The *Raison d'architecture* and Architectural Theory in Early Sixteenth-Century France¹

SANDRA
RICHARDS

Résumé : *Cet article analyse le premier traité d'architecture écrit en français, La Raison d'architecture antique, extraite de Vitruve (Paris, 1537), un opuscule sur la question des ordres classiques. Malgré son immense popularité au milieu du XVI^e siècle, on lui a consacré peu d'études, sans doute en raison du fait qu'il s'agit d'une traduction de la première édition du Medidas del Romano de Diego de Sagredo, texte lui-même obscur. Cependant plusieurs modifications du texte et des illustrations indiquent une réécriture de l'œuvre source, dont les implications éclairent notre compréhension de l'architecture de cette époque.*

Until recent decades, studies of sixteenth-century French architecture told the story of the “march of classicism,” that is, the waning of France’s native Gothic style, as it was progressively supplanted in favour of the Renaissance style, first imported at the end of the fifteenth century in the wake of the invasions of Italy.² According to this schema, French classicism evolved from the naïve and superficial application of ornament à l’antique in traditional cathedrals and châteaux to the correct and thorough — yet still distinctively French — style developed under the aegis of Henry II and ratified by the French academies of the seventeenth century. Against the twin ideals of the Italian Renaissance and the French Baroque, both posed as normative models of classicism in histories of architecture, the earlier, so-called “mixed” style of the French Renaissance had long been subject to scathing criticism, or at best, benign condescension.³ By calling into question the prejudices behind these negative assessments, new research in the field has endeavoured to assess early sixteenth-century French architecture according to its own terms, that is, as a resourceful, experimental, and frequently resistant response to the unavoidable influence of Italy.

Although the existence of a fully formed architectural theory at this time seems unlikely, consistent strategies and aesthetic principles of early French classicism⁴ have been deduced from careful morphological analysis of the buildings themselves.⁵ Unfortunately, there is very little in the way of contemporary architectural writing that might help deepen our understanding of this especially crucial period, which witnessed the construction of France's earliest Renaissance buildings. Illustrated French-language treatises only began to appear during the mid-1530s, and these were all translations of works originating in Italy or Spain. Although these editions are clear manifestations of an interest in classical forms, their relation to the architecture of the period, which remained closely tied to Gothic traditions, is not so immediately discernible. By contrast, the publications and manuscripts of Sebastiano Serlio, Guillaume Philandrier, Jean Bullant, Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, and Philibert de l'Orme that accompanied the maturation of classicism amply and explicitly convey much about theory and practice during the latter half of the century, a time when French architects first proclaimed their independence from the dominant Italian model. Nevertheless, in the decades preceding the emergence of this pool of homegrown architect-writers, such translations must have filled the gap. Given the persistent biases toward authorial innovation, scholarship has amassed around the later, independent French treatises, with these translations receiving disproportionately little attention. However, any translation, especially in the early modern period, contains some measure of distortion arising from the re-contextualization of the source material, and, in effect, constitutes an "original" text. Thus the translated treatises are, *ipso facto*, both congruous with the architecture of the period and continuous with later developments in French classicism. As such, these translations present an unmined resource that can complement formally driven studies of early French Renaissance architecture. The first and arguably most important of these editions was the *Raison d'architecture antique, extraicte de Victruve* (fig. 1),⁶ a little-studied treatise on classical ornament first published in Paris by Simon de Colines sometime after 1536 and reprinted four times before 1560.⁷

The *Raison d'architecture* is an anonymous translation of the *Medidas del Romano*, written in Castilian by the Spanish cleric Diego de Sagredo and published in Toledo in 1526.⁸ The *Medidas*, a short tract on the orders freely adapted from Books Three and Four of Vitruvius's *De architectura* and, to a lesser extent, Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* and other unnamed sources, was the first original work on architecture to be printed outside Italy and the first to be composed in a language other than Latin or Italian.⁹ The *Raison d'architecture*, in turn, was the first French-language architectural treatise,¹⁰ and through its re-editions retained this status until the 1560s, when the

Imprime par Simon de Colines demourant a Paris rue
saint Iehan de Beauuais, a l'enseigne du soleil dor.

Auec priuilege.

Figure 1: Anonymous. Frontispiece, fol. [1]^r

Raison d'architecture antique, extraicte de Victruue
Paris, c. 1537

Source: Centre Canadien d'Architecture /
Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

works of De l'Orme and Bullant first appeared. Meanwhile in Italy, new editions of Vitruvius's *De architectura* — the only treatise on architecture passed down from antiquity, and as such the *locus classicus* on classical architecture for humanists, antiquarians, and architects throughout Europe — appeared in rapid succession throughout the first half of the sixteenth century,¹¹ even though the text was not only notoriously difficult, because of the obscurity of many of its technical terms and frequent contradictions with respect to the ruins themselves, but often irrelevant for current architectural practice.

What is particularly striking, then, is that it was a book originating in Spain — not Italy — that enjoyed the greatest success during this pivotal period in the development of classicism in France. The *Raison d'architecture* even eclipsed in popularity the series of translations by Jean Martin of key Italian publications: Serlio's treatises on geometry and perspective (Paris, 1545)¹² and ecclesiastical architecture (Paris, 1547);¹³ Vitruvius's *De architectura* (Paris, 1547);¹⁴ and Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* (Paris, 1553).¹⁵ An unauthorized French translation by Pieter Coecke van Aelst of Sebastiano Serlio's *Regole generali di architettura sopra gli cinque maniere* [Book Four] — the first treatise to systematize the orders and the first true manual for architects — did appear in Antwerp in 1542.¹⁶ Although Serlio's treatises certainly made their way into the hands of French readers,¹⁷ no translation of Book Four — authorized or otherwise — was published in France for the duration of the century, despite the immense popularity of the book elsewhere in Europe.¹⁸ The fact that only Martin's edition of the *Hypnerotomachia Polifili*,¹⁹ Francesco Colonna's lavishly illustrated antiquarian fantasy, rivalled the popularity of the *Raison d'architecture* seems to confirm the eclecticism of French architects at mid-century, whose attitudes toward ancient Rome were still more elegiac than scientific.²⁰ Still, it seems counter-intuitive that at a time when architects were beginning to pursue an archaeologically informed classicism, the translation of an obscure, Spanish dilettante would not only precede that of Vitruvius but continue to outsell him. We must assume that the translator believed that the principles and goals of French classicism were addressed most effectively by Sagredo. Two years later Coecke produced *Die inventionen der columnen*, a loose adaptation of the *Raison d'architecture* for a Flemish audience.²¹ French architects, after all, faced the same essential challenge as their Spanish and Flemish counterparts — namely, how to reconcile the new idiom with regional traditions and workshop practices.²² And with France situated between Italy, Spain, the Low Countries, and the Germanic provinces, the absorption of sources from across Europe was a matter of course.²³

The *Raison d'architecture* must have been intended as a best-seller from the outset. The modest dimensions of the book indicate that, like the *Medidas*, it would have been relatively affordable to a sizable readership. It is also worth noting that the anonymous translator retained Sagredo's original dedication to the Archbishop of Toledo. Thus, the book did not serve to promote its author, nor was it published under the auspices of a wealthy patron — common motivations for publication in the Renaissance, which must be considered in assessing the actual audience of any book. Rather, the *Raison d'architecture* must have responded to a clearly perceived demand. It is the nature of this demand that must be investigated.

The *Raison d'architecture* (like the *Medidas*) proceeds in the form of a dialogue between the cleric, Tampeso, a thinly disguised pseudonym for Sagredo, and his friend, the French painter Léon Picard. Picard, acting as the neophyte, seeks information on the classical style for the purposes of frame design, as well as the composition of his own paintings, and eagerly poses leading questions, to which Tampeso provides lengthy explanations. The dialogue is supplemented by numerous small woodcut illustrations throughout the text. The treatise begins with a moral apology for financial expenditure on architecture, followed by discussions of anthropomorphic proportions and rudimentary geometry. The interlocutors then turn to the classical orders, the principal topic of the book. Tampeso defines terminology, explains and demonstrates geometrical procedures, and discusses the origins, component parts, and standard measurements for the Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Tuscan orders. The treatise concludes with practical remarks for the patron on labour, materials, and construction.

Despite its practical orientation, neither the original version nor its translation should be seen as responding strictly to the practical exigencies of introducing classical architecture to regions which lacked architects and builders with the necessary training. Quite simply, no architect or sculptor not already familiar with the repertory of classical ornament would be able to produce convincing results based on the coarse and schematized illustrations found in either treatise. A comparison with a woodcut of a capital from Serlio's Book Four illustrates this point (fig. 2 and 3): Serlio's image is accurately proportioned and replete with fine detail — an exact model that could be copied more or less directly.²⁴ Moreover, such knowledge had already been widely disseminated through the crosscurrents of architects and sculptors travelling between northern Italy and France, as well as the drawings and sketchbooks that circulated in workshops. From the early years of the sixteenth century, classical motifs were incorporated in châteaux and cathedrals and, more frequently, micro-architecture, such as jubés, tombs, and seignorial chapels.²⁵ With architects looking at an array of sources of

varying degrees of “authenticity” — which, beyond the expected ancient and Italian Renaissance sources, also would have included early Gothic cathedrals, such as Laon and St. Denis, and richly ornamented Lombard monuments, such as the recently completed Certosa of Pavia — the results varied accordingly.²⁶ Thus the *Raison d’architecture* must have been intended both as an introductory primer to architecture *à l’antique* and as a means to establish the fundamental vocabulary of classical ornament as it became more and more prevalent during the 1530s. The content provides the theoretical underpinnings, essential measurements, and, perhaps most important, a working vocabulary for the new style.²⁷ The technical terms follow the Castilian text but are adjusted according to French spelling; Sagredo’s terminology, in turn, was comprised both of vernacularized versions of Vitruvius’s Latin terms (themselves ultimately derived from Greek) and of modern construction terms that could be applied to roughly comparable classical forms. Although these two onomastic approaches would later be polemicized as opposing strategies by Martin and De l’Orme, the *Raison*

Figure 2: Anonymous. Designs for Composite capitals, fol. 33^v
Raison d’architecture antique, extraicte de Victruve
 Paris, c. 1537
 Source: Centre Canadien d’Architecture /
 Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

Figure 3: Sebastiano Serlio. Designs for Composite capitals, fol. 63^r
Regole generali di architettura sopra gli cinque manieri [Book IV]
Venice, 1537

Source: Centre Canadien d'Architecture /
Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

d'architecture was the principal text in establishing the French lexicon of classical architecture.²⁸

Such a didactic program, of course, would have been consonant with Sagredo's intentions for the *Medidas del Romano vis-à-vis* his Spanish readership. The primary audience of the original *Medidas*, which begins with a prolonged defence of the building of magnificent tombs and concludes with advice on procuring labour, must have been potential patrons of the new style. Its dialogic format seems geared more toward humanists and dilettantes than true practitioners, though the book, of course, would still be of obvious interest to the architect or sculptor who could afford it. But the *Raison d'architecture* also belonged to a different context, both geographically and chronologically. As a result the translator felt compelled to revise the original and made numerous modifications that were necessarily congruent with his own architectural background, running the gamut from minor clarifications of meaning to major additions of new material. These changes were not always for the better: some revisions were inconsistent with other parts of the text, and several mistakes were introduced. The existing scholarship on the *Raison d'architecture*, scant as it is, has already catalogued most of these alterations;²⁹ but perhaps because of the shortcomings of the translation, scholars thus far have been disinclined to delve more deeply into their impact on the meaning of the text. However, it is precisely the discrepancies between the translation and its source, emendations as well as errors, that can help bring the translator's agenda into sharper focus and thus shed light on the principles and practices that informed his work.

In recent years, studies in print culture and the history of the book have brought to light the highly contingent nature of early modern publishing, in which the meaning of texts was conditioned by the various agents involved at the stages of production, transmission, and reception.³⁰ With little in the way of copyright protection, revisions and corruptions were a common occurrence in the successive incarnations of any book. But more than that, as Roger Chartier has repeatedly stressed, the belief in the linguistic and semantic stability of texts is a purely modern construction.³¹ At the same time, scholars of French Renaissance literature have observed that over the course of the sixteenth century translators came to see their art as a creative act, in which they consciously asserted their autonomy from their sources, recasting them according to their own agendas.³² Thus translations, in particular, can act as a site in which the reception of a foreign model is visibly and intellectually apparent; differences can be quantified and analyzed. Even minor discrepancies should arouse our curiosity; the fact that the translator intervened in some areas and not others alerts us to those passages that had to be just right, and by extension, those issues that were most pressing to

him and his audience. That said, a thorough analysis of the syntactical and lexical variances of the translation which are manifold throughout the *Raison d'architecture* is beyond the scope of this preliminary study. Rather, I would like to focus on several clear-cut cases of intervention.

The most striking changes are graphic. Bâtarde type was replaced by italic for the text and roman for headings, both more fitting for the subject of classical architecture. Woodcuts greater in both refinement and accuracy were designed anew, rather than simply copied from the original. Labels, measurements, and keys were also incorporated into the images in order to clarify their relation to the text (fig. 4 and 5). Additional diagrams elucidate geometric procedures, and new subjects derived from Cesare Cesariano's Italian translation of Vitruvius (Como, 1521) illustrate passages of the text. The new woodcuts were an obvious improvement and were instated in all subsequent editions, even those published in Spain and Portugal.³³ By far the most significant of the graphic interventions is the eleven-page appendix on pedestals and intercolumniations, topics not treated by Sagredo, which is inserted towards the end of the book. The appendix, which contains four full-page and eight half-page woodcuts, accompanied by explanatory text, also constitutes a radically different approach to the subject. The quality of the illustrations itself had changed; the columns are proportionately scaled and presented in orthogonal projection in the manner of a professional drawing. As opposed to the original format, in which small woodcuts are contained within the block of text, here they take precedence over the brief text printed alongside. Image had replaced text as the primary conveyor of information, a transformation which also has significant implications for our understanding of the *Raison d'architecture*.

Indeed, the new material is not so much an addendum to the original text as a corrective. The preceding discussion progresses according to the constituent parts of the Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Tuscan orders — that is, the column, the base, the capital, entablature, and the pediment — with discrete woodcuts illustrating each part of each order. This system of organization effectively follows Alberti's *De architectura*, which had been composed more than seventy years prior and thus did not reflect recent thinking on the subject. The *Medidas*, however, would not have been completely obsolete, especially in Spain, since the idea of the orders as a system of column-types — each with its own set of prescribed proportions and unique decorative vocabulary — had only just begun to take hold.³⁴ The term “order” itself, with its clear suggestion of a rule-based system, was still not consistently used; the terms “genero” and “façon” are used in the *Medidas* and in the *Raison d'architecture*, respectively. Similarly, it seems that Sagredo's descriptions of the orders themselves relied heavily on the

Figure 4: Anonymous.

Elevation and plan of a Corinthian capital, fol. 32^r
Raison d'architecture antique, extraicte de Vitruve
 Paris, c. 1537

Source: Centre Canadien d'Architecture /
 Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

Figure 5: Diego de Sagredo
Elevation and plan of a Corinthian capital, fol. Dii^v
Medidas del Romano
Toledo, 1526
Source: Centre Canadien d'Architecture /
Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

old sources. While it was clear enough to distinguish the capitals and bases corresponding to each column type, things got murkier when dealing with entablatures. Sagredo, like Vitruvius and Alberti before him, offered few guidelines regarding the ornament specific to each type of entablature. Even worse, he was apt to confuse matters further by prescribing, for example, a single architrave for all orders.³⁵ For the translator, this ambiguity was a clear deficiency. Text added to serve as a transition to the new material plainly makes this point. Picard tells Tampeso: “Mais ie ne suis point assouuy de ses mesures si ie ne les voys avecques leurs aornaments tel quil leur appartient. Cestassavoir leur difference des moslures de lune a lautre, & aussi de leur cornixe, frise, et architrave.”³⁶

The first four woodcuts of the appendix, although ostensibly demonstrating the designs and proportions of pedestals, present each order in its entirety in a single, full-page woodcut (fig. 6). The real function of the woodcuts, in other words, is to assemble and thus establish the constituent parts and proportions of each of the Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Tuscan orders. Curiously, the translator illustrated the Tuscan order with what is properly the Composite order, perhaps an indication of his familiarity with Italian architects for whom the order had become a medium for speculation on license and invention.³⁷ Such an image, that is, a large-scale representation of a complete column, has connotations, however, that run counter to the original program of the *Medidas*. Whereas Sagredo had bypassed the topic of pedestals in the first place, on the basis that the matter was best left to the architect’s own judgement,³⁸ the graphic clarity of the illustrations supersedes the text and imparts a new sense of objectivity, authority, and fixity to the proportions and components of each order.³⁹ Moreover, in this presentation of each order as an inseparable unity, the freedom tacitly granted by Sagredo to the architect in his treatment of the orders as assemblages of interchangeable parts is now circumscribed. This reconfiguration of the orders owes much to a more sophisticated understanding of ancient architecture influenced by the archaeological strains of discourse which sprang from academic circles in Rome. In fact, a similar innovation appears in Serlio’s famous woodcut of the five orders beginning Book Four,⁴⁰ the first installment in the series of treatises that were the eventual outcome of his studies of antiquities in Rome begun under the tutelage of Baldassare Peruzzi.⁴¹ It is a telling detail that the translator modified Sagredo’s pan-European term for classical architecture — “romano,” referring to the ancient Romans as mere popularizers of the Greek style — to “italique ou romain,” or more simply, “italique,” in clear acknowledgement of Italy’s hegemony in the revival of antiquity.

Figure 6: Anonymous. Doric order with pedestal, fol. 44^r
Raison d'architecture antique, extraicte de Victruve
 Paris, c. 1537
 Source: Centre Canadien d'Architecture /
 Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

Further, the appendix indicates a deliberate reorientation of the book's programme toward not only the standardization of the orders but also their application to built architecture. The *Medidas*, it should be recalled, related foremost to architectural sculpture, which, as a sub-genre of architecture, was virtually exempt from rules or standards. The addition of new material on intercolumniations and the superimposition of orders, for example, presupposes an extended structure and thus denotes the translator's interest in large-scale construction. But at a more fundamental level, the concerns over orthodoxy implied by the translator were the exclusive domain of architecture proper, a distinction also made clearly by Serlio, who encouraged free invention in the designs for altarpieces, doors, fireplaces, and gates that follow each of the orders in Book Four. This shift in orientation is indicated explicitly on the title page. No longer the "Measurements of the Romans," it is now the "Theory of Ancient Architecture, Extracted from Vitruvius." Where Sagredo specifies that the book treats the various parts of antique ornament ("necessarias alos oficiales que quieren seguir las formaciones delas . . . pieças delos edificios antiguos"), the translator lays claim to Vitruvian authority and announces that his book treats architecture itself ("a lutilite de ceulx qui se delectent en edifices"). The translator changed the title-page illustration accordingly. A woodcut of a Corinthian aedicule accompanying the discussion of tomb monuments — the only depiction of an architectural composition in the entire book — was re-used in place of Sagredo's Corinthian capital.

The revised title also signals a deepened emphasis on the "reason," that is, the theory of classical architecture. Thus we find that another aspect of the translator's interventions is to "elevate" Sagredo's text, that is, to make it more rigorous, more humanistic. This tendency was consistent with the translator's revised presentation of the orders, for developing their theoretical substructure served to reinforce their authority. Subtler textual interpolations in the passages on anthropomorphism and the liberal arts refine Sagredo's pragmatic approach according to a developed familiarity with Italian architectural thought. In the first set of interventions, the translator injects the description of human proportions with Neoplatonic significance. According to Vitruvius, the governing principles of classical architecture — symmetry and proportion — are realized most perfectly in the human body, which in turn provides the basis for all measure. Although cosmological significance is doubtless implied in Vitruvius's remarks, it was not until the Renaissance that theorists explicitly endowed this axiom with Neoplatonic significance, that is, the idea that the human body attains its perfection as the microcosm of the celestial realm.⁴² Sagredo, however, offered only a perfunctory statement that the human body is referred to as the microcosm

because it is the archetype of all worldly things, before moving on to enumerate the various bodily proportions.⁴³ Significantly, he chose not to illustrate Vitruvius's well-known *homo ad circulum/homo ad quadratum* — an exceedingly popular theme of Neoplatonism in Italy in architectural discourse, as well as other disciplines⁴⁴ — on the grounds that it was false and unnatural. Rather, his views on anthropomorphism are more fully expressed in the fantastical woodcut derived from Francesco di Giorgio's late fifteenth-century manuscripts depicting the cornice with a human face in profile superimposed (fig. 7), that is to say, the direct application of human proportions to architecture.⁴⁵ This literal-minded interpretation of anthropomorphism, which drew from medieval traditions, had since been superseded in some humanist circles by more abstract speculation on the divine nature of the hidden mathematical and geometric correspondences embodied most perfectly in the human figure. By seamlessly inserting passages ranging from a few words to an entire paragraph, the translator was able to transform Sagredo's straightforward account into an up-to-date Neoplatonic exegesis. One of the translator's concerns, as demonstrated in the following excerpt, was to make explicit the hieratic relationship between microcosm and macrocosm (the italics indicate the translator's addition):

Doncques les anciens ouvriers qui voulurent asseoir leurs raisons sur lordre de construire & edifier: *ne peuvent mieulx querir considerations propres, que sur le maisonnement de Dieu eternal, qui est lhomme rapportant la vraye figure du grand maisonnement de ce monde, que ne pouvons apprehender pour nostre insuffisance.* Pour ce se adonnerent a imiter la proportion de lhomme. . . (fol. 6^r)

In this example, as well as in other interpolations, the translator stresses the religious and metaphysical underpinnings of human proportion. He must have felt it necessary to elaborate on exactly why the human body represented such an important conceptual model for classical architecture, especially since Sagredo had left the concept of anthropomorphism virtually unexplained, despite its centrality in the *Medidas*. The intervention, in effect, adds a theoretical dimension to the original text.

More grievous in the eyes of the translator, however, was the fact that Sagredo conspicuously eschewed Vitruvius's most fundamental proportion (that is, the height of man equals ten faces) in favour of the medieval proportions (nine and one third faces) still utilized by sculptors and favoured by his friend, Felipe Bigarny.⁴⁶ Again, Sagredo had favoured the practical over the theoretical. This substitution is characteristic of the *Medidas*, which was a thoughtful compendium of available information on ancient architecture more than it was a sustained exposition of a consistent point of view, as well as of Sagredo's latitude toward the sources themselves: Vitruvius

dros en cinco lugares el dicho rostro. El p̄mero sobre la fr̄
 te. El.ij. sobre los ojos. El.iii. por las narizes. El.iiii. sobre
 la boca. El.v. so la barua. El p̄mero salia mas q̄ el segūdo/
 todo lo q̄ ay del vno al otro: el segūdo mas q̄ el tercero: y el
 tercero por el semejante mas q̄ el quarto: y el quarto mas q̄ el
 quinto. De guisa q̄ el p̄mero sale mas q̄ el quinto: todo lo
 q̄ ay del vno al otro. En estos q̄tro interuallos q̄ se causan cō
 estos cinco quadros formauan los dichos antiguos quatro
 principales molduras: cōuiene a saber: sobre la frente/ vna
 Gula: sobre la nariz vna Corona: sobre la boca vn Bozel:
 ya podria ser q̄ por venir esta moldura sobre la boca se diga
 Bozel. sobre la barua formauan vna gradilla o talon.

Figure 7: Diego de Sagredo. Cornice, fol. Bii^v

Medidas del Romano

Toledo, 1526

Source: Centre Canadien d'Architecture /
 Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

was an important source, but not necessarily more authoritative than his own contemporaries.⁴⁷ Nowhere was his independence from italo-centric Vitruvianism more plainly apparent, and more plainly in need of rectification, however, than in his rejection of these proportions. Although the translator faithfully renders the text and reproduces the accompanying woodcut, only a few paragraphs later he counters with a complete rebuttal of the logic and validity of Sagredo's proportions.⁴⁸ It is curious that he left the original proportions intact, though it seems consistent with his method of adapting the source text by means of emendation and amplification rather than deletion and replacement.

The translator also took special interest in the passages concerning the ideal education of the architect. Sagredo recommended only knowledge of geometry, whereas his principal sources, Vitruvius and Alberti, had advocated broad learning in all of the liberal arts.⁴⁹ Both Vitruvius and Alberti, as is so often told, had proposed an ambitious educational program with the intention of ennobling the profession of architecture; Sagredo, on the other hand, specifically omitted architecture from his discussion of the liberal arts, although he did include painting and sculpture, because they are capable of creating a record of historical figures and events.⁵⁰ Sagredo's more limiting assessment of the architect's status was tempered, however, by the respectful attitude he held towards manual labourers. Sagredo saw no contradiction in exalting the primacy of geometry among the liberal arts at the same time that he claimed its necessity for masons and stonecutters ("*oficiales mechánicos*"). Indeed he argues that both manual labourers and practitioners of the liberal arts alike use their inventiveness ("*ingenio*"); the difference is that the former must work also with their hands ("*manos*"), while the latter exercise exclusively their intellect ("*espíritu*").⁵¹ The translator, by contrast, hardened this distinction in the comments he added in response to Picard's questions on the definition of the liberal arts:

Les sciences ne sont pas dictes liberalles de la liberalite que tu entens. Ains sont elles nommees, pour ce que iadis nulz hommes de serve condition ni estoient introduictes: & nestoit souffert que aultres les sceussent que les nobles & gens libres. Et aussi pour ce quelles requierent l'homme sans occupation des affaires mondaines, et qui sont contrainctz a faire ouevre mechaniques. (fol. 9^v)

The translator thus declares the liberal arts to be the province solely of nobles and scholars. Further on, he maintains Sagredo's exclusion of architecture from the liberal arts, and adds that the mathematical procedures of painting "donne beaucoup a entendre de chose aux ouvriers mecanique mesmes a ceulx qui sont ministres de l'architecture."⁵² The translator's comments express his desire for a "scientific" foundation for architecture and hint at his disappro-

val of the artisanal practices that were still very much alive in French workshops. They would also seem to confirm that he was not an architect himself.

Several names have been put forward in an attempt to identify the translator, although with very little consensus among scholars.⁵³ Part of the problem of attribution arises from the fact that the translation is at once dotted with errors and characterized by a general tendency to refine the source material according to humanistic interests. I would like to venture the hypothesis here that the translation was composed in the circle of Geoffroy Tory, the humanist printer and print-maker, if not by Tory himself.⁵⁴ Tory, however, died in 1533, which would have made the *Raison d'architecture* a posthumous publication, although this conceivably could account for its anonymity and occasionally slipshod quality. Tory was a frequent collaborator of the publisher of the *Raison d'architecture*, Simon de Colines, and was knowledgeable about Italian Renaissance architecture. After spending several years in Rome and Bologna, in 1512 he edited the Paris edition of Alberti's *De re aedificatoria*,⁵⁵ and as further references to Vitruvius and Luca Pacioli occurring in his own writings indicate, he was well versed in contemporary architectural discourse. But Tory was no specialist and he almost certainly lacked expertise in practical matters, and this is a quality consistent with the some of the technical inaccuracies occurring in the translation. Finally, we should not overlook the fact that Tory was a translator by profession, and his expressed views on the practice are compatible with the *Raison d'architecture*. Tory, like most of his contemporaries, instructed the translator to attend to the meaning rather than the letter in order that he write in the best style of his native language, although, as we have seen above, fidelity to meaning was understood much less stringently than it is today.⁵⁶ Mistranslations do plague the text, yet the translation of passages of prose, in particular, such as the dedicatory address, demonstrates a very conscientious reworking of the source material according to the characteristic elaborateness of French syntax.⁵⁷

I do not want to insist too forcefully on this attribution to Tory, since it remains largely conjectural. But if Tory was not directly involved in the translation, the translator was someone whose views on Italian Renaissance culture were very much in line with Tory's and was quite possibly someone he knew. Tory circulated widely in elite humanistic circles. He would likely have had contacts with Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Oronce Finé and others in the ambit of Colines, who was the preeminent humanist printer in Paris from the 1520s to the 1540s, and who himself carried a high profile, counting François Rabelais and Guillaume Budé among his peers at the court of Francis I. Tory's appointment in 1531 to the newly revived post of king's

printer only confirmed his standing among Paris's leading artists and intellectuals. One of his closest associates was the celebrated French bibliophile, Jean Grolier. Grolier, who had been a high-ranking bureaucrat during the French occupation of Milan, set up an informal academy upon his return to Paris, much like those he had encountered in Italy.⁵⁸ It is perhaps no accident that Grolier adopted the frontispiece for the *Raison d'architecture* as a design for several of his celebrated bespoke bindings.⁵⁹ So while Tory's relationship to the *Raison d'architecture* remains uncertain, we should not be deterred from exploring the representativeness of his ideas, given his wide exposure to and possible influence on contemporary architectural discourse.

Indeed, thematic parallels can be found between the *Raison d'architecture* and Tory's *Champ fleury* (Paris, 1529), a treatise on orthography and typography written in the milieu of Grolier's "academy."⁶⁰ The *Champ fleury* follows a tripartite rhetorical structure, beginning with an exhortation to perfect the French language, followed by a discussion of the anthropomorphism of roman letters and, finally, instructions for the construction and pronunciation of letters. Tory's Neoplatonic speculations on proportion are idiosyncratic and convoluted — one book historian has characterized the *Champ fleury* as "cabalistic abracadabra"⁶¹ — yet they clearly denote his preoccupation with human analogy, much as the translator had shown particular attentiveness to those analogous passages, although in the *Raison d'architecture* the subject is treated strictly in Christian terms. This approach to typography was novel; previous guides to typography by Pacioli's *De divina proportione* (Venice, 1509) and Albrecht Dürer's *Underweysung der Messung* (Nuremberg, 1525) had demonstrated purely geometric constructions.⁶² Tory instead looked to architectural theory to imbue his letters with symbolic meaning and adopted the *homo ad circulum/homo ad quadratum* as the governing paradigm for his canon of proportions, which is depicted in numerous woodcuts based on both Leonardo's celebrated drawing and Cesariano's edition of Vitruvius (fig. 8). In fact, Tory states that one of the woodcuts was copied from a design furnished by his friend, Jean Perréal, who had studied with Leonardo himself while in Milan.⁶³ Tory's excursus on the "golden chain of arts and sciences" — by which study of the liberal arts and constancy to the cardinal virtues can lead one to higher knowledge of the Graces, Muses, Apollo, and ultimately God — is similarly invested with quasi-Neoplatonic themes, but at the same time demonstrates a genuine concern with the status of the liberal arts which he shared with the translator of the *Raison d'architecture*.⁶⁴

In broader and more consequential terms, however, the *Raison d'architecture* and the *Champ fleury* are united in their careful negotiation of Italian influence. Tory intended to purify and reform the French language, which

he believed could equal ancient Greek and Latin, through the imposition of the standards delineated in his treatise. Similarly, he expressed in the dedication to his edition of Alberti that it was intended to help the French surpass the classical style of the ancients.⁶⁵ Yet in the *Champ Fleury*, Tory twice declares that he is eager to write a similar treatise on his native letters, the “forme” and “bâtarde.”⁶⁶ For all the vehemence with which Tory sought to establish standards of the classical style in France — in his edition of Alberti, in the *Champ fleury*, and possibly also in the *Raison* — he also recognized the viability of French traditions toward these ends. Indeed, as Henri Zerner has aptly observed, Tory’s celebrated twin editions of an “antique”-style *Book of Hours* in 1525 and a “modern” (*i.e.*, Gothic) one in 1527, with typography, ornament, and illustrations according to each style, are emblematic of the equivalence across the visual arts of the Renaissance and Gothic as alternative modes.⁶⁷ Tory’s ambivalence toward the two styles was virtually unthinkable in sixteenth-century Italy, where even in the North, the Gothic persisted mostly in typology and syntax or in historicizing projects for the completion of existing projects.⁶⁸ But there are further implications to Tory’s faculty in both the Gothic and classical idioms. For the former, the continuing vitality of the Gothic was not due to ignorance or intransigence; for the latter, it means that the emulation of antiquity does not seem to have held the same sense of urgency or authority as it did in Italy.

In the above discussion I have stressed that throughout the *Raison d’architecture*, the translator sought to submit the *Medidas* to more rigorous standards, both practical and theoretical, which were informed by Italian currents. But by the very selection of the source text, the translator also assumed a stance that was independent from the more dogmatic attitudes that prevailed in Italy. It is a commonplace in accounts of the Renaissance architectural treatise that “column books,” such as the *Raison d’architecture*, attained their greatest popularity in transalpine countries, where they were well suited to the needs of architects who adopted Renaissance classicism chiefly through the application of the orders onto traditional building types. The expeditious succinctness of these books suggests that they were unencumbered by the anxieties of correctness and license that underlie Italian treatises. The *Raison d’architecture*, however, lies somewhere in the middle. It standardizes and theorizes the orders according to archaeologically informed norms of correct usage, yet presents neither guidelines nor proscriptions governing their use and offers very little in the way of usable designs.

A handful of direct quotations from the *Raison d’architecture* that appear in architecture of the 1540s have been detected,⁶⁹ but the treatise’s wider impact on architecture remains unclear. We might quickly note,

Figure 8: Geoffroy Troy
Human proportions of letters “I” and “K”, fol. XLVI^v
Champ fleury
Paris, 1529
Source: Centre Canadien d’Architecture /
Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal

however, that it was precisely this tension between orthodoxy and license that characterized the eventual flowering of the “*manière française*” in the latter half of the century. Jean Guillaume points to the very continuities with Gothic tectonics and construction traditions as the hallmarks of this new style, in which the correct use of free-standing columns and abundant ornament in designs such as Pierre Lescot’s façade of the Louvre (1546–53) was paradoxically more “Roman” in its grandeur than anything in Italy.⁷⁰ The development of this autonomous French classicism, along with the emergence of the independent French architectural treatises, is typically contextualized in terms of an increasingly fervent sense of nationalism that swept France during the reign of Henri II, and, more specifically, the promulgation of the French language, which culminated in the formation of the Pléiade. Joachim Du Bellay’s *La Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* (1549), which incorporated sizeable passages from Sperone Speroni’s *Dialogo delle lingue* (1542), is exemplary of the apparently unfeigned manner in which the French could declare their emancipation from Italy while appropriating Italian sources to do so. To come full circle, it was during the 1520s and 1530s, in works such as Tory’s *Champ fleury*, that these nationalistic sentiments began gaining momentum. If we similarly consider such ideas as representative of pan-cultural currents, the “mixed”-style architecture of early sixteenth-century France might be seen also to embody, already, a self-conscious and critical reworking of Italian influences in deference to French traditions.

As a specific translation of a specific text, the *Raison d’architecture* reveals, through careful analysis, the translator’s efforts to plot a course for the development of French classicism, in which authentically classical ornament could be put to the service of established tastes. Studies of other translations would undoubtedly yield further insights into the theory and practice of early French Renaissance architecture.⁷¹ But we should also begin to consider the implications of translation itself — a dauntingly vast and complex subject, to be sure. We might begin by examining the possible role of contemporaneous theories of translation in the visual arts. The seepage of theories from the poetic and rhetorical arts into writings on art and architecture has become a common theme in current scholarship on Italian Renaissance art and architecture. Can an analogous influence be ascribed to the French debates on translation? Scholars on French Renaissance architecture have stressed the shared attitudes of writers and architects, but have yet to fully explore the potential cross-fertilization of theories and methods across the arts. Translation was a pressing issue in sixteenth-century France, perhaps more so than elsewhere in Europe, with numerous prefaces and treatises responding to the problem of asserting the French style

in the face of the dual influences of antiquity and Italy⁷² — a problem, it would seem, of direct consequence for French architects. And if we think of French Renaissance architecture in metaphorical terms, that is, as a translation of influences from Italy and elsewhere in Europe, it becomes a hermeneutical construct in which modern structuralist, linguistic, and reception theories of translation might be enlisted. Examining the very process of cultural transmission — as the reading, criticism, and transformation of foreign sources into a native language — offers another way to understand the transformation of ancient and Italianate forms by French sculptors and architects beyond looking strictly at buildings and texts. In other words, as a means of addressing the still-thorny problem of the diffusion of Italian culture during the sixteenth century, the untapped potential of translation in all its guises beckons.

University of Toronto

Notes

1. For their helpful comments and suggestions, I would like to thank Gerald Beasley, William Kemp, Ethan Matt Kavaler, Alexander Nagel, Myra Nan Rosenfeld, and Maggie Trott. I am grateful to the library staff of the Canadian Centre for Architecture for their generous assistance, and to the organizers and participants of the France/Italy conference for their encouraging feedback.
2. See, e.g., Anthony Blunt's popular and influential survey first published in 1953, *Art and Architecture in France, 1500 to 1700* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).
3. For an overview and historiography of these attitudes and a trenchant critique of them, see Anne-Marie Sankovitch, "Structure/Ornament and the Modern Figuration of Architecture," *Art Bulletin* 80 (1998): 687–717.
4. With regard to the use of the term "classicism," I follow the remarks of Henri Zerner, *L'Art de la Renaissance en France. L'invention du classicisme* (Paris: Flammarion, 1996), pp. 386–89. Zerner stresses the very problematic nature of defining "classicism" in French Renaissance architecture, given its diverse manifestations, and proposes a relativistic understanding of it as the art of the dominant classes, specifically those who sought to appropriate the prestige of classical antiquity.
5. See, e.g., Jean Guillaume, "Les Français et les ordres, 1540–1550," in *L'emploi des ordres dans l'architecture de la Renaissance. Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 9 au 14 juin 1986*, ed. Jean Guillaume (Paris: Picard, 1992), pp. 194–218; Anne-Marie Sankovitch, "A Reconsideration of French Renaissance Church Architecture," in *L'église dans l'architecture de la Renaissance. Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 28 au 31 mai 1990*, ed. Jean Guillaume (Paris: Picard, 1995), pp. 161–80; and esp. Zerner, ch. 1, "Le Gothique à la Renaissance."
6. *Raison d'architecture antique, extraicte de Victruve, et aultres anciens Architectuers, nouvellement traduit Despaingnol en Francoys: a lutilite de ceulx qui se delectent en ediffices* (Paris: Simon de Colines, [c. 1537]). The first edition was undated; however, scholars generally agree upon a date of 1536 or 1537, based on three clues: Coline's address at the

sign of the “soleil d’or,” indicated on the title page; the standard two-year copyright period in Paris; and the appearance of the gros canon typeface introduced by Colines in 1536. On the dating of this edition, see Jeanne Veyrin-Forrier, Introduction, *Simon de Colines: An Annotated Catalogue of 230 Examples of His Press, 1520–1546*, ed. F. Schreiber (Provo, UT: Friends of the Brigham Young University Library, 1995), pp. xxvii–xxviii.

7. Subsequent editions were published in Paris in 1539, 1542, 1550, and 1555. A final edition was issued in 1608.
8. *Medidas del Romano: necessarias alos oficiales que quieren seguir las formaciones delas Basas, Colunas, Capiteles, y otras piezas delos edificios antiguos* (Toledo: Remón de Petras, 1526).
9. On the sources of the *Medidas* see Fernando Marías and Agustín Bustamente, Introduction, *Medidas del Romano*, (1549; fac. rpt. Madrid: Dirección General de Bellas Artes & Consejo general de Colegios Oficiales y Arquitectos, 1986), pp. 63–65, and Nigel Llewlyn, “‘Hungry and Desperate for Knowledge’: Diego de Sagredo’s Spanish Point of View,” in *Paper Palaces: The Rise of the Renaissance Architectural Treatise*, ed. Vaughan Hart and Peter Hicks (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 130–35.
10. Earlier editions of Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria* (Paris, 1512) and Vitruvius’ *De architectura* (Lyons, 1523) had been published in their original Latin. Manuscript translations of Vitruvius into French, on the other hand, seem to have circulated starting in the 1520s but were never published. See Margaret M. McGowan, *The Vision of Rome in Late Renaissance France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 88, n. 8.
11. On editions of Vitruvius published in Europe from the *editio princeps* through to the end of the sixteenth century, see the useful catalogue: Luigi Vagnetti and Laura Maruccci, “Per una coscienza Vitruviana. Regesto cronologico e critico,” *Studi e documenti di architettura* 8 (1978): 29–88.
12. *Il primo [-secondo] libro d’architettura. Le premier [-second] livre d’architecture . . .* (Paris: Jean Barbé, 1545). The second edition did not appear until 1590.
13. *Quinto libro d’architettura nel quale se tratta de diverse forme de tempj sacri* (Paris: Michel de Vascosan, 1547). No subsequent editions were printed in France.
14. *Architecture ou art de bien bastir* (Paris: Jacques Gazeau, 1547). A second edition did not appear until 1572.
15. *L’architecture et art de bien bastir* (Paris: Jacques Kerver, 1553).
16. *Reigles generales de l’architecture, sur les cinq manieres d’edifices, ascavoir, thuscane, dorique, ionicque corinthe & composite, avec les exemples dantiquitez, selon la doctrine de Vitruve* (Antwerp: Pieter Coecke van Aeslt, 1542). The subsequent editions in 1545 and 1550 were also issued in Antwerp.
17. See Jean-Jacques Gloton, “Le traité de Serlio et son influence en France,” in *Les traités d’architecture de la Renaissance. Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 1er au 11 juillet 1981*, éd. Jean Guillaume (Paris: Picard, 1988), pp. 407–23.
18. See John Bernard Bury, “Serlio: Some Bibliographical Notes,” in *Sebastiano Serlio, Sesto Seminario Internazionale di Storia dell’Architettura, Vicenza 31 agosto–4 settembre 1987*, ed. Christof Thoenes (Milan: Electa, 1989), pp. 92–101.
19. *Hypnerotomachie, ou discours du songe de Poliphile* (Paris: Jacques Kerver, 1546). Editions followed in 1554, 1561, 1600, and c.1610.

20. The notable exception is Philibert de l'Orme, who carefully measured many of the ruins during his stay in Rome from 1533 to 1536. On the activities of French artists and architects in Rome, see especially McGowan, ch. 5, "Visions Transported: The Creative Power of Ruins."
21. *Die Inventionen der colommen met haren coronementen ende maten* (Antwerp: Pieter Coecke van Aelst, 1539).
22. On the architectural treatises in Spain, see Earl Rosenthal, "The Image of Roman Architecture in Renaissance Spain," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 6th ser., 52 (1958): 329–46; Marías and Bustamente, "Trattistica teorica e Vitruvianesimo nell'architettura spagnola del Cinquecento," in *Les traités d'architecture de la Renaissance. Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 1^{er} au 11 juillet 1981*, ed. Jean Guillaume (Paris: Picard, 1988), pp. 307–15. For the Low Countries, see Joannes Offerhaus, "Pierre Coecke et l'introduction des traités d'architecture aux Pays-Bas," in *Traité d'architecture*, pp. 443–52, and Krista de Jonge, "Vitruvius, Alberti and Serlio: Architectural Treatises in the Low countries, 1530–1620," in *Paper Palaces*, pp. 281–96.
23. André Chastel, "French Renaissance Art in a European Context," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 12 (1981): 77–103.
24. On the function of Serlio's writings as architecture manuals, see Myra Nan Rosenfeld, "Sebastiano Serlio's Contributions to the Creation of the Modern Illustrated Architectural Manual," in *Sebastiano Serlio*, ed. Thoenes, pp. 102–10.
25. For the precedence of sculpture in the incorporation of Italianate forms, see Earl Rosenthal, "The Diffusion of the Italian Renaissance Style in Western European Art," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 40 ff. For the specific case of the jubé in France, see Bertrand Jestaz, "Le jubé comme organe de diffusion des formes classiques," in *L'église dans l'architecture de la Renaissance. Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 28 au 31 mai 1990*, ed. Guillaume, pp. 181–94.
26. See especially Zerner, ch. 1, "Le Gothique à la Renaissance."
27. On the development of French terminology for classical architecture, see M. Cagnon and S. Smith, "Le vocabulaire de l'architecture en France de 1500 à 1550," pts. 1 and 2, *Cahiers de lexicologie* 18 (1971): 89–108; 19 (1971): 94–108; for the *Raison d'architecture* in particular, see Frédérique Lemerle, "Jean Martin et le vocabulaire d'architecture," in *Jean Martin. Un traducteur français au temps de François I^{er} et de Henri II. Actes du colloque organisé à l'Université Paris—Sorbonne le 5 mars 1998*, ed. Marie-Madeleine Fontaine (Paris: Centre V.-L. Saulnier, 1999), pp. 116–20.
28. Martin advocated recycling traditional words, whereas de l'Orme, who criticized the workers' dialect as a "façon barbare," opted for Latin terms adapted to French orthography. The scales would eventually tip in favour of Martin as later commentators ridiculed the pretensions of de l'Orme's pseudo-classical terminology. On these debates, see Mario Carpo, "La traduction française du *De re aedificatoria* (1553): Alberti, Martin, Serlio et l'échec d'un classicisme vulgaire," in *Leon Battista Alberti. Actes du congrès international de Paris, Sorbonne – Institut de France – Institut culturel italien – Collège de France, 10–15 avril 1995*, ed. Francesco Furlan, 2 vols. (Turin: Nino Aragno; Paris: J. Vrin, 2000), 2: 935–40.
29. The only studies devoted to the *Raison d'architecture* are: Marías and Bustamente, pp. 125–30; José Luis Sierra Cortés, "Los añadidos temáticos franceses en *Medidas del Romano* de Diego de Sagredo," in *Homenaje al profesor Antonio Bonet Correa* (Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1994), pp. 595–609; Yves Pauwels, "Jean Goujon, de Sagredo à

- Serlio: la culture architecturale d'un 'ymaginer-architecteur',” *Bulletin Monumental* 156 (1998): 137–48; and Frédérique Lemerle, “La version française des *Medidas del Romano*,” in *Diego de Sagredo: Medidas del Romano*, ed. Fernando Marías and Felipe Pereda, 2 vols. ([Toledo]: Antonio Pareja, [2000]), 2: 93–106.
30. One of the seminal works for this rethinking of bibliography is D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, The Panizzi Lectures, 1985 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
 31. For a summary of recent trends in the history of the book, including Chartier’s considerable contributions, see Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), ch. 1, “Introduction: The Book of Nature and the Nature of the Book”; also Graham Larkin and Lisa Pon, “Introduction: The Materiality of Printed Words and Images,” *Word and Image* 17.1–2 (2000): 1–6.
 32. This new emphasis on translation arose from nationalistic calls for the development of the literary vernacular. Still, theories of translation were by no means unified and also varied according to whether the source material was poetic or oratorical. But the debates themselves, which erupted in the 1540s, were nevertheless indicative of a clear reorientation of the purposes and methods of translation from paraphrase and pedagogical exercise to creative imitation. For an overview of the issues, see Glyn P. Norton, “Translation Theory in Renaissance France: Étienne Dolet and the Rhetorical Tradition,” *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* os 10.1 (1974): 1–13, and “Translation Theory in Renaissance France: The Poetic Controversy,” *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* os 11.1 (1975): 30–44.
 33. The Spanish and Portuguese editions, however, retained the original text (with the addition of the new text on pedestals), so that the labels and keys could not be included in the new woodcuts because it would require altering the original text. These editions appeared in Lisbon in 1541 and 1542, Madrid in 1542, and Toledo in 1549 and 1564; see Florentino Zamora Lucas and Eduardo Ponce de Leon, *Bibliografía española de arquitectura (1526–1850)* (Madrid: Asociación de Libreros y Amigos del Libro, 1947), pp. 11–34.
 34. The classic statement on orders as Renaissance invention is Christof Thoenes and Hubertus Günther, “Gli ordini architettonici: rinascita o invenzione?” in *Roma e l’antico nell’arte e nella cultura del Cinquecento*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1985), pp. 261–310.
 35. D4^r–E1^v. For a thorough discussion of Sagredo’s errors, see Marías and Bustamente, pp. 117–120.
 36. *Raison d’architecture*, fol. 43^r.
 37. Alina Payne, “Creativity and Bricolage in Architectural Literature of the Renaissance,” *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 34 (1998): 20–38.
 38. Marías and Bustamente, p. 126.
 39. On the pivotal role of image-based treatises in the standardization of the orders, see Mario Carpo, *Architecture in the Age of Printing: Orality, Writing, Typography, and Printed Images in the History of Architectural Theory*, trans. Sarah Benson (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001), ch. 4, “Architectural Drawing in the Age of Its Mechanical Reproduction.”
 40. These similarities have prompted much speculation as to whether one may have influenced the other, especially given the uncertainties regarding dating of the *Raison d’architecture*, which have only recently been resolved. With the dating now narrowed down to 1536–37,

that is, exactly coincidental with Book Four, it seems more likely that the two treatises were mutually independent and that similarities arose from common sources.

41. New documents and manuscripts, along with a deepened understanding of antiquarian circles and the circulation among architects of drawings of Roman antiquities, have overturned Vasari's long-uncontested claims that Serlio had merely utilized drawings inherited from Peruzzi. The exact nature of the relationship between the two remains unclear. For a discussion of recent research into the matter, see Myra Nan Rosenfeld, *Serlio on Domestic Architecture*, 2nd ed. (Mineola, NY: Dover, 1996), pp. 1–2.
42. Erwin Panofsky, "The History of the Theory of Human Proportions as a Reflection of the History of Styles," in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1955), pp. 88 ff.
43. *Medidas*, A4^v–A5^r.
44. There is a clear distinction between theory and practice. In recent years, scholars have chipped away at Rudolf Wittkower's eloquent and influential essay on Neoplatonism in architecture, "The Centrally Planned Church in the Renaissance," first published in 1949. See Wittkower, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*, 5th ed. (London: Academy Editions; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), pp. 14–40. Whereas Wittkower asserted that Neoplatonism was manifest in architectural design through geometric forms and/or mathematical ratios, the lack of hard evidence indicates that Neoplatonism was operative primarily as a theoretical construct. For challenges to Wittkower, see Frank Zöllner, *Vitruvius Proportionsfigur: quellenkritische Studien zur Kunstliteratur im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1987), and A. Payne, "Rudolf Wittkower and Architectural Principles in the Age of Modernism," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53 (1994): 324–30.
45. Sagredo's interpretation of anthropomorphism as a metrological system of measure, rather than as a symbolic prototype, however, was typical of many writers on the subject. Cf. Zöllner, pp. 123–24.
46. *Medidas*, A5^v.
47. On Sagredo's independence from Vitruvius, see especially José Luis Sierra Cortés, "Diego de Sagredo y Vitruvio," *Fragmentos revista de arte* 8/9 (1986): 4–19.
48. *Raison d'architecture*, fol. 7^v.
49. *Medidas*, A7^r–A7^v.
50. *Ibid.*, A7^r.
51. *Ibid.*, A7^v.
52. *Raison d'architecture*, fol. 9^v.
53. For an overview of early attributions, see Marías and Bustamente, pp. 39–40. Marías and Bustamente (pp. 40–41) propose Guillaume Philandrier, member of the Accademia della Virtù in Rome and author of the *Annotationes* on Vitruvius. However, as others have already pointed out, Philandrier is too academic, too well-entrenched in Roman circles to have been the translator. Pauwels (pp. 146–48) has proposed Jean Goujon, the sculptor and illustrator of Jean Martin's edition of Vitruvius, although, as mentioned above, it seems unlikely the translator was an architect. His attribution is not implausible, but it depends primarily on the appearance of motifs taken from the first and second editions of the *Raison d'architecture* in Goujon's own work, which is not firm evidence for Goujon's authorship. Finally, Lemerle ("La version française des *Medidas del Romano*," pp. 97 ff.) ventures that the

translator was a sculptor with Spanish contacts and ascribes the more humanistic and theoretical passages of the revised text to the editor, Colines. But although Colines was a leading humanist, there is little evidence of his architectural interests.

54. I would like to thank Sally Hickson for drawing my attention to the possibility of Tory's involvement. The only comprehensive study on Tory remains Auguste Bernard's monograph originally published in 1857. See Auguste Bernard, *Geoffroy Tory: Painter and Engraver: First Royal Printer, Reformer of Orthography and Typography under François I*, trans. George B. Ives (1909; New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969).
55. *Libri de re aedificatoria decem* (Paris: B. Rembolt, 1512). Tory's work on this edition was strictly editorial. As is announced on the title page, he divided the work into titled chapters and each chapter into separate paragraphs, adding marginal notes, an index, and a table of annotations.
56. Tory expresses his views on the practice of translation in his preface to Egnazio's *Sommaire de chroniques* (Paris, 1530). Cf. Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva: Droz, 1984), pp. 92–93. The preface is translated in Bernard, pp. 89–90.
57. This was a tendency commented on by contemporary writers; see for example, Pauline M. Smith, "Le redoublement de termes et les emprunts linguistiques dans la traduction en France au XVI^e siècle," *Revue de linguistique romane* 47 (1983): 37–58.
58. Colin Eisler, "Jean Grolier and the Renaissance," in *The Library of Jean Grolier* (New York: The Grolier Club, 1971), pp. 1–21; see also McGowan, p. 102.
59. *Exposition de la Société de la Reliure Originale accompagnée d'une présentation des reliures ayant appartenues à Jean Grolier* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1959), no. 161; *Bookbindings from the Library of Jean Grolier* (London: The British Museum, 1965), no. 87.
60. *Champ fleury*, *Au quel est contenu lart & science de la deue & vraye proportion des lettres attiques, quon dit autrement lettres antiques, & vulgairement lettres romaines proportionnees selon le corps & visage humain* (1529; fac. rpt. Paris: Gustave Cohen, 1931). There is still no comprehensive study of this treatise.
61. Stanley Morison, *Fra Luca de Pacioli of Borgo S. Sepolcro* (1933; fac. rpt. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969), p. 24.
62. *Champ fleury*, fol. XIII^f. It is worth noting that Tory singled out for criticism the lack of a theoretical substructure in the work of his predecessors. This was pure posturing on Tory's part, since Pacioli's theory was geometry itself. *De divina proportione* is rooted in the more abstract Neoplatonic significance of the "divine proportion" (i.e., the Golden Section), an incommensurate proportion represented by a straight line divided into two segments such that *ab* is to *bc* as *bc* is to *ac* — a proportion which Pacioli believed was, like God, singular, immutable, and ineffable.
63. *Champ fleury*, fol. XLIV^f. On Perréal's relation to Leonardo, see Carlo Vecce, "Piglia da Gian di Paris," *Accademia Leonardi Vinci* 10 (1997): 208–13.
64. *Champ fleury*, fols. XXVIII^f–XXX^f.
65. The dedication is translated in Bernard, pp. 68–69.
66. Fol. I^f, fol. VII^f.
67. The preface of the 1525 edition tells us that Tory "ha faict, & faict faire certaines histories et vignettes a lantique, et paraillement unes autres a la Moderne." Tory's under-

standing of each style encompasses all aspects of the page: typography, ornament, scenery, figure type, costume, and even pose and gesture. Cf. Zerner, p. 15–16.

68. On differences between the Gothic tradition in Italy and France, see Marvin Trachtenberg, "Gothic/Italian 'Gothic': Toward a Redefinition," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 50 (1991): 22–37. For the problem of the persistence of the Gothic in Renaissance Italy, see, e.g., Giorgio Simoncini, "La persistenza del gotico dopo il Medioevo: periodizzazione ed orientamenti figurativi," in *La tradizione medievale nell'architettura italiana dal XV al XVII secolo*, ed. G. Simoncini (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1992), pp. 1–50. The designs produced for the facade of Bologna cathedral are a particularly notorious and oft-cited example of Italian attitudes toward the Gothic; their duration and intensity attest to the fact that the matter was anything but neutral. For an overview of the debates, see Richard Bernheimer, "Gothic Survival and Revival in Bologna," *Art Bulletin* 36 (1954): 263–84. On the Gothic projects as deliberately historicizing, see, e.g., Christoph Luitpold Frommel, "Il progetto di Domenico Aimo da Varignana per la facciata di San Petronio," and Howard Burns, "Gli architetti rinascimentali e gli edifici preesistenti: il contesto dei progetti per la facciata della basilica di San Petronio," in *Una basilica per una città: sei secoli in San Petronio. Atti del Convegno di Studi per il Sesto Centenario di fondazione della Basilica di San Petronio 1390–1990*, ed. Mario Fanti and Deanna Lanzi (Bologna: Fabbriceria di San Petronio, Istituto per la Storia della Chiesa di Bologna, 1994), pp. 223–41 and 259–62.
69. Pauwels (pp. 140 ff.) cites the example of the bases and pedestals at Saint-Maclou at Rouen, which resemble those in the *Raison d'architecture*. The pedestal derives from the appendix added by the French translator and the base copies a technical diagram that was introduced in the second edition.
70. Guillaume, pp. 200 ff.
71. For example, Mario Carpo's analysis of Jean Martin's translation of Alberti reveals that he revised the profane references in the discourse on temples according to reform-minded beliefs. Carpo, "La traduction française," pp. 942 ff.
72. James B. Atkinson, "Naïveté and Modernity: The French Renaissance Battle for a Literary Vernacular," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35 (1974): 179–96.