tratingly generic. While much of the discussion is given over to the issue of pairings and patterns in the display of spolia, virtually none of the illustrations provides the visual evidence to shore up this point.

These flaws should probably be understood as the fruit of missionary zeal. In an effort to right a historiographic wrong, Fabricius Hansen, though unwilling to cut back or see shades of gray, has produced a book that is learned, thoughtful, and provocative. It is what one wants a work of scholarship to be.

SARAH BASSETT
Wayne State University

Notes

2. See n. 1 for examples pertinent to the visual phenomenon of reuse. On the question of sympathy with cognate disciplines, see esp. Michael Roberts, The Joveled Style Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity (Ithaca and London, 1989).

Georgia Clarke
Roman House—Renaissance Palaces: Inventing Antiquity in Fifteenth Century Italy

Georgia Clarke’s book deals with one of the major themes that has occupied architectural history in the last two generations: the influence of ideas and concepts about ancient houses on palace architecture in Italy from around 1440 to around 1500. Her definition of palace is a building of a certain status and standing, not necessarily related to the rich and noble alone, but mainly a type of building that exhibits elements of “conscious design.” This characterization takes into account the social structure of Renaissance Italy, where courts and republics, princes and bourgeoisie competed in transforming the antique into a modern and suitable concept of self-representation and adequate habitat, and it emphasizes (though perhaps insufficiently) visual appearance.

There has been a great deal of detailed research in this area during the last five decades, concentrating on single buildings, prominent architects or particular clients, and specific cities or regions. Clarke’s careful bibliography is a valuable vademecum to this field. Her book also provides what has been missing: a panoramic view that includes north and south, centers and peripheries. She explores many of the most important examples: the Roman Casa dei Crescenzi (an early, still medieval but advanced example of the integration of antique remains); the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino; the Neapolitan palaces of Diomede Carafa and Angelo Cuomo; the Palazzi Rucellai and Gondi in Florence; Palazzo Vitelleschi in Tarquinia; and Palazzo Orsini in Nola. She divides her highly readable and erudite text into five chapters, dealing with questions of antiquity and identity, variety, magnificence, and imitation; and with aspects of texts and memory, discovery and creation. All these terms are current and somewhat trendy. Recently, research has explored widely the function of the appeal to antiquity and, in the happier cases, succeeded in integrating this particular branch of art-historical literature into the more general discourse on memory, aesthetics, and iconic criticism.

Even so, Clarke’s “reading” of architecture, with a focus mainly on Vitruvius, falls back into a traditional, particularistic attitude. There is no objection to her philological insistence on the importance of the antique source, for example regarding courtyards. Her list of manuscripts and printed copies of Vitruvius in the appendix is valuable (though selective), as architectural history has concentrated too exclusively on the physical remains of antiquity and neglected the written tradition. And there is no doubt that the reading and exegesis of Vitruvius is at least as elucidating as the drawings and measurements of antique buildings or fragments (documented in far too many “databases” in recent years, with uncertain effectiveness). Clarke’s analysis of Francesco di Giorgio’s and Giuliano da Sangallo’s drawings of Roman palaces shows instead the fruitfulness of a close reading that does not depend on a huge technical apparatus. But this book perpetuates a somewhat homespun antiquarian research. It is a critical compilation of the existing literature—though I wish to emphasize that, unlike much Anglo-Saxon academic writing, Clarke’s takes into account the multilingual production of the scholarly community.

The author’s chapter on façades and ancient and early modern rustication makes it evident that the concentration on classical antiquarian sources—writing in particular—does not really enable her fully to describe, capture, and interpret the great impact of the discovery and transformation of the antique on Renaissance Europe. Although in her discussion on the façade of the Palazzo Medici in Florence Clarke acknowledges the important role played by the drafted masonry of the castle of Frederick II in Prato and of the Forum of Augustus in Rome (thought by many in the quattro-
cento to be the remains of an imperial palace), she seems to prefer the philological key. In fact, she argues that the façade was probably a specific expression of rhetoric rather than a generic manifestation of rhetorical *magnificentia*. She discovers an architectural analogy in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ Greek *De compositione nominum*, particularly in the three stories of the palace and the three styles of rhetoric (austere, polished, tempered). Now, these affinities might be less “strong” than the author believes—there is no direct proof that either the architect or his patron directly knew this source. George of Trebizond (present in Florence from 1440 to 1443) had made various architectural analogies in his *Rhetoricon*, and it seems that these allusions were common. What matters more is the fact that Clarke does not really investigate the reasons for these analogies and their consequences. If rhetorics are paralleled with architectural structures (and vice versa), they are considered as images. The laws of visual appearance, the necessities of order and arrangement, and the cognitive powers of the visual thus also apply to the written and spoken word.

Nowhere in the book does Clarke refer to image or painting; the term “icon” does not figure. We know that Leon Battista Alberti, in the foreword to his treatise on painting “dedicated” to his fellow architect Filippo Brunelleschi, insisted on the major role of painting in exploring new means of construction under the primacy of antiquity. The art of painting—the murals of Masaccio or Fra Angelico, Andrea Mantegna or Piero della Francesca—provided architectural practice with indispensable details and veritable “blueprints.” Architecture of the early modern period therefore must be thought of mainly as an “image”; it should be confronted in terms of iconic criticism. Discussions on the orders from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century show how evident the purely “visual” character of architecture always was, particularly concerning the façade.

“Inventing antiquity” in Renaissance Italy also meant trying to appear within a single perspectival scheme, turning the façade into a sort of “canvas,” a portrait, a historical account, and mainly, a structure that followed the laws of the visible. Even whole cities, as is the case with Florence, were transformed into a visual “setting.” These qualities of Renaissance architecture allow us to reconstruct not only buildings but also the entire antiquarian *Lebensgefühl* and the impact that the visual arts—the epistemic icon—had on the early modern period. In order to recapture “conscious design,” research should focus on the visual. As long as architectural history does not consider itself part of an integrative, aesthetic, art-historical debate and discourse, it will remain not only incomplete, but will not even keep up with the expectations and the ideals of its practitioners. Clarke’s book, despite its indubitable merits, therefore reads as an epilogue to an outmoded architectural history.

ANDREAS BEYER
University Basel

David R. Coffin

Pirro Ligorio: The Renaissance Artist, Architect, and Antiquarian

It is remarkably fitting, and at the same time bittersweet, that David R. Coffin’s last book, published shortly after his death in October 2003, returns to the subject of his first full-length scholarly study, his dissertation for Princeton University on Pirro Ligorio and the Villa d’Este at Tivoli, completed close to fifty years before. After this work, Coffin went on to write classic studies for a field that was only beginning to emerge, the architecture of wealthy patrons’ private retreats and their garden settings. This area came into being in large part because Coffin carefully crafted the subject for years through loving labor in archives, libraries, and museums. After producing a monograph on Ligorio’s architecture and garden design for the Cardinal of Ferrara (like Ligorio, a cov-