvise Cornaro, Giuseppe Falcone, and Daniele Barbaro, who raised the art of agriculture to saintly status, supporting their speculations with references to Genesis and to Greek and Latin authors. Invoked as well were the patriarchs of the Hebrew Bible, who served as archetypes for the new landlords (*padroni*) of latifundia. This recourse to ancient sources for the legitimization of contemporaneous social practices is identified as a "key concept of villa ideology;" the need to address the present on its own terms, the first step to radical social change, is thus obviated (22). The concomitant desire to maintain the status quo is briefly compared to the "religious ideology" of the exactly coeval Council of Trent, which itself had to come to grips with divisive social change (25).

Sixteenth-century Venetian villa culture was definitively structured by Andrea Palladio. The proportions and axial arrangements of his interiors bespeak an intimate connection to mathematics and music theory, while the siting of his building complexes establishes a striking dialogue between the residence (composed of functionally and hierarchically differentiated spaces arranged under one roof), and the surrounding landscape. Whitewashed exteriors, the orders, inscriptions, coats-of-arms, the dome on the Villa Rotonda: all these components of architectural form combine to make an abstract symbol of dominion concrete. The authors demonstrate how Palladio merged aspects of urban palace design with his patrons' new needs, which revolved around the agricultural enterprise; his seamless synthesis looked timeless when new. But it is the social function of these villas, "substi-

1. Spence and Craven essentially incorporate nine of these seventeen additional images into their text, although sometimes the vantage points are different. Throughout the present review I shall make recourse to the German third edition: Reinhold Bentmann and Michael Müller, *Die Villa als Herrschaftsarchitektur,* 3rd ed. (Frankfurt am Main, 1979), hereafter cited as *Die Villa.*

This content downloaded from 174.62.219.112 on Mon, 09 Jul 2018 15:51:37 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

tute[s] for the civic symbols of hegemony," that Bentmann and Müller also explicate vividly (34).

The collaboration between Palladio and Paolo Veronese in the Villa Barbaro at Maser resulted in a *Gesamtkunstwerk* that defined the age. Bentmann and Müller devote several chapters to the study of this pictorial decoration. The presence of ruins in Veronese's frescoes is seen as the union of the distinct topographies of Rome and the Veneto. This process of abstraction and idealization, in the authors' view, "eliminate[s] the contradiction between the beautiful villa and the economic villa" (39). Such mediation was not new in Venetian architecture, since the great city palaces had long combined frank economic functions at the aqueous base with seigneurial magnificence in the superstructure. Be that as it may, the incorporation of generalized evocations of Roman ruins added an extra layer of timelessness to the villa, just as fictive windows that give onto painted landscapes emphasized the relation between the building and the surrounding agricultural estate, between architecture and power.

Bentmann and Müller elaborate on the idea of the villa as "negative utopia." They observe that Renaissance utopian thought, as expounded by More and Campanella, was oriented towards the future, towards the creation of an improved urban society. On the other hand, Venetian villa culture found its legitimization in the literary and historical reconstruction of a rural past, shaped simultaneously by the writings of Pliny the Younger and the old feudal order of communities in the Veneto. More and Campanella criticized contemporary Europe in order to change it for everyone's benefit; proponents of villa culture fled the iniquitous city in search of a mythic earthly paradise designed and designated for a privileged few. The authors trenchantly point out that there are no villas in More's *Utopia,* for the villa "presupposes the dominance of some people over others" (67).

Later chapters treat villa culture in the modern era. Bentmann and Müller draw comparisons between villas established on newly-acquired agricultural estates in the sixteenth century, and villas set in proximity to large industrial complexes in the nineteenth. Palladio was a likely source for capitalist magnates' architectural fictions, for he had codified an expressive yet appropriately ahistorical language. Academically-trained architects of the nineteenth century, who stood at the service of the haute bourgeoisie, learned that language by heart, but used others as well, as in the Villa Hügel at Essen, which combines several stylistic modes. The authors offer a salutary caution against the dismissal of such architecture solely in terms of normative aesthetics. Finally, they liken descriptions of the villa from Theodor Fontane's novel, *Frau Jenny Treibel* (1892), to the functional and aesthetic categories elaborated in sixteenth-century Italian villa books.

With reference to the twentieth century, the authors hold up to scrutiny Heidegger's reversion to archetypal myths of the land. They also uncover a profoundly ideological "hostility toward the city" that characterizes governmental agricultural subsidies and land use, as well as the construction of housing complexes within (sub)urban oases (127–28). A chapter on "Satellite Town and Penthouse" ("*Trabantenstadt und Penthaus*") likens the social place of modern skyscrapers to the towers of San Gimignano. Lost in the translation of the chapter title, however, is the word *Trabant* itself, whose affectionate diminutive *Trabi* recalls the erstwhile East German little-car-that-couldn't, and its daily journeys to some of the most horrific housing projects on the planet. The present translation ends with the first afterword, in which Bentmann and Müller discuss the concept of quality in art in terms of "basic questions of economic structure," and as a "social phenomenon" (143, 146).

However, one entire chapter on the twentieth century found in the German original is absent, namely Chapter 18, "The Dream of the Land in Israel. Kibbutz-Ideology."[2] This astounding omission occurs without a word of explanation (although the translators do explicitly insert themselves into the text at one point [135]), leaving readers to wonder if certain sentences from the German original sounded an unappealing note. For example, in comparing "Venetian villa culture of the sixteenth century" to "the modern kibbutz movement," Bentmann and Müller write: "In each case, behind the programs of settlement and colonization, clear political, social-political, and imperialist goals are concealed."[3] Apparently, despite David Craven's introduction, there are still points at which "the incorporation of critical theory into the discipline" remain unwelcome (xvi). Do Spence and Craven lack what Werckmeister, in his foreword, called "political nerve" (x)?

Indeed, by their act of omission, Spence and Craven unwittingly vitiate their entire project. Yes, it is laudable to introduce an English-reading audience to a Marxist study of Venetian villa culture, one that James S. Ackerman rightly called "innovative."[4] In a post–cold war America, perhaps the fears and ignorance that for years discouraged or scotched similar critiques—both of capitalist economic production, and of the unspoken premises of academic art historical practice—can be put to rest. A new and expanded audience stands to benefit from the synthetic insights of many fine scholars whose work has been enriched by the Frankfurt School of critical theory. But if English readers are to open their minds and disabuse themselves of prejudice in terms of Marxist scholarship, Spence and Craven cannot simultaneously deny them the opportunity to read a section of a book that treats a topic some consider controversial. Did the translators suppress Bentmann and Müller's discussion of penthouses so as not to offend those who live within them? Of course not. The unspoken act of omission is hubris; the translators position themselves as protectors of disembodied sensibilities, or as eliminators of a dissension they assume will ensue when readers are presented with the interweaving of fact, analysis, and opinion that constitutes all scholarship. Spence and Craven have created a slightly abridged translation, and need to own up to that honestly.

2. The format of the third German edition preserves entirely that of the first, adding to it the two subsequently published afterwords and a new appendix of photographs. In their first afterword, Bentmann and Müller explicitly refer to the date of publication of the first edition as "Summer 1970," and cite a review of their book that dates to 18 July 1970; they go on to speak of accusations of anti-Semitism that accompanied some reviews: see Bentmann and Müller, *Die Villa,* 206. On the copyright page of the present translation, Spence and Craven cite the first edition, although they were using the second, since their Chapter 20 constitutes the "Afterword to the Second Edition," which was signed by the authors in March 1971 and published that same year (iv). In any case, the translators self-consciously suppress part of the original text.

3. "Jeweils verbargen sich hinter den Siedlungs- und Kolonisationsprogrammen handfeste politische, sozialpolitische und imperialistische Ziele;" see Bentmann and Müller, *Die Villa,* 128.

4. See James S. Ackerman, *The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses* (Princeton, 1990), 287, n. 2. This book should stand next to Bentmann and Müller on the shelves of readers interested in villa culture.

This content downloaded from 174.62.219.112 on Mon, 09 Jul 2018 15:51:37 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

There are other changes of which the reader must be aware. The sequence of footnotes is altered between the German third edition and the English translation, yet the rationale for this is unstated; perhaps the idea was to relieve the text of distracting references, but this practice is not carried through consistently. Also, Spence and Craven often omit footnote text that contains quoted passages on which the authors based their analyses. This unwise procedure robs the original text of its historical grounding. Misleading as well is the bizarre italicization of phrases or sentences not necessarily more important than others (31, 33, 34), or italicization that reverses arguably proper emphasis (40). In the German original, the authors rarely use typography to call attention to sentences or ideas embodied therein, rightly leaving that task to the discretion of individual readers.

Translation is itself an act of interpretation. Although there are always turns of phrase and renderings that will strike those who read both languages as infelicitous, Spence and Craven have transposed the subtle ideas of the text with sufficient success to make the book accessible to a wide audience that can, and should, include undergraduates, who do not need to worry about verbatim accuracy. However, scholars in the field must keep a close eye on the German original, especially if the arguments presented in the text are to serve as a springboard for further exploration.

The translation definitely shows its spots, as when the relative pronoun "who" appears three times in a sentence with no human antecedent, an incorrect rendering of the German *die* (29). The way to say *Putten* in English is "putti," not "putties" (35); similarly, *Attiken* is "attics," not "atticas" (90). In reference to a building represented in a Veronese fresco at Maser, the German *Risaliten* means "wings," not the macaronic *risaltos.* Daniele Barbaro was not "Palladio's client," but his patron; the confusion results from the faulty translation of the German *Auftraggeber* (42). *Erholung* means "relaxation," not "reproduction;" in context, this error constitutes not only a mistranslation but a Freudian slip (134). Spence and Craven struggle to render the twists and turns of Bentmann and Müller's different ways of naming the Villa d'Este at Tivoli, and create nonsense as a result, as though this particular complex were arcane or no longer extant (76). Here the simple title does not literally translate the German, but it makes the most sense in English. That is a lesson translators should take to heart.

Problems arise with Italian words and phrases as well. *Paiono* does not mean "intend," but "seem;" to get this wrong dilutes and distorts Palladio's lovely, albeit patriarchal architectural metaphor about the arms of the Villa Mocenigo (34).[5] The phrase *virtù magica* does not mean "celestial virtue," nor is such a reading implied in the German rendering, which is simply misconstrued (55). The English word for *diletto* is "delight," but Spence and Craven use Bentmann and Müller's "aesthetic satisfaction," although that expanded phrase is unwarranted (33). At another point, where the authors have translated an Italian sentence inexactly, Spence and Craven proceed to mistranslate the imprecise German, instead of translating directly from the Italian into English, which would be the preferred course (70).

Italian and Latin are carelessly interchanged (*santa* instead of *sancta* [18]), and words are transcribed incorrectly (*via* for *vita* [5]), or provided with spurious accents, even though the spelling in the German original is correct (*virtùs* and *utilitàs* [40]). The Latin *solitarius* is misspelled twice, and differently, on the same page (75). And what is the point of translating the Latin *divina sapientia* by the Italian *santa ragione?* At least Bentmann and Müller include a "List of Frequently-Used Italian and Latin Concepts" at the back of their book, a tool that Spence and Craven omit. Some of the Latin translations are imprecise: *auctoritas historiae* means "the authority of history," not "historic authorities" (17); *sapientia veterum* means "the wisdom of the ancients," not "ancient wisdom" (19). Elsewhere strings of Latin words describing landscape elements are transcribed correctly from the German, but not translated into English (43).

Spence and Craven cite ancient texts in a telling way. To begin with, it is extremely unhelpful to cite a 166-year-old German translation of Pliny the Younger's *Letters*—even though Bentmann and Müller used that particular source—when numerous English versions exist, including one within the widely accessible Loeb Classical Library. In addition, the proper citation that the authors use is meaningless to Spence and Craven: they carry over "V, 6," and think that the Arabic numeral corresponds to a page in the German translation, when it in fact corresponds to the sixth letter of the fifth book of the *Letters.*[6] This sloppiness bespeaks a lack of familiarity not only with the centuries-old system for referring to ancient texts, but with the texts themselves.

Further, why italicize the locales of Pliny's villas, as though no one ever had heard of them (95)? Why translate the famous dictum, *mens sana in corpore sano,* as "a healthy mind in a healthy body" (99)? The English translation of the phrase is "a sound mind in a sound body" (Juvenal, *Satire* X.356). Centuries of use have rendered Biblical quotations, proverbs, and translations of foreign words and phrases rather inelastic; that process enriches language, making speakers aware of its history as they use it.

Bentmann and Müller use the Latin phrase *Vestigia terrent* but do not translate it. To be sure, larding a discourse with quotations from Latin literature—or fragments thereof, like ruins in a landscape—was a hallmark of the humanist enterprise, and sixteenth-century writers could afford to suppress the source of their apothegms; a common education made citation irrelevant, maybe insulting, within a narrow circle of literate readers. Perhaps the German authors, too, could retain the Latin phrase, assuming that their readers possessed certain abilities and experiences. In an age of post-modernism and MTV, however, one must debate this genre of erudition.

Nevertheless, it is important to understand not only what words mean, but where they come from and what they evoke. The words constitute a *locus classicus* from Horace (*Epistle* I.i.), and translate as "footprints frighten."[7] Horace writes from his Sabine farm to which he, a middle-aged man, has retired, likening himself to a gladiator who has given up the arena, and a horse turned out to pasture. No longer intent upon achieving worldly fame, he wants "to study what is true and proper," namely philosophy. He wants to discover a course of action "useful to the

5. In both German original and English translation, the page number from Palladio is given as 66 with no additional comment. However, Book Two of the Italian edition of 1570 erroneously includes page 66 twice; the relevant quotation is on the second page 66 (actual page 78).

6. The same mistake is made in reference to Petrarch's *Epistolae familiares:* Spence and Craven cite "Vol. 6, p. 2" instead of "VI.2" (160, n. 81).

7. I would like to thank Scott Bradbury of the Department of Classics at Smith College for locating the exact citation for me.

This content downloaded from 174.62.219.112 on Mon, 09 Jul 2018 15:51:37 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

poor and the rich." The urban world of business is evoked through the figure of the "energetic trader," whose business brought him to the "extreme Indies, fleeing poverty by sea." But, with fortunes reduced, the trader "will be a plebeian." To explain why he rejects the dangerous pursuit of material gain, Horace cites a fable in which "a cautious fox told a sick lion: 'Because the footprints frighten me, all tending towards you, [with] not one in reverse' " (I.i.74–75). The lion's question is suppressed, but readers can supply it: Why would a fox be wary of a sick, therefore weakened, lion? Horace, world-weary and disabused, is also wary, in his case of the rhythms of urban life.

The larger issue is this: if Bentmann and Müller do not see fit to identify a Latin citation, nor to explain why they use it, readers are left either to fill in the blanks themselves, or to miss the point. The authors often provide useful telescopic summaries of ancient texts. But suppressing a source eliminates the readers' ability to reflect and compare. Certainly capable of addressing the images evoked in a poem by Horace, the authors choose not to do so, and thus rob their argument of some of its potential richness. For Horace's first *Epistle* could be applied quite neatly to the economic and social conditions of mid-sixteenth-century Venice that the authors so masterfully describe elsewhere. Venetians who once derived profit from overseas trade turned to buying property on the mainland in order to protect and increase their wealth. Whether Horace turns to philosophy in the Sabine country, or a merchant turns to "holy agriculture," what we observe is the fashioning of an ideology that naturalizes the possession of power and privilege, and hides the unbalanced economic basis of social interaction. Like Horace, Venetian intellectuals claimed that their writings would change the lives of rich and poor alike. But their discourse in fact legitimated the exercise of oligarchic power, albeit newly on land, rather than, as formerly, in the lagoon. It is striking that Bentmann and Müller would not wish to enrich their analysis with similar observations.

Spence and Craven retain the Latin *Vestigia terrent,* and then translate the words as "retention of the old ways," which is syntactically and lexically impossible. It is hard to know whether to ascribe such a mistake to the editorial process, or to linguistic deficiencies on the part of the translators. But making up translations for Latin words does not serve English readers well, nor does an abdication of the hard work that turns a translation into a critical study in its own right. Bentmann and Müller chose, perhaps foolishly, to assume that readers would catch the Horatian reference and some of its implications; Spence and Craven obviously cannot make the same assumption, because they do not know what the Latin says.

Bentmann and Müller do not always fully utilize their illustrations. The authors make no recourse to the woodcut plan and elevation of the Villa Barbaro at Maser from Palladio's treatise, even though it is reproduced on the facing page; explicit discussion would have both substantiated their observations, and increased the readers' appreciation of the two texts, written and visual (30–31). Works of art engender interpretations as varied as the people who study them. Still, without guidance from the authors, readers gain no understanding of how a particular image moves the argument forward, or why some images are included at all. Is the *Portrait of Daniele Barbaro, Patriarch of Aquileja and Padrone of the Villa Maser* mere page fill, or is it an historically mediated text whose signs and structures need decoding (2)? What is the point of simply referring readers to "Figure 1" immediately after the phrase, "[i]n his letter to Daniele Barbaro," as though the painting were nothing more complex or visually interesting than a gritty newspaper photograph (19)?

The disjunction between written and visual texts is even more explicit in the third German edition. There an appendix of seventeen illustrations is included, with captions that alternately offer an illuminating walk through a given image (Abb. 12, which reproduces Benedetto Caliari's *Garden of a Villa near Bergamo*), or a pedestrian observation (Abb. 13, where readers learn that Monticello is a "free copy of Palladio's Villa Rotonda"). Bentmann and Müller call this appendix "independent," and thank the publishers both on their own behalf, and for "the reader who does not know Venetian villa culture from personal experience." But calling any series of images "independent" begs the question of how much we should assume that illustrations speak for themselves, or whether a separate appendix of images should exist as such, instead of in intimate connection with a written argument. No benefit accrues to a history of art informed by the brilliant insights of Marxist (or any other) analysis if authors do not treat the works of art with the same patient yet scrupulous intellectual rigor that they apply to words.

Spence and Craven have added an illustration that does not exist in the German third edition, yet one has no idea why the charming woodcut frontispiece to Pietro de'Crescenzi's *De agricultura vulgare* is included in Chapter 3 of the English translation, for it is not mentioned there (12). Many pages afterward, the authors describe a configuration of forms that "might have been used to illustrate any contemporary villa book," but Spence and Craven make no mention that one such book is illustrated in their translation (45). Similarly, when Palladio's unique and unifying architectural conception of the villa is set out, and contrasted to "the traditional *casa colonica,*" readers cannot recall having seen any such rustic farmhouse, even though the Crescenzi frontispiece depicts one (29). The translators would have validated their choice by encouraging readers to use the illustrations more often than the German authors did.

In the bibliography, only the translated German title of a book (by Carter and Muir) is given (along with the wrong date of publication), while Bentmann and Müller give both the earlier English original and the German translation, and provide the proper dates of publication (169). Arnold Hauser's *Philosophy of Art History* has been available in English translation since 1958; a similar situation exists for Walter Benjamin's *Illuminations.* These observations demonstrate that translators should not approach their task slavishly; thus books conceived and written in English should be cited in the bibliography of books directed to an audience that reads English, as should English translations (when available) of books written in German or other languages. Doing this would have required Spence and Craven to hunt out and compare passages, but the effort would have benefited readers who wish to follow the arguments of cited authors. In his introduction, Craven says that historians of art in the United States are not familiar with German art historical scholarship of the "post-1968 generation" (xi). True enough, but that situation is hardly ameliorated by keeping the audience ignorant of Hauser and Benjamin. Spence and Craven do not carry over useful information by the mere translation of German footnotes.

The indissoluble association of domestic buildings with particular lifestyles, and with hierarchies of power, is well-established in the history of western architecture. So extensive and impressive

This content downloaded from 174.62.219.112 on Mon, 09 Jul 2018 15:51:37 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

was the complex of imperial residences on Rome's Palatine Hill that, by antonomasia, the word *palatium* and its derivatives came to signify any ruler's dwelling. That architectural elements unambiguously signified the interaction between social realities and theatrical fictions is expressed by Vitruvius himself, who calls for "columns, pediments, statues and other royal effects" for the tragic stage set, on the unquestioned assumption that only monarchs' lives could serve as suitable subjects for that literary genre (*De architectura,* V.vi.9). Bentmann and Müller have written a book that elucidates the role that architecture assumed in response to fundamental changes in the economic life of sixteenth-century Venice and its mainland dependencies. They trace shifts and novel developments in a discourse that contemporaries fashioned to justify the retention of power, and provide a keen discussion of the afterlife of villa ideology in the modern world.

Although Spence and Craven are to be thanked for their efforts, it remains unclear what expertise they bring to translating a book whose subject—the villa—is explored principally within the historical framework of the sixteenth century. The subject includes texts, the language of Roman antiquity: what would the humanist villa be without humanist literary scholarship? That a given book has proven to be of general methodological interest does not mean that its specific subject merits sloppy, bowdlerized, or illiterate consideration. In a translation published twenty-two years after the first German edition, Spence and Craven would have done better both to inform themselves more thoroughly of the subject under consideration, and to craft a translation that, like a critical edition of an ancient text, consistently clarifies and enriches the original, while remaining self-consciously rooted in its own time. Daniele Barbaro's edition of 1556 and commentary on Vitruvius still serves as a pertinent and prismatic model for this type of scholarly enterprise, even though (or perhaps because) it creates a beguiling myth in the process.

JOHN E. MOORE
Smith College

JÁNOS GERLE, ATTILA KOVÁCS, and **IMRE MAKOVECZ,** *A századforduló magyar építészete* (Turn-of-the-century Hungarian architecture), Budapest: Szépirodalmi könyvkiadó-Bonex, 1990, 287 pp., 964 illus., 800 Hung. Ft. (paper).

This book is a major work, a lexicon containing a highly detailed and wide-ranging collection of data and photographs of the architecture built in Hungary during the last twenty years before World War I. It is the fruit of some sixteen years of research and will undoubtedly become a basic text for all future analysis of the architecture of Eastern Central Europe.

Although the cover credits three authors, the lion's share of the work involved in collecting the material and writing the text was undertaken by János Gerle. All three contributors are architects: the eldest is Imre Makovecz (born in 1935), mentor to his two younger colleagues. Makovecz is one of Hungary's leading architects, but also one of the most controversial because of his advocacy of an organic Hungarian style. He is perhaps best known outside the country for his design for the Hungarian pavilion at the recent exposition in Seville. While Makovecz was the inspiration for the book and assisted in its publication, Attila Kovács supplied the excellent photographs of the buildings that accompany Gerle's text.

The encyclopedic contents are divided into two principal sections; the larger of these (17–222) presents an alphabetical catalogue of architects. Apart from the biographical data, including all available information on training, travels abroad, and personal contacts, there is also a selection of photographs of executed buildings, and in some cases plans as well. This information accompanies a list of buildings, together with their addresses and remarks on their present condition. The bibliography consists of the most important publications by the architect concerned and the most important works written about him. For leading figures, the authors supply quotations typical of the architect's views and on occasion examples of contemporary criticism.

The second part of the book (223–76) comprises a directory of turn-of-the-century buildings listed in alphabetical order by Hungarian place-names (cities, villages, or settlements). Apart from buildings already mentioned in the architects' section, a number of modernist/art nouveau buildings by unknown builders are also included in this pioneering gazetteer. This list also features works designed in Hungary by architects from other countries, and some buildings dating from after World War I that nevertheless still display the stylistic marks of the *fin-de-siècle.* In the case of Budapest and other larger cities, maps are provided to assist with orientation.

Included in this topographical material are works located in areas that, since the Versailles Treaty of 1919, no longer belong to Hungary. Thus the book is not only of interest to those who want to study architecture in Hungary during this period, but also to those who wish to get acquainted with important aspects of the cultural heritage of such parts of Eastern Central Europe as Slovakia, the Carpatho-Ukraine, Romania, Croatia, and the Vojvodina.

Orientation for the reader is provided by the book's various indexes (there is an insertion with notes in English and German on how to use these). On the inside of the cover is a map of the Carpathian Basin featuring all the important place names in Hungarian, together with their present-day equivalents where the names have changed. Another very unusual graphic tool on the cover is Gerle's time chart, compiled on the model of Charles Jencks' diagrams. This shows parallel stylistic trends in Hungarian architecture between 1890 and 1919 as a sort of life-tree of the most important influences, interactions, and relationships between sources and trends of stylistic development.

Gerle is also the author of the introductory essay (translated into English and German, and included in the volume as an insertion). He presents an original and in some respects unorthodox panorama of the Hungarian architectural output of the age. Prior to his work there were only a few summaries of this period, the most important of which was the section on architecture in the basic reference book, *Hungarian Art 1890–1919* (Németh Lajos, ed. *Magyar müvészet 1890–1919,* 2 vols. [Budapest, 1981]). The structure of this reference book obliged the authors (Eszter Gábor, Imre Kathy, and Zsuzsa Mendöl) to take a more comprehensive and catholic viewpoint than Gerle in that they needed to cover all main stylistic tendencies of the period including the somewhat virulent late phases of historicism and eclecticism. They were summarizing existing data rather than introducing new material and in any case had no access to Gerle's manuscript, with its vast quantity of new discoveries, which lay neglected at the state art publisher, Corvina, for a number of years. For this

This content downloaded from 174.62.219.112 on Mon, 09 Jul 2018 15:51:37 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms