authority is unquestionable (but *dormitat Homerus*: the Democritus Junior whom John Aubrey supposed to have hanged himself was Robert Burton, not Thomas Browne). What is distinctive about Cardano’s *Cosmos* is not simply its authority, though, but the brilliance with which Grafton transforms his extensive and highly technical researches into a narrative which is both economically written and extraordinarily lively and engrossing. The experience of reading this book is that of being in the hands of a great teacher; every sentence flashes with intellectual energy and excitement. The urge to go off and work on Cardano is almost irresistible. Even when an isolated image in the prose does not command immediate assent — can one cower in the middle of a whirlpool? is astrology really like a glacier? — the pace, and the reader’s pleasure, never slacken, and a number of passages of the highest artistry (the close of Chapter 9 is a good example) remind one that this book is not only a masterpiece of research but a masterpiece of English prose.

JOHN CONSIDINE, University of Alberta


Twentieth-century studies of Renaissance building theory have traditionally suffered from a certain modernist disdain for architectural ornament. Rudolf Wittkower’s canonical *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1949) — cited at times in connection with the minimalist ideology of Loos, Le Corbusier, and Mies van der Rohe — is probably the best known example. Emphasizing the centrality of abstract formal relationships within Serlio’s and Palladio’s writings on churches and villas, Wittkower saw mathematical harmony and geometric proportion as the hallmarks of Renaissance architecture. In his avowedly anti-sentimentalist analysis, architectural meaning resided less in the experience of decorative encrustations than in the apprehension of Neoplatonist symbolic values, inherent in coolly rational arrangements of columns, pilasters, and oculi (Bramante’s *Tempietto*, for example). Ornament, in such a narrative, was of course important (Quattrocento and Cinquecento distillations of Vitruvius made this clear), but for Wittkower it remained oddly “subjective,” almost too irrational, expressionist, and inessential to express transcendent values. “Ornament is something added and fastened on, rather than proper and innate,” he claimed, glossing Leon Battisti Alberti’s 1485 Ten Books; “Beauty is thus . . . a harmony inherent in the building, a harmony which . . . does not result from personal fancy, but from objective reasoning” (Architectural Principles, p. 29).

Wittkower’s modernist interest in “absolute values” is both the precedent and the foil to Alina Payne’s new study of Italian architectural treatises. Interested, she claims, in the role a “body consciousness” and an “increasing humanization of architectural detail” (p. 8) played in Renaissance discourse about buildings, Payne
aims to show how ornament became the locus where debates about reception and recovery of antiquity converged. Payne's subjects are specific (Northern) Italian texts from around 1400–1600, wherein a broad discourse about *inventio* and *licentia* in architecture spilled over into contemporary arguments on poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy. Unlike Wittkower — but like the recent volume edited by Vaughn Hart and Peter Hicks (*Paper Palaces: The Rise of the Renaissance Architectural Treatise* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998]) — Payne thus regards the texts' audience as a central consideration: “Since ornament is as close as architecture gets to ‘picture-making,’” she asks, “does a discourse about viewer response claim a place in its theory?” (p. 7). The answer here is a categorical yes, and the concomitant attention to *responses* to Italian architectural treatises is this work's greatest asset. Payne's book (originally a dissertation [University of Toronto, 1992]) thus turns out to be as much about the posthumous construction of Renaissance architectural history as about buildings. As such it is particularly timely alongside two recent volumes on antiquity and ornament: Ingrid D. Rowland's translation of Vitruvius' *Ten Books of Architecture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and *The Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s*, edited by Christopher S. Wood (New York: Zone Books, 2000).

Looking past Wittkower, Payne seeks to rehabilitate Alois Riegl's long discarded (until recently) attention to ornament and to the more personal, sensory, and emotional responses to artifacts advocated by nineteenth-century *Einfühlung* (empathy) theorists like Heinrich Wölflin. This methodological positioning applies to buildings as well as texts, although the main focus here is clearly literary. Close readings of passages from Alberti (1486), Francesco di Giorgio Martini (ca. 1490), Sebastiano Serlio (1537), Gherardo Spini (1568–70), Andrea Palladio (1570), and Vincenzo Scamozzi (1615) occupy individual chapters, which are in turn paired with rich thematic sections, *e.g.*, “Of License and Archeology” (Chapter 1) and “Literary Grids and Intersections” (Chapter 3). The latter examine concepts which dominate Payne's (and the Renaissance theorists') analyses: artistic freedom, *mescolanza* (mixture), and the precedent of ancient Rome in the construction of buildings *con dignita e decoro*. Somewhat ambiguously, Payne links ornament to *licentia* as a whole, pointing to the larger conflict that must have arisen with respect to decorum: “what did Renaissance architects think they were doing when they invented such [ornamental] forms while ostensibly modeling themselves on antiquity?” (p. 3), she asks.

This would seem a potentially fruitful starting query, since Vitruvius, the main source for information about antique building theory, was notoriously disjunctive in his comments about artistic license and imitation, and said virtually nothing explicit about ornament, leaving Renaissance writers relatively free to debate the idea for themselves. Yet although Payne's close readings of individual texts go on to evoke the “repetitive, often contradictory” attempts of treatises to deal with this ostensible lack of paradigm (pp. 89–92), “ornament” takes on so many forms in the course of the analysis that its intended relationship to an idea of freedom is often lost. Presented in the introduction as the world of “brackets,
voluttes, consols, balustrades, parapets, masks, shells,” etc., attached to architectural facades (p. 2), ornament at subsequent points seems to mean simply “the orders” (e.g., pp. 114–16) — a connection which is certainly understandable but could perhaps use clarification.

In many ways, however, such instability of Renaissance architectural terminology is Payne’s main concern. Her judicious borrowings from modern language philosophy and “image theory” (the influence of W. J. T. Mitchell and Hans Belting, for example, seems apparent) lead her to interpret the intersections and overlaps between writers, viewers, and readers as intrinsic to the generation of meaning. This is certainly borne out by the Renaissance texts. With reference to one copy of Daniele Barbaro’s 1556 *Id i e c il i b r i*, for example, Payne discusses documentation of response in the form of Scamozzi’s handwritten notes and underlinings (p. 222). Elsewhere, Payne shows how the illustrated woodcuts in Serlio’s *Fourth Book* not only supplement the text but actually demonstrate the idea of architecture as a combinatory activity: “two images remain intact, floating across one without interacting: the viewer’s attention is either on one or the other, and it is this optical alternance between the two images that creates the new assembly” (p. 130). The role of the beholder in the process of Renaissance “picture-making” is certainly not a new subject of study, but in the specific context of the architectural treatise, its invocation is striking. Payne is also certainly to be commended for her sensitivity to the treatises’ different physical forms (for Martini and Spini, an unfinished manuscript; for the others, printed books) and the differing impacts of such forms on potential audiences. Paired with a meticulous exegesis of content and careful inclusion of the Latin and Italian originals throughout, such sensitivity makes Payne’s study stand out among the flood of recent publications devoted to paper architecture.

The book is not a survey, and will be valuable chiefly to specialists in the history of aesthetics, rhetoric, or philosophy, as well as art and architecture in Italy. Its most original contribution, alluded to above, remains its engagement with the historiography of Renaissance architecture. Payne skillfully reviews the idea of Cinquecento buildings and decoration as a categorically “Mannerist” aberration from a classical norm, exploring the (far from implicit) connection drawn between ornament and experimentation in architectural histories of *this* century. She is clearly exercised in the history of the discipline (see, for example, her articles in *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 34 [1998] and the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53 [1994] and 58 [1999]) — so much so that interested readers may find themselves yearning for more than a series of long footnotes (pp. 241–43) ultimately provide. Overall, however, Payne’s attention to methodological underpinnings of Renaissance studies is welcome indeed. So, too, is the book’s related consideration of the role of the print medium in the apprehension of architectural theory and its audience. Arguably, from the sixteenth century — the exact moment of the architectural treatise’s efflorescence — print transformed the ways that real buildings from the past were viewed, largely by emphasizing the architectural specificity of the present and the possibility of multiple readings of
the antique. Payne's consistent acknowledgement of her own historical position thus fits the subject of Renaissance architecture particularly well.

CHRISTOPHER HEUER, Universiteit Leiden


Le dynamique Centre V.-L. Saulnier de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, animé par Nicole Cazauran et une solide équipe de direction, apporte chaque année ou presque une précieuse contribution aux recherches sur la Renaissance par l’organisation d’un colloque dont les Actes sont publiés avec une belle régularité l’année suivante dans les Cahiers V.-L. Saulnier. Ce seizième Cahier rassemble les communications de la journée d’étude organisée par le Centre le 5 mars 1998, et dont Marie-Madeleine Fontaine a été la cheville ouvrière.

Jean Martin méritait au moins ce fort ensemble de contributions, lui donnant enfin la juste place qui lui revient dans le vaste mouvement de traduction qui a animé le XVIe siècle français en y transposant des œuvres majeures de la latinité classique et du patrimoine culturel européen. Longtemps ignoré, ou jugé même indignement par son principal biographe qui l’englobait dans le mépris longtemps attaché à l’exercice de la traduction, il bénéficie, depuis quelques années, d’un regain d’intérêt qui rend justice en particulier à l’intense activité traductrice qu’il déploie entre 1543 et 1553. Après l’article de M.-M. Fontaine dans les Mélanges Robert Aulotte, la mise au point de Michèle Lorgnet, le coup de projecteur de Jean-Claude Arnould sur ses préfaces, il revenait à Toshinori Uetani, auteur d’un mémoire de D.E.A. en civilisation française sur Jean Martin traducteur, de dresser de Jean Martin une biographie fort documentée, faisant la part raisonnable des hypothèses, des lacunes et des certitudes, en le distinguant de la foule des homonymes donnée en fin d’ouvrage ; y sont caractérisés les grands moments de son existence : formation intellectuelle, secrétariat d’ambassade, intenses activités littéraires à Paris. Mais d’autres contributions précisent des aspects encore peu connus de son parcours et de son réseau de relations : les liens étroits qui l’unissent au noyau d’humanistes érudits composé par Denis Sauvage, Théodore de Bèze, sur lesquels Michel Simonin présente des documents originaux ; et plus encore son appartenance intime au « cénacle » ou atelier du célèbre imprimeur humaniste Michel de Vascosan regroupant aussi Peletier du Mans, Jacques Gohory, Jean-Pierre de Mesme et Jean Goujon, sans compter ses relations encore à creuser avec les ateliers lyonnais. Également le tissu serré de conjonctions avec la ville des Este, habitée par les idéaux de gloire chevaleresque, où Jacopo Caviceo compose son Peregrino, poème d’« amour furieux », dont Jean Martin revoit la traduction de l’obscur François Dassy, parue en 1527, en une lecture moralisante, voire allégorique qui se retrouve dans la traduction du Roland furieux, portant l’empreinte du même réviseur. Semblerait ainsi confirmée l’hypothèse d’un rôle direct de com-