reflection, that is, in discursive fields unquestionably shaped by his work. The essays speak for themselves, with occa-
sional glosses in the postscripts—for example, alleging a shift away from a looser approach to footnoting, implicitly allied with the possibility of more inno-
vative and suggestive academic writing. If the contemporary academic world often resembles a Renaissance court, with its princes, courtiers, and sober pro-
fessionals, Thoenes leaves no doubt where he stands. One may sometimes be
impatient with his restraint, but it is impossible not to be impressed by his achievement.

Charles Burroughs
Binghamton University

Notes
1. Not included in the volume is Thoenes's impor-
tant essay "Staatsauftrag und Marc Aurel," in V. von Flemming and S. Schütze, eds., Ars naturam adiuvans:
2. Apart from the collaboration with F. Wolff Metternich (Die frühen St. Peter Entwürfe, 1505–1514
[Tübingen, 1987]), however, Thoenes has edited an
impressive volume of proceedings of a conference
on Serlio (Milan, 1989).

Alina Payne
The Architectural Treatise in the
Italian Renaissance. Architectural
Invention, Ornament and Literary
Culture
New York: Cambridge University Press,
1999, xv + 343 pp., 88 illus. $75.00 (cloth).

Alina Payne's study of Italian Renaissance
architectural treatises is one of the
numerous recent publications on this
material. To mention only those of book
length and most closely related to the work under review one would have to include Mario Carpo's L'Architettura del
tèa della stampa: Oralità, scrittura, libro stampato e riproduzione meccanica dell'immagine nella storia delle teorie architettoniche
(1998), his La Maschera e il modello. Teoria architettonica ed evangelismo nell'Extraord
nario libro di Sebastiano Serlio
(1993), and his Metodo e ordini della teoria architettonica
dei primi moderni. Alberti, Raffaello, Serlio e
Camillo (1993); Candida Syndikus's Leon
Battista Alberti. Das Bauornament
(1996); and Vaughan Hart with Peter Hicks,
Paper Palaces. The Rise of the Renaissance
Architectural Treatise (1998). This publica-
tion activity has been paralleled in the
past decade by a number of recent major
exhibitions, accompanied by catalogues,
on Renaissance architects (Francesco di
Giorgio, Leon Battista Alberti, Giulio
Romano, and Michele Sanmicheli), prac-
tice (Renaissance models and drawings),
and architectural theory (the treatises themselves).
And there has been a wealth
of new publications and translations of
treatises by Vincenzo Scamozzi (1991),
Andrea Palladio (1997), and Sebastiano
Serlio (1994 and 1996). That Sebastiano
Serlio has received particular attention is
evident from the titles just listed as well
as the publication of two monographs on
him by Christoph Thoenes (editor, 1989)

Most of the recent work on Renais-
sance architectural theory has focused on
the sixteenth- rather than the fifteenth-
century material, partly because the later
treatise literature is more abundant.
Additionally, however, the new interpre-
tive methods, informed by literary crit-
cism, that are being implemented by
young authors (many of the book-length
studies began as dissertations) find a natu-ual subject in the published (later) trea-
tises. Much, probably most, of the
new literature—including Payne's book—
engages the relationship between the
Renaissance treatises and Vitruvius's Ten
Books on Architecture. (Vitruvius, too, has
been the subject of recent interest with a
new edition edited by Franca Bossalino
[1998], a study of his reception in the
Middle Ages and the Renaissance by
Stefan Schuler [1999], and a new Eng
lish translation of the treatise by Ingrid
Rowland, expected soon.) And most—
again including Payne's book—focus on
the Renaissance reception of the orders.
Undoubtedly, a radically different under-
standing of sixteenth-century
architectural theory will emerge from
the extraordinarily intense scholarly
activity of this decade, only a small sam-
ing of which I list above. But this will
take some time to coalesce, not only
because of the sheer abundance of new
material, ideas, and interpretive models,
but also because the publications are so
close in date that the authors had little
opportunity to respond to each other's
views. For instance, of the publications I
refer to above, only two—Carpo's earli-
est book and the original, not the ana-
tastic reprint, of Scamozzi's treatise—are in
Payne's bibliography. Granted, her bib-
liography does not include all the works
cited in her notes, but it also may be that
many of the new publications appeared
after she completed her dissertation
(1992) and too close in time to its publi-
cation as a book for her to incorporate them.

Payne situates her book intellectu-
ally between Alois Riegl, cited on the
first page of the Introduction (1), and
Walter Benjamin, a quotation from
whom ends that chapter (11). From the
former she draws the importance of
ornament, a potentially marginalized aspect of architectural style that for
Riegl was the locus of unmediated cul-

tural expression and that Payne associ-
ates with individual artistic freedom and
invention. Riegl has been the subject of
special scholarly interest recently (the
English translation of his Problems of
Style was published in 1992), together
with other late-nineteenth-century crit-
cits like Wilhelm Vöge, Adolph Gold-
schmidt, and Jakob Burckhardt, perhaps
in part because of their engagement
with the more sensory aspects of art. In
embracing Riegl's subjectivity, Payne
states her rejection of Rudolf Witt-
kower's abstract and intellectualizing
treatment of form in his classic Architect-
ural Principles in the Age of Humanism
(1949), an approach that she associates
with the dominance of High Modern
ism in twentieth-century architec-
ture (8). But Payne is not, like
Wittkower, interested in the philosop-
chal and religious content of architec-
ture. Rather, she seeks to elucidate an
emotional and intellectual conflict
between commitment to imitatio,
whether of nature or of antiquity
(loosely, convention), and the drive toward individual expression, or freedom, which she identifies with anxiety over *licentia* (loosely, invention) (4). The dynamic tension between tradition and innovation inherent in the term “Renaissance” has always been at the center of scholarship on this period, and the originality of Payne’s contribution lies in her particular formulation of this problem. The conflict is explored within the treatises of Leon Battista Alberti (chapter 4), Francesco di Giorgio (chapter 5), Sebastiano Serlio (chapter 6), Gherardo Spinelli (chapter 7), Andrea Palladio (chapter 8), and Vincenzo Scamozzi (chapter 9); treatises by other authors are included peripherally. However, the book is more complex structured than a sequence of individual studies, for Payne queries not only the relations of these texts to Vitruvius and more broadly, to ancient classical texts, but most importantly their relation to each other and to contemporaneous thought, especially in literary theory and science. The book is in two parts, with the first five chapters developing the intellectual matrix and the last four, plus the coda, presenting case studies.

Before addressing Payne’s argument in greater depth, let me say what the book does and does not include. It provides an extremely detailed presentation of the Renaissance reception of Vitruvius and related activities such as publication and commentary. There is a wealth of information about individual Renaissance treatises and very close readings of individual passages from them, based on Payne’s own reliable translations in the text, which the reader can compare with the original Latin or Italian in her notes. On the conceptual plane, since Vitruvius does not discuss invention and originality, Payne focuses on his accounts of: the origins of the orders; the story of the Persians and the caryatids; Vitruvius’s criticism of Second Style Pompeian painting; his vignette about Aristophanes of Byzantium; and his vignette about Dinocrates. She also focuses attention on his (and others’) use of the terms *decor* and *decorum* and its Greek equivalent to *prepon* in a discussion that oddly neglects Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, surely the main source for this Greek term in the Renaissance (57). Such discussion of actual buildings as there is appears as companda for written theory. This is a book for readers already familiar with Renaissance architecture who can supply from their own memories the built work of the treatises’ authors as well as the general lines of stylistic development, the historical context, and the main events in painting, sculpture, and literature for the later fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries. While Payne’s book offers exceptionally close and perceptive readings of certain aspects of the major treatises, those wishing a balanced survey of Renaissance treatises, together with short biographies of the authors and illustrations of their built works, will be more satisfied with Hart and Hicks’s *Paper Palaces*.

Payne has chosen to focus on ornament as the locus of artistic freedom, or license. Like the English “license,” *licentia* means both licit and licentious, freedom and excessive freedom. It is, therefore, no easy task to determine when the term carries a positive and when a negative charge for Renaissance theorists. By and large, all the theorists approve of some artistic freedom and condemn licentiousness, thought to result in bad design. Since the criteria of sixteenth-century aesthetic judgments are elusive, Payne’s close readings of the texts offer welcome insights, especially in distinguishing the fine line between the two kinds of license. However, since the word *licentia* first appears in an architectural context in Book IV of Serlio’s treatise, devoted to the rules for the orders (118) and published in 1537, one wonders if the problem of artistic freedom associated with “licentia” is specific to a rather narrower segment of the Renaissance than the scope of Payne’s book engages.

A new critical instrument for the investigation of Renaissance architectural theory, hinted at in Payne’s book, is the importance of the theory of *disegno* in painting for judgments about the quality of architectural compositions. Spinelli’s praise of Michelangelo for a classicism based on *disegno*, nature, and art (151) suggests parallels with the approach of painters like Bronzino, especially as interpreted by Craig Smyth (*Mannerism and maniera* [Vienna, 1992]) and David Summers (“Contrapposto: Style and Meaning in Renaissance Art,” *Art Bulletin* 59 [1977]: 336–362). Thus, the passage from Vincenzo Danti’s treatise (1567) (Payne, 289 n. 54) that claims the right of *disegno* to create artistic forms that don’t exist in nature, such as the Chimera, evokes hybrid creatures such as Bronzino painted in *Venus, Cupid, Folly and Time* (1546) together with its elaborate intellectual context. Again, Serlio’s recommendation of fragmented forms that are completed by the spectator’s knowledge of what the whole would be (130) seems analogous to the contemporaneous practice in painting of including fragments from famous ancient statues (as in Rosso’s *Moses and the Daughters of Jethro* or from “authoritative” High Renaissance compositions (Giulio Romano’s Sala di Psiche in the Palazzo del Te). Perhaps Zuccaro’s and Lomazzo’s belief that the *disegno* that guides painting is the common denominator for all the arts (309 nn. 69 and 70) has greater significance for sixteenth-century architectural theory and practice than has been thought. The possibility that, at mid-century and later, compositional criteria developed for painting might be applicable to architectural design is tantalizing, more especially because it coincides with the rise of the illustrated architectural treatise and the popularization of engravings of architecture.

Payne’s choice of “ornament” as the locus for discussion of artistic freedom is, frankly, confusing because she nowhere defines what she means by this term and most of the book is about the orders. Nor can readers easily deduce from the treatises what their authors intended by “ornament”. Palladio disapproves of “ornament” that has no practical or necessary function (186), but...
Serlio likens ornament to clothing or jewelry worn by a woman (140)—that is, something added. It could be argued that, since in Renaissance architecture (as in much of Roman architecture) the orders often have little or no tectonic function, they are therefore ornament. But does this mean that the orders and ornament are coterminous? And would an ornamental understanding of the orders not be a crucial factor in the Renaissance reception of Vitruvius, for whom they were first of all structural? Is it the case that the orders are only sometimes, or partly, ornament? And does not ornament encompass in the Renaissance—as earlier—gilding, coffering, wall revetments, and pavements, which are unrelated to the orders and are not included in Payne’s book? Yet Payne characterizes Serlio’s Book IV, the subject of which is the orders, as “testimony to the fact that by the third decade of the sixteenth century ornament elicited a discourse all its own,” and as “focused on the taxonomy of ornament and its uses” (116). It may be accurate to describe Renaissance architectural theory, focused in this book on the orders, as “the painstaking process of developing a general theory of ornament” (238). But some additional discussion of what ornament was thought to be in the Renaissance and of the degree to which the architectural orders belong to this category seems needed.

One of the most illuminating themes in Payne’s book is that of the reception of Vitruvius, supported by first-rate textual analyses delineating those aspects of his work of interest to sixteenth-century readers and their transformation in the treatises. Payne sees the Renaissance recuperation of antiquity as inevitably including a textual and theoretical component, with Vitruvius as “the one stable reference point” (33). This interpretative assumption has long dominated the study of Renaissance architecture, but its present revitalization may be associated with the fact that several of the authors of recent works in the field were trained as architects and/or teach in professional schools in the postmodern era. However, positing Vitruvius and the orders at the center of the study of Renaissance architecture distinguishes the direction of architectural history from the tendency to a more inclusive approach of other kinds of Renaissance scholars whose interests include (for example) the vernacular and patristics. It marginalizes a great deal of what was actually built, overlooking, for instance, the vivid interest in Early Christian architecture, a partner to the revival of patristic literature and evidenced in revival-style architecture especially in later fifteenth-century Rome; the Byzantine revival in the same period in Venice; the Romanesque revivals in Florence and Milan; and ambitious gothicizing projects of the time such as the Cathedral of Milan, the Cathedral and Certosa of Pavia, and San Petronio in Bologna. While much is still to be learned about Vitruvius and his followers, as Payne’s book shows, we need also to remember that the vast majority of structures built between 1400 and 1600 did not utilize the orders, if only because their expense suits them for the most elite projects, and that virtually all the architects and theorists had a Christian understanding of human freedom before some acquired a classical one.

Payne’s book makes a substantial contribution toward understanding the treatise literature as an evolving reflection on the principles of good architecture. In so doing, her book lays the foundations for future syntheses. For instance, one might explore the hypothesis that the rather broad artistic freedom claimed by Alberti (79) and Palladio (172) bracket a more restrictive and authoritarian period following the High Renaissance in the 1530s and 1540s when licentia seems to have been most closely scrutinized. Whatever general conclusions will emerge from the abundant new literature of which Payne’s book is a part, they will be indebted to her meticulous analyses of the relevant passages in the treatise literature.

Christine Smith
Harvard University

Daniela del Pesco
L’architettura del seicento
Storia dell’arte in Italia

Daniela del Pesco’s L’architettura del seicento, part of UTET’s series History of Art in Italy (as opposed to a History of Italian Art), provides a comprehensive pan-Italian account of the subject, fittingly published exactly forty years after that of her most important predecessor. This worthy alternative to Rudolf Wittkower’s Art and Architecture in Italy 1600–1750 (Harmondsworth, 1958)—which also included painting and sculpture—provides a well-balanced and up-to-date survey that is both extremely useful and a pleasure to read.

Following the general format of the series, this survey is arranged by region. Del Pesco begins with Rome and the Papal States and then moves systematically through Northern Italy and Tuscany before descending to cover the South. A great advantage of this approach is that a plausible account of the development of architecture in the seventeenth century emerges for each individual region—whether a major center such as Rome, or what might be termed one of the “lesser” Italian centers. Nobody would deny that Rome was the most important place for the development of Baroque architecture, but too often it has seemed to be almost the only one. By devoting the first (very long) chapter of 112 pages to “Rome and the Papal States,” and charting developments there from the end of the sixteenth century right through to the end of the seventeenth, Del Pesco sets out the important achievements at Rome. However, due to the topographical arrangement of the book, this strategy leaves the author clear to deal autonomously with the other Italian regions without constant recourse to the “capital”; in addition, because stylistic analysis is not the principal engine that drives her analyses, odious comparisons are avoided.