these authors, that it cannot be of the 16th century, which Academia E. 2.2.18 certainly is.

In effect, Parronchi's hypothesis is complex and reversible. To support it, it is necessary to assume for Magnificienianus II.1.141, and also for S.IV.4, a pseudo-Quattrocento handwriting, and a multiplicity of sources such as the first version of Francesco di Giorgio's treatise, his translation of Vitruvius, Leonardo's codex Madrid II, and Academia E. 2.1.18, which, in turn, is a copy of a lost original hypothetically attributable to Peruzzi. Finally, Parronchi must assume a conscious will in the midst of the Cinquecento to create an apocryphal text with obsolete examples of military and civic architecture, perhaps the will of Cosimo Bartoli, as Parronchi has earlier proposed. Having successfully identified Lorenzo Donati, an engraver documented in Siena from 1535 to 1550, as the copyist of Academia E. 2.1.18, Parronchi associates this fact with the statement in Academia E. 2.1.18 that the author was present at the siege of Florence in 1539. This, together with the Sienese origin of the manuscript, purports to be the only indisputable element on which Parronchi bases his attribution to Peruzzi.

Some specific issues must also be examined in order to determine the validity of Parronchi's attribution. He compares the passage narrating the Vitruvian anecdote of Dinocrates in Academia E. 2.1.18 with the same in Magnificienianus II.1.141, and deduces a derivation of the latter from the former. What was left out of the reasoning process, however, was a similar comparison with the analogous passage in the autograph translation of Vitruvius. The anecdote of Dinocrates in Academia E. 2.1.18 is particularly faithful to Francesco di Giorgio's text, and, as is demonstrated by numerous brief omissions, it clearly derives from the autograph translation in Magnificienianus II.1.141. This translation, in turn, is closely tied to the first version of Francesco di Giorgio's Trattati, which was the basis for all improvements in the clarification of Vitruvius in the autograph translation. Therefore, Magnificienianus II.1.141 did not have to refer to Academia E. 2.1.18 for its Vitruvian sections.

As for the passages of text and drawings of military architecture in Academia E. 2.1.18, it must be stressed that Parronchi's arguments can be turned around to prove the opposite points. Furthermore, if the descriptions of fortifications were derived from an original by Peruzzi, instead of by Francesco di Giorgio, insurmountable difficulties related to content would arise, difficulties admitted even by Parronchi himself (p. 178). Academia E. 2.1.18 would contain anachronistically, and for the first time, images of such structures as the roche of Cagli and Sassoferato, erected by Federico da Montefeltro in the 1470s. And, above all, we should have to attribute to Peruzzi technical and stylistic ideas which are fully of the late Quattrocento. One cannot argue, as Parronchi does, that the concept of the rocca as a small, isolated, and fortified nucleus, and the approximations of flanking fire which appear prominently in the figures of Academia E. 2.1.18, are in any way reconcilable either with the request by Imperial forces during the siege of Florence for Peruzzi's and Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's expert advice, or with the restructuring and modernization of the defenses of Siena by Peruzzi.

On the subject of the drawings of machines in the Raccolta of Magnificienianus II.1.141, and Parronchi's view of their presumed derivation from Academia E. 2.1.18, it needs to be emphasized that the Raccolta, which I consider to be by Francesco di Giorgio, was not considered by him to be an organic whole. It was rather his pupils who collected the material and attempted to give it a homogeneous appearance to allow for its inclusion at the end of the codex. As I suggested in 1978 (Città e macchine dell'800 nei disegni di Francesco di Giorgio Martini), similar drawings were added to the remaining blank sheets of the codex until a character of completeness was achieved. These "school" drawings have been so identified in my catalogue, as well as the captions which are different than and subsequent to the original ones. But Parronchi gives no importance to such distinctions. Besides all this, it is impossible to see how the drawings of machines in the Raccolta could derive from the rapid and extremely minute sketches contained in just a few sheets, by a hand other than Lorenzo Donati's, in Academia E. 2.1.18. In any case, the drawings in the Raccolta contain definite differences, are generally superior in synthetic graphic quality, are strictly late Quattrocento, and are difficult to attribute to a simple copyist.

However, what does show the characteristics of a Cinquecento copy of Academia E. 2.1.18 are the drawings copied by Oreste Vannoccio Biringuccio in the Sienese codex S.IV.1, as is noted by Parronchi.

The copies after Francesco di Giorgio in the Taccuino of Pietro Cataneto are an altogether different matter. These lead Parronchi to recognize Cataneto's handwriting in Academia E. 2.1.18. But what we have in this case are youthful exercises in calligraphy, which cannot be recognized with certainty in Academia E. 2.1.18, nor described as being the model for the Raccolta drawings. To be sure of this, one need only look at Catanato's Sienese manuscript L.V.I.10, fo. 1 recto, in preparation for his commentary on Polybius' castrum.

Finally, a comparison of the fortification illustrations in the text of Academia E. 2.1.18, with the one bastardone form sketched in the first folios of the codex, would suffice to point out the historical hiatus between one type and the other. Also, it is not sufficient to claim that one Chamucini, whose name appears on one of the sheets, is an unknown and therefore not the author of annotations.

Academia E. 2.1.18 must be seen more as a factor in the history of Francesco di Giorgio's theoretical writings than in the theoretical writings of Peruzzi. As a copy of the Cinquecento it does indeed reflect a moment of reworking and elaboration which Maltese had already (1967) considered to be intermediate between the two versions of Francesco di Giorgio's Trattati. It contains Vitruvian passages which, although present in the translation in Magnificienianus II.1.141, disappear in the final version of the treatise, and it adds the description of the Regioni di Roma to the corpus of Francesco di Giorgio's writings. Its attribution to Peruzzi is not necessary and is altogether impossible. It is far more probable that Baldassare, like so many other Sienese, followed in the tradition of Francesco di Giorgio, conforming to it and adapting it, without needing to draft further copies of the writings. That task could be left to the younger generation, or to secondary figures, for example, our Lorenzo Donati.

The Cinquecento transcription, in Academia E. 2.1.18, of so many Vitruvian passages from Francesco di Giorgio's translation is testimony of its critical fortune, not only at the court of Urbino, where it was cited in Luca Pacioli's De divina proportione, but also in Siena at a time when Vitruvian studies had reached an altogether greater degree of accuracy and refinement. In all probability, Francesco di Giorgio drafted his translation prior to the editio princeps by Sulpicio da Veroli, in 1486. From this observation, and from the close relationship between the autograph translation and the first version of the Trattati, one could hypothesize an earlier date for that first version. If this were the case, the paternity of Francesco di Giorgio's Trattati in S.IV.4 and Magnificienianus II.1.141 would be assured, as would also the derivation of Leonardo's codex Madrid II from this later version. Parronchi's attribution to Peruzzi, of an original later transcribed in Lorenzo Donati in Academia E. 2.1.18, would remain unconfirmed.

F. PAOLO PIORTE
Università di Roma


Richard Spear has written a valuable book that should not escape the notice of architectural historians even though the artist that is his subject is not widely known as an architect. Domenichino was a classical painter born in Bologna in 1581 and trained by the Carracci on the scaffolding of the Farnese Gallery in 1602-1603. He went on to paint major fresco cycles in the abbey chapel of Grottaferrata; in the Roman churches of San Luigi dei Francesi, Sant'Andrea della Valle, and San Carlo ai C-
tinari; and finally in the Cappella del Tesoro in Naples, where he died in 1646 after a decade of harassment from his relatives and maybe a touch of poison from his local rivals.

Domenichino built no buildings. He struggled across architecture while reading Vitruvius in the search for a key to Greek musical theory. During a stay in Bologna in 1639-1641 he studied some architecture, and supposedly he picked up mathematics and perspective from the shadowy Fra Matteo Zaccolini in Rome. He was catapulted into the profession in 1621, when his patron Cardinal Ludovisi was elected to the papacy as Gregory XV. Domenichino hurried from Bologna to Rome to assume the post of architetto del Palazzo Apostolico. For the moment it was a sinecure, but the pope had great plans for Domenichino, who "takes pleasure in architecture" (we are told by a biographer in 1621), but whose ambitions were thwarted by the pope's death in 1633.

As it stands, Domenichino's architectural oeuvre amounts to two interesting tomb monuments, the architectural backgrounds in his frescoes, and the coffered ceiling of Santa Maria in Trastevere. There are also projects on paper for the façade of Sant'Andrea della Valle and for the great Ludovisi church of Sant'Ignazio. On the eve of the high baroque age, Domenichino seems to be saying that the classical tradition still offered unexploited possibilities, that antiquity was neither stiff nor monolithic, but more fertile than even a Montano might think.

The early tomb monuments and fresco backgrounds are an extension of Domenichino's work as a painter and art theorist. In 1605-1606 he designed the monument to Cardinal Giorfamo Agucchi in San Pietro in Vincoli in Rome at the behest of monsignor Giambattista Agucchi, the cardinal's brother and the leading theorist of early seicento classicism. This theory revolved around a concept of ideal beauty selectively formed on the example of antiquity and the best Renaissance art, particularly that of Raphael. But the monument comes straight out of Michelangelo; or rather out of the way Michelangelo's ideas were being developed by architects like Giacomo della Porta, whose portal on the Senator's Palace on the Capitoline Hill shows the same dense packing of Michelangelesque forms, the same idea of interlocking and interpenetrating shapes, as the Agucchi monument. In 1608 Domenichino designed another monument to the same cardinal, this time in the church of San Giacomo Maggiore in Bologna. The space above a doorway is given over to a commemorative inscription surrounded by stucco allegories standing between Ionic pilasters as though in some sort of classical atrium of virtue. The design is close to the classicizing atrium in which St. Cecilia meets her death in Domenichino's famous fresco in San Giorgio dei Carmini.

The Bologna monument occasioned an exchange of letters in 1609 between the artist and monsignor Agucchi, giving us a glimpse into a theory of architecture based on the Carracci gallery. Good architectural decoration is substantial, noble, and antique in inspiration. The indiscretions of the lower classes may result in damage to the stucco ornament, but it doesn't matter. Annibale painted fictive stucco statues that look broken in areas of the Farnese Gallery that were out of reach, just to make (we read into his remark) the illusion all the more complete. Thus the appearance of ruin increases the depth of the illusion. Domenichino followed this principle on an even larger scale in the fictive architecture he painted in the frescoes at Grottaterra. The west wall of the chapel shows a triumphal arch with fictive marble columns holding up a cornice on which Greek saints, illusionistically rendered in fresco, seem to stand. Three columns are there, but the fourth, the last on the right, is painted as though missing, so that one sees just the respondent pilaster behind it, like an ancient arch from which one column had fallen or been plundered. The trick reminds us of the miracle of the falling column, a legend from the founding of the abbey that Domenichino paints as one of the scenes on the side walls. The same kind of illusionism can be found in the pendentives Domenichino later painted in Roman churches, where the heavy mural masses of the real architecture are fictively opened up, while a rush of air and heavenly visions sweep in to fill the void, casting their shadows on arches and cornices. There were precedents for the idea in the work of Cherubino Alberti and a splendid sequel in the Gesù vault by Galli and Bernini. But Domenichino's illusionism has its own unique power, and few will forget the sistine grandeur of the figures who spill out into space from the crowded pendentives of San Carlo ai Catinari.

The most significant work of architecture that Domenichino left behind is the wooden ceiling of Santa Maria in Trastevere, built for Cardinal Aldobrandini in 1616-1617 upon his return to Rome after ten years of self-imposed exile. The coffered ceilings that are such a distinctive feature of so many basilicas and palace saloni descend from the stone coffers of Roman temples, such as the Temple of Mars Ultor or Peruzzi's adaptation of the idea in the Palazzo Massimi alle Colonne. In the wooden ceilings, however, the real structure was different from the apparent one. A ceiling that looks as if it is made up of large beams is in fact made up of hundreds of pieces of light wood hung from the roof timbers. Renaissance ceiling designers began to depart from the appearance of continuous structural beams by enlarging the central coffers, but Domenichino left structure behind altogether by designing a pattern based on octagons and the eight-pointed star of the Aldobrandini, with crosses set diagonally. Instead of the usual coat of arms the central octagon contains Domenichino's canvas of the Assumption of the Virgin, as though the coffers were really the central oculus of a cupola.

Without precedent and without progeny in the world of coffered ceilings, the ceiling of Santa Maria in Trastevere prepares the way, indirectly, for the vault patterns of Borromini's San Carlo.

Under the Ludovisi in the early 1620s Domenichino almost became a practising architect. In 1621-1623 he drew a series of façade designs for Sant'Andrea della Valle. Eighteen designs quickly sketched on three sheets show an enormous fertility of invention. Some of the schemes fall into the post-Vignola tradition of Roman façades, but others cast back in a novel way to antiquity and the Renaissance and draw on a whole range of building types never before associated with church façades. Domenichino seems to be saying that the old tradition of superimposed temple fronts—used from Alberti to Della Porta—had run dry, and that façade design could explore totally new territory. There are adaptations of the Arch of Constantine done with a bold classicism that Cockerell would have admired. Some of the designs are modelled on the great Roman show fountains, the Acqua Felice and the Acqua Paola, and like them they accord generous space to inscriptions. The Counter-reformation spectator was always meant to read a message. The giant order makes an appearance in pedicules that anticipate Bernini's façade of Sant'Andrea al Quirinale, designed almost 50 years later. Several designs show porticoes taken over from secular architecture like the Villa Medici or the Palazzo Massimi alle Colonne. One shows a great niche on the second story, as though the façade were meant to display and to celebrate some special personality. The function, if not exactly the form, looks forward to Cortona's Santa Maria in Via Lata, with its grand viewing box on the Corso.

In 1626 Domenichino was consulted on the design of the second Jesuit church in Rome, Sant'Ignazio. He had the ear of the patron, Cardinal Ludovisi, but the Jesuits had their own ideas and their own man, padre Orazio Grassi. Domenichino's ideas are preserved in a small, fascinating drawing in Windsor. His nave would have been a grand thermal hall with large clerestory windows and an Albertian vault. The aisles would have been very low and the side chapels rather high, allowing a strange, dramatic flow of light into the church. Columns, statues, and a scelliana motif mark the bays of this imperial interior, which was butchered in committee and watered down by patrons who wanted another Gesù.

Domenichino's last architectural design was an elaborate portal added in 1628 to the older Palazzo Lancellotti. The grotesque mask at the center is a beautiful adaption of a theme from the Carracci. Domenichino had always looked back to the Farnese Gallery, but soon Roman architecture would begin to catch up with him, as in the lively grotesques of the Barberini façade done at about the same time.

Domenichino proves that there are no easy
labels in early 17th-century architecture. The most ardent theorist of an art based on Raphael found his first inspiration in Michelangelo and produced façade designs that anticipate the great, later façades of Cortona and Bernini. Like Borromini he would have agreed that the way forward lay in looking backward, imaginatively, at an antiquity that was larger and more copious than anybody suspected.

The crisp and abundant black and white illustrations and the superb color plates work together with a handsome typography to make a book that will surely be one of the most beautiful of its generation. Aside from the excellent chapter on architecture and the interest of the text in general, the chapter on musical theory should be read by anyone interested in 17th-century aesthetics or in new directions in art history.

JOSEPH CONNORS
Columbia University


A candid approach to the architecture of Wren is difficult because of the almost superstitious esteem in which his works are held. So wrote Sir John Summerson in his landmark essay on Wren, which was first published in 1937 with the title “The Tyranny of Intellect.” That “almost superstitious esteem” may be a thing of the past, at least in architecturally knowledgable circles, but other things have come between us and Wren’s architecture. One is the suspicion that it is not really Baroque and therefore insular, although in fact, as Rudolf Wittkower wrote, “the cool reserve of his manner exactly corresponds to the Baroque classicism of the second half of the seventeenth century throughout Europe.” Another is what, reviewing Kerry Downes’ Hawkinsmoor in this journal more than 20 years ago, I called the Hawkinsmoor cult, “to whose devotees it is a matter of faith that Hawkinsmoor was a greater architect than either Vanbrugh or Wren.”

Downes was never a devotee of the Hawkinsmoor cult. In his 1959 book on Hawkinsmoor, discussing the question of the attribution of the designs for Whitehall Palace made after the fire of 1689—a question of the first importance because, as Summerson put it in Architecture in Britain 1530-1830, they “inaugurate the English Baroque School”—he came down firmly on the side of Wren. (Summerson had proposed “a coalition of Wren and Hawkinsmoor, with the latter at the drawing-board” as “the least improbable answer.”) In The Architecture of Wren Downes does not find it necessary to mention Hawkinsmoor in connection with the Whitehall designs.

The first two chapters are biographical, “Promise” telling the story of Wren’s life down to the Great Fire of London in 1666 and “Occasion” carrying it on to his death in 1723. Downes’ subject being Wren’s architecture, he does not go into his scientific achievements in any detail, so that Summerson’s little book of 1953 is still the place to turn to for them. In Chapter III, “Quality,” rather to one’s surprise, because none of Wren’s works has been discussed in any detail yet—Downes discusses the question of Wren’s greatness as distinct from his fame, the relationship between his work and mental attitude as a mathematician and scientist and his architecture, the famous passage in Parensahla about the “two Causes of Beauty, natural and customary,” and the speed with which English architecture caught up with that of France and Italy in the later 17th century. “Wren’s own style,” he writes, “passed, in a manner of speaking, from Brunelleschi to Carlo Fontana in one lifetime.”

Chapter IV, “Experiment I,” treats of Wren’s first two buildings, Pembroke College Chapel, Cambridge, and the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford. Both illustrate his use of ancient models, in the chapel a temple at Tivoli (in Serlio’s version) and in the theatre the Theatre of Marcellus, and show how freely he interpreted them, so that “the Theatre of Marcellus is forgotten rather than remembered in that of Sheldon.” With Chapter V, “Principles,” we return to theory, in particular to Wren’s attitude to proportional systems and the effect of the codification of architecture, formulated by Raphael and first consistently applied by Serlio, in plans, elevations, and sections, upon Wren’s early architecture, which is “one of plans, elevations and sections which fit together with the clarity and precision of a construction kit” and is controlled by a “grid framework.” The Whitehall Palace design of 1664, the range built for Dr. Sacheverell at Trinity College, Oxford, the chapel and gallery at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and the London Custom House are discussed as examples. Chapter VI, “Experiment II,” treats of the pre-Fire design for the repair of St. Paul’s, the plan for London, and the peculiar First Model design for St. Paul’s, which proposed a galleried basilica with a circular domed vestibule attached to its west end.

In Chapter VII, “Results,” we come to the buildings that Downes describes as “the most elusive and least understood” of all the categories of Wren’s architecture, namely the City churches built under the Act of Parliament of 1670 (though the last six were not begun until 1686 and the steeples of many of them were added later still). Part of the problem is that others besides Wren, notably Robert Hooke, had a hand in the design of some of them, part that the building accounts and other documents have not been sufficiently studied. Like others before him, Downes finds that St. Stephen Walbrook stands out from the rest. “In this building especially, the geometry that Wren considered to be the basis of the whole world and the manifestation of its Creator, and the light that not only made visible the geometry but also represented the gift of Reason—light which was the first thing created by God—will fit into place like a mathematical solution.”

St. Stephen Walbrook was begun in 1672, which was also the year in which Wren made the Greek Cross design for St. Paul’s, developed in 1673 into the Great Model design, discussed in Chapter VIII, “Spring.” The Great Model design, reputedly Wren’s favorite design for the cathedral, was doomed from the start as being “not enough of a Cathedral-fashion”—and too Popish; magnificent though it was, Downes suggests that adherence to it “would surely have become an embarrassment to Wren as he saw the slowly rising building with the everchanging gaze of a fertile imagination.” From it Downes passes on to two related designs of the mid-1670s, St. James, Piccadilly, and Trinity College Library, Cambridge. St. James was the church that Wren recommended in a letter to the commission for Fifty New Churches in 1711 because of its cheapness and capaciousness. (I have never read any comment on the curious fact that when Wren, the great mathematician, wanted to know how many people it would hold, he went up into a gallery and counted heads.) Downes finds in St. James “calm and order, the sense of immutability and righteousness.” But his favorite Wren building, one guesses, is Trinity College Library, and he devotes four pages to it. (In his discussion of what may be seen in it as High Renaissance and what Baroque, I missed a mention of Bernini, whose Baroque had a similar relationship to the High Renaissance.) From Cambridge we return to London and St. Paul’s, for which the Warrant Design and the so-called Definitive and Penultimate Designs, attempting to “reconcile, as near as possible, the Gothic to a Better Manner of Architecture,” were all made in 1679, while the building of the cathedral began in the same year. The last executed design of the 1670s considered in Chapter VIII is the great steeple of St. Mary-le-Bow.

Wren’s work in the 1680s, the subject of Chapter IX, “Summer,” was diverse in style and scale—by chance rather than choice, Downes points out. In 1681 he designed Chelsea Hospital, Charles II’s answer—forget Nell Gwyn—to Les Invalides in Paris and Kilmainham Hospital near Dublin, with John Webb’s projected palace at Greenwich in mind. In the following year the King’s answer to Versailles, the never completed Winchester Palace, was begun, to a design which was clearly inspired by Louis XIV’s palace. Then in 1685, for James II, Wren designed the Privy Gallery range in Whitehall Palace. This contained the Roman Catholic chapel of whose decorations John Evelyn left an admiring account, though he came away from a service in it “not believing I should ever have lived to see such things as the K. of Englands palace, after it had pleas’d God to