

## Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW  
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Litchfield, R. Burr. *Emergence of a Bureaucracy: The Florentine Patricians, 1530–1790*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986. Pp. xiii, 407. Illustrations, tables, bibliography, index. \$47.50 (U.S.)

David Wooton

Volume 17, numéro 3, february 1989

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017643ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017643ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cette note

Wooton, D. (1989). Litchfield, R. Burr. *Emergence of a Bureaucracy: The Florentine Patricians, 1530–1790*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986. Pp. xiii, 407. Illustrations, tables, bibliography, index. \$47.50 (U.S.). *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 17(3), 221–222.  
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1017643ar>

illustrated how easily demographic shifts can cause urban violence. As Levitt and Shaffir conclude, "the swastika battles in Toronto during August 1933 were among the most violent expressions of ethnic animosity in the city's history." Their book is a tribute to the new "Toronto the Good," a city which has taken great strides towards making the scores of different ethnic groups who constitute the multicultural mosaic of the city feel safe, secure, welcome, and at home. In doing so, they have enhanced our understanding of the development of the "city that works."

Paula J. Draper  
Research Associate  
Multicultural History Society  
of Ontario

**Holdsworth, Deryck W. *The Parking Authority of Toronto, 1952-1987*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987. Pp xii, 122. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index.**

In writing this brief, authorized history of the Parking Authority of Toronto (1952-1987), Holdsworth, a geographer, had both full access to the Authority's files plus (to quote the foreword) "complete freedom in his work." He used that freedom to extol the Parking Authority as "demonstrably economic, self-sufficient, and exemplary — and consequently representative of the established Canadian preference for benign government." In other words, when he is not narrating the Authority's history, garage by garage, Holdsworth is anxious to contrast (superior) Canadian public enterprise with (inferior) American private enterprise. "The American model was," he writes, "largely one where municipalities built and then leased garages to private bidders, using their leverage over parking rates as their window on the industry. Toronto, in contrast, chose a different variant on the authority model, one where the municipality owned and operated the facilities."

But Holdsworth does not explain why the Toronto model works better, just that it does. Yet why should the government construction of a carpark and its subsequent operation as regulated private enterprise lead to a situation where one "has to park one's car, unlocked, in a seedy lot in some larger American city . . . ?" Holdsworth seems to suggest that urban pathology can be prevented by government-operated carparks. No doubt the Parking Authority would agree. But should scholars? Is not the difference between government ownership and regulation too minor, and the municipal carpark too insignificant (especially when most of Toronto's have been privately-owned), to account for either American urban decay or the success of Toronto? And, since the "Toronto model" had only one other application in Canada, it surely cannot provide a foundation for differentiating Canadian from American cities.

Basically, Holdsworth expects too much of the carpark. It simply did not have the impact — judging from his own evidence — to make Toronto the "city that works." But as a book on a parking authority, there are penetrating insights here into Toronto's traffic history, and the debate over the automobile around 1970. Urban specialists should read this small book, perhaps the best on the subject when the subject is parking.

Donald Davis  
Department of History  
University of Ottawa

**Litchfield, R. Burr. *Emergence of a Bureaucracy: The Florentine Patricians, 1530-1790*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986. Pp. xiii, 407. Illustrations, tables, bibliography, index. \$47.50 (U.S.).**

There are few good books on Florence after the collapse of the republic, with the notable exception of Eric Cochrane's well-known *Florence in the Forgotten Centuries*. This

book is thus welcome on that account alone. Professor Litchfield is the author of three fine essays on Florence in this period: on the demography of the patriciate (*Journal of Economic History*, 1969), on their commercial investments (*Annales*, 1969), and on their access to office (*Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, 1971). It has been almost 20 years since he promised us in those essays a general study of the patriciate during the principate: at last his long labours have reached fruition.

Unfortunately the end product is not a great book. The patriciate as members of the bureaucracy provides Litchfield with his guiding theme but little he has to say on this subject (for all the care and effort he has brought to it) surprises or excites. One cannot help regretting that he did not complete the more general social history of the patriciate that he seems once to have planned.

At the centre of his early work were the economic strategies of the patriciate: marriage customs designed to prevent the dissipation of patrimonies and extensive investments in land and (until the mid 18th century) in Florentine commerce. Office-holding, in his original view, gave them an influence on policy that served to protect their commercial investments: as a source of income it was of limited (though not negligible) importance. With the end of the Medici dynasty that influence collapsed. They saved what they could from the wreckage of their commercial investments, abandoning commerce to the urban middle class. But they were compensated by the end of controls on the grain trade which had kept down prices. What they lost in trade they stood to make up in rents. Paradoxically, then, their loss of power freed them from an outmoded economic strategy based upon guild monopolies.

Litchfield's book provides, in its last two sections, a much more developed account of patrician land-holding. Particularly interesting

is his stress on the absence of any real interest in agrarian improvement until the end of the 18th century. His attitude to the regulated grain trade has changed markedly from his work in earlier essays. He now stresses its corruption and inefficiency to a much greater degree. One ends up longing for an even more sustained account of the social and economic revolution for which the Hapsburg-Lorraine rulers of Florence were responsible after 1737. From being a protected centre of commerce and manufacture Florence was demoted to a town amongst others; its inhabitants, previously guaranteed a supply of grain, were left to fend for themselves on the open market. At the same time, the old ruling elite were ejected from office and new standards of bureaucratic efficiency were imposed. It would be hard to imagine a more interesting case study in the transition from a medieval and early modern city state to a modern city — a transition accompanied by the reception and adoption of Enlightenment ideas. Tuscany was, following the advice of Beccaria, the first state to abolish the death penalty, and government fiscal policy was debated in terms drawn from physiocracy.

Professor Litchfield felt the need to tell us what happened to the patriciate during the years of Medici rule. But in the end we have neither a full social history of the patriciate nor a full-scale study of the 18th-century reforms. Here and there, too, his book (which is beautifully produced, as we have come to expect from Princeton) is clumsily written. There are other faults, but it may be churlish to complain: Litchfield takes his place beside Cochrane as one of our few and valuable authorities on post-republican Florence. He takes us from Machiavelli to Beccaria; from the guilds to free trade; from republican magistracies, through the ducal court, to the formation of a modern bureaucracy. He has chosen to concentrate on the administration of government, and in the process he has

reminded us of the interest and importance of Florence in these forgotten centuries.

David Wooton  
Department of Political Science  
University of Western Ontario

**Kramer, Lloyd S. *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830-1848*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988. Pp. xii, 297. Illustrations, index. \$31.50 (U.S.).**

This book offers a fascinating exploration of the relationship between social and intellectual history. Combining theory and practice, Kramer begins with a sophisticated discussion of the historiographic problems involved in trying to clarify this relationship and then illustrates his recommended approach with a clearly written account of how the experience of exile affected the thought of three major writers living in Paris under the "July Monarchy."

Rejecting approaches that stress the primacy of social experience in shaping ideas or of ideas in shaping social experience, Kramer insists on the reciprocal influence between experience and texts. As he puts it, "Without ideas, experience does not make sense . . . Without society, ideas do not make sense." Social experience takes place within interpretive systems derived from inherited ideas or texts while all ideas and texts appear within social systems. Most people living in stable societies, of course, are scarcely conscious of the extent to which their reality is defined by their social system. But the experience of exile, Kramer contends, "provokes new forms of interpretation by defamiliarizing the familiar and familiarizing the unfamiliar." In the case of the three highly gifted individuals examined in this study — Heinrich Heine, Karl Marx, and Adam Mickiewicz — the experience of living in exile in a challenging and stimulating new environment (Paris of

the 1830s and 1840s) played an important, perhaps indispensable, role in provoking them to work out innovative interpretations of social realities. Since their new theories (of socialism and nationalism) were of fundamental importance to subsequent European history, Kramer's exploration of their genesis provides both demonstrations of his methodology and valuable contributions to European social and intellectual history.

The book is organized in a straightforward way, with chapters on Paris, Heine, Marx, and Mickiewicz. Kramer utilizes the existing secondary material on all four topics, but primary materials have also been used extensively. The description of "the capital of Europe," as seen and experienced by foreigners, is an impressive piece of urban history. In part because the length of their Parisian experience varied (Heine and Mickiewicz lived out their lives in Paris after their arrival in the early 1830s, whereas Marx resided there for only a little more than a year — October 1843 to February 1845), the treatment accorded each figure is somewhat different. For Heine and Mickiewicz, whose works and importance are little appreciated in the English-speaking world, Kramer provides full accounts of their lives, literary works, and influence. With Marx, given the vast literature on every aspect of his life, Kramer concentrates on a detailed examination of how his experiences in Paris affected him during this crucial period in his intellectual development, and how this evolution found expression in the texts he produced during his months in the French capital (i.e. the articles he contributed to the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, *The Holy Family*, and the long unpublished *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*), and the text in which he settled accounts with the French socialist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (*The Poverty of Philosophy* of 1847). Kramer argues convincingly that Marx's experiences in Paris encouraged him "to investigate the historical inadequacies of the economists, the philosophical errors of the Hegelians, and the revolutionary mistakes of the Jacobins"