

Today, however, the existentialists have shaken our faith in the power of reason, and our theologians tell us that God is dead. Our "ideal image" is by no means clear. Chaos does not seem to be the answer, and Harries rejects any hint of nihilism: "... to say that God does not call man is not to say that man is not called at all. We may no longer know our place in the world, yet the world still speaks to us, a geometric figure, a crack in a concrete wall, neon reflections on wet pavement, melting snow, a wrinkled shirt, the motion of a hand—we have to listen carefully to hear this language at all" (p. 159).

This book is well written, though it is closely argued, and this does not make for easy reading. Harries draws upon English and German sources in art history and criticism, as well as philosophy. He is at his best when discussing the modern existentialists, especially Sartre and Heidegger.

ELMER H. DUNCAN

Baylor University

KAUFMANN, WALTER. *Tragedy and Philosophy*. Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968, pp. xx + 388, \$6.95.

Walter Kaufman is a prolific writer, the author of several books. He is also known for his translations of Goethe and Nietzsche. With the possible exception of his *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (now in its third edition), the book under review is probably his best.

Philosophical discussions of tragedy have the common failing that they involve much speculation coupled with very little detailed analysis of that about which they speculate. This tradition began with Plato. The *Dialogues* condemn the poets, especially the tragic poets. But while Plato quotes Homer very frequently (without, however, dealing at length with either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*), he rarely refers to any of the great tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Euripides. This neglect of primary sources has led the philosophers to say strange things. Thus Plato in the *Republic* refuses to permit the poets to enter his ideal state because they were (allegedly) guilty of lying, but his guardians must be permitted to invent lies for the common good (pp. 14–15, 22–23).

Kaufmann also deals harshly with Aristotle's *Poetics*. The *Poetics* has such a prominent place in the history of aesthetics that we are likely to think that whenever Aristotle *seems* to have made a mistake, the error must be due to a mistranslation or a misunderstanding of the Greek text. But Kaufmann finds several mistakes in Aristotle. To cite only one example, Aristotle said rather clearly that the ideal tragic hero

would be someone intermediate in character, better than we are, certainly, but not perfect, for if he were perfect we could not identify with him. The tragic events that befall him must be due to some *hamartia* (tragic flaw, or perhaps intellectual error). But if we look, for example, at the tragedies of Sophocles, this is not what we find. Instead, Kaufmann claims, "Sophocles went out of his way to tell us explicitly that he wrote tragedies about the sufferings of exceptionally noble men and women" (p. 116). Thus, Sophocles is quoted saying of Heracles, "the noblest man who ever lived, whose peer you never shall behold again," and of Electra "Was there ever one so noble...?" and of Ajax, "There never has been a man nobler than he" (pp. 116, 119).

Kaufmann also gives us extended discussions of other philosophical writings on tragedy by Hegel, Hume, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Max Scheler. But the bulk of the book is made up of exceptionally well-written analyses of the great tragedies themselves, especially *Oedipus Tyrannus*, by common consent of critics the greatest tragedy ever written. These analyses are too detailed to summarize.

The book also has interesting historical arguments regarding the birth and death of Greek tragedy. Kaufmann argues that the climate for tragedy was created by Homer's *Iliad* (chap. 5) and that its death was due to the fact that when Athens declined as a great power "War was no longer the glory of Marathon and Salamis, heroism seemed futile.... Gradually the confidence that had grown in the wake of Marathon and found its ultimate expression in Pericles' great funeral oration gave way to doubt and increased self-consciousness, and eventually the New Comedy replaced tragedy" (p. 194).

A central aim of the book is nothing less than the production of a new poetics (chap. 3) involving a new definition of tragedy. I shall not quote the entire, lengthy definition, but one important aspect of it is that it involves tragedy represented as "releasing us with some sense (a) that suffering is universal—not a mere accident of our experience, (b) that courage and endurance in suffering or nobility in despair are admirable—not ridiculous" (p. 85).

One question remains. Can tragedy be written today? There seems little doubt that Shakespeare wrote tragedies, and great ones. Can the same be done in the twentieth century? Kaufmann thinks that the possibility of a modern tragedy is demonstrated, because we have an example of the genre in Rolf Hochhuth's *The Deputy* (1963). The priest in *The Deputy* is a tragic figure, and surely the terrors of his fate at Auschwitz are as great as any that faced the ancient tragic heroes. Kaufmann's discussion of

The Deputy is both perceptive and moving (chap. 10, esp. pp. 322–37). By contrast, Kaufmann is extremely critical of the plays of Bertolt Brecht (especially his *Galileo*) and William Styron's recent (1967) novel, *The Confessions of Nat Turner*. These works, Kaufmann argues convincingly, do not qualify as tragedies.

Finally, any reviewer who deals with this book must surely feel that he has not done justice to it. The book contains a vast amount of learning regarding tragedy as an art form, the different tragedies (ancient and modern), and the discussions of them by philosophers and critics. Further, Kaufmann can write; he is extremely readable.

The appendices include a Chronology, a Bibliography, and an Index. All in all, a job well done.

Readers who prefer damning reviews to favorable ones should consult the recent review of this book by Tom Driver in the December 28, 1968, edition of the *Saturday Review*, pp. 27–29. I know that it is not customary for one reviewer to comment on the work of another, but Driver says things that make me wonder if we really read review copies of the same book. For example, he quotes Kaufmann as saying, "It . . . seems reasonable to call any play that powerfully stirs the emotions we have described a tragedy" (Driver does not give page numbers, and I have not, as yet, found the quote). He then criticizes this "definition"—"The trouble with this definition is that it is virtually the lowest common denominator. It leaves out of account other qualities of the greatest tragedies . . ." (Driver, p. 28)—as if this were the only definition Kaufmann gives of tragedy! But as I indicated above, Kaufmann devotes an entire section (section 18) to formulating a new definition of tragedy, which finally appears (10 lines long) on page 85. Similarly, on the same page quoted above, Driver adds, "But the tragedians, if we listen to Kaufmann, haven't said much either, though he admires them no end. Their value lies in the emotional effect they have produced." The small part of Kaufmann's definition that I quoted (from p. 85) is sufficient to show that this simply is not true. Further, Kaufmann has a great deal to say (e.g., p. 93) about the poet's "experience of life" and the "philosophical dimension" (e.g., p. 94) of tragedy. But Kaufmann does not require my defense and the reader must decide for himself concerning the book's merits or demerits. I simply thought that readers of the journal might find this contrast interesting.

ELMER H. DUNCAN

Baylor University

NORBERG-SCHULZ, CHRISTIAN. *Intentions in Architecture*. M.I.T. Press, 1968, pp. 242, 100 ills., \$4.95, paperback.

Without any doubt, *Intentions in Architecture*, first published 1965, in Norway, the United Kingdom, and by the M.I.T. Press in the United States, represents the most important comprehensive and coherent theory of architecture written during the last decades, far more than the more popular writings by the late S. Giedion, stimulating as they may be. The frame of reference, beyond the specific field of architectural history and aesthetics, includes modern psychology (especially *Gestaltpsychologie*) and general philosophy (e.g., Ernst Cassirer, Susanne Langer, R. Carnap, H. Reichenbach), quotations from architects' writings, from Vitruvius to Le Corbusier and P. L. Nervi, as well as from the writings of archeologists. This emphasis on sources from such diversified fields is necessary, since the author, a practicing architect, was able to systematize his ideas derived from his own practical and intellectual experiences, but also from a thorough knowledge of the thinking of the leading writers in related fields.

The introduction contains a survey of the present state of architecture as well as of a truly coherent and precise terminology; it also contains a comprehensive presentation of Norberg-Schulz's architectural theory: "the work of architecture is a function of factors which are not immediately accessible. . . . Only when intending what the form represents as a manifestation of higher objects may we talk about a real architectural experience." After a very precise analysis of the relationship between buildings and those who use them, there follows the discussion of the means of architecture and how far they correspond to particular prerequisites. Quite naturally, the problem of space consciousness is considered, too, and the author has proven that it represents more than a mere psychological perception of the objective physical space of science.

The conceptual analysis of architectural compositions goes beyond the experience of purely quantitative space. There are no general attempts to explain one all-comprehensive principle, neither of architectural creation nor of architectural experience. The basic formative principle, the underlying "intention" is never the same, not even among works of the same period and style, very often not even among creations of one and the same architect.

The selection of illustrations and occasional schematic drawings of fundamental structural elements is, although not in all examples, rather