Some degree of happiness

Studi di storia dell'architettura in onore di Howard Burns

Some degree of happiness

Studi di storia
dell'architettura
in onore di
Howard Burns

a cura di
Maria Beltramini
Caroline Elam

Oxford, Worcester College Library, aprile 2007

Indice

Premessa

«The quality and moral and intellectual commitment of [Palladio's]
work have few parallels in the history of architecture.
For anyone seriously concerned with creating some degree
of happiness for himself and for others 'here below', Palladio's
achievement will always repay study and reflection.»
da H. Burns, *Andrea Palladio 1508-1580. The Portico and the Farmyard*,
in collaboration with L. Fairbairn and B. Boucher, London,
The Art Council of Great Britain 1975, p. 72.

Howard Burns ha cominciato ad insegnare alla Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa nell'autunno del 2005. Per la prima volta un seminario di Storia dell'architettura faceva la sua comparsa nelle aule del palazzo dei Cavalieri, e le sue lezioni hanno subito suscitato curiosità, richiamando studenti da altri corsi, non solo da quelli paralleli di storia dell'arte, ma soprattutto antichisti, letterati e storici. Simmetricamente, quando gli impegni glielo hanno consentito – e certo meno spesso di quanto avrebbe voluto – Howard si è seduto tra gli allievi e ha preso parte attiva alle lezioni dei colleghi: un costume rivelatore di un modo coinvolto e collegiale di vivere il mestiere di docente che alla Scuola Normale è ancora possibile praticare. Al momento del suo approdo pisano iniziava per Howard la fase preparatoria della grande mostra e del simposio del cinquecentenario palladiano svoltisi nel 2008: un'occasione unica per gli studenti, che hanno potuto seguire in tempo reale il delicato processo di selezione delle opere, vedere da vicino i meccanismi che regolano l'organizzazione di grandi eventi culturali, confrontarsi – in una memorabile settimana londinese nella primavera del 2007 – cogli emozionanti fogli palladiani conservati in Inghilterra e in più casi partecipare con interventi originali al catalogo e agli atti.

In occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno questo libro vuole quindi essere un omaggio ad Howard Burns e al suo magistero, iniziato – come ci racconta Caroline Elam nelle pagine che seguono – a

Cambridge e presso il Courtauld Institute di Londra nel corso degli anni Sessanta, proseguito negli Stati Uniti ad Harvard e poi in Italia: prima all'Università di Ferrara, poi all'IUAV di Venezia e infine a Pisa.

Al volume hanno contribuito alcuni tra gli allievi che hanno avuto il privilegio d'incontrarlo e seguirlo lungo questo suo percorso: il lettore riconoscerà quelli della prima ora, ormai stimati professori presso grandi istituzioni e università, e scoprirà via via i più giovani studiosi, fino ai dottorandi, pisani d'adozione, che Howard ha nel tempo indirizzato verso lo studio della cultura architettonica dell'età moderna, non importa se incarnata in un edificio reale o dipinto, o in un disegno, un trattato, una decorazione, una descrizione testuale. La liberalità della Scuola Normale, in questi tempi duri per la ricerca italiana, ha dovuto darsi un limite; ma gli autori qui raccolti sperano di rappresentare degnamente i moltissimi ai quali Howard, con la sua curiosità intellettuale e la finezza del suo sguardo, ha fatto balenare dinnanzi quel "some degree of happiness" che dà senso all'impegno quotidiano dello studio.

Assieme a Caroline Elam desidero esprimere la mia gratitudine a Maria Vittoria Benelli e a Bruna Parra per la competenza e la dedizione con le quali hanno seguito la realizzazione di questo volume.

<div align="right">Maria Beltramini</div>

Introduzione
Precision and *fantasia*:
Howard Burns, scholar and teacher

'non fu solamente dottissimo in quest'arte per Theorica
e per pratica ma fu anche cortese e liberale assai:
insegnando la à chi se n'è dilettato: e massimamente a me'
(Serlio on Peruzzi, *Regole Generali di Architettura*, 1537, p.V).

Howard Burns is hard to pin down intellectually. Largely self-taught, belonging to no 'school', eschewing 'theory', he has been and continues to be one of the most influential figures in the architectural history of the Italian renaissance, itself a subject which has seen a notable rebirth since the Second World War, and perhaps especially since the 1960s. Howard, as writer, teacher, exhibition curator, conference organiser (and playwright) has been at the heart of that resurgence, promoting the development of the discipline with quiet persistence and un-flashy brilliance in Britain, the United States and Italy.

This volume in Howard's honour, with its contributions drawn exclusively from among his pupils, has been kept as a secret from him until its presentation. It has therefore not been possible, while preparing the introduction, to consult Howard himself about the details of his education, career and intellectual roots. His modesty and his famous, Scarlet Pimpernel-like elusiveness ('They seek him here, they seek him there. . .') , means that he has, of course, no web-page. What follows is thus highly provisional and biography would in any case be premature. If it is, as I suspect, replete with inaccuracies, I console myself with a memory of Howard once describing history as 'telling stories about the past'.

Born in Aberdeen in 1939 of Scottish stock, with direct patrilineal connections to the poet Robert Burns, Howard was educated at Westminster School in London and in 1961 took his B.A. degree in history at King's College, Cambridge, supervised by the famously dedicated teacher Christopher Morris. While an undergraduate he edited the literary magazine *Delta*, with his friend, later the celebrated playwright, Simon Gray. Surely stimulating for his emerging interests was the presence in the college of the eccentric social and economic historian of the middle ages and more specifically of King's chapel, John Saltmarsh, a devotee of account books as primary sources, who delighted in showing the secrets of the chapel's vaulting to interested visitors. Even more important must have been the influence of the great scholar R.R. Bolgar, author of *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (1954).

In the early 1960s the study of art history in Cambridge was in its infancy. When Howard decided to undertake postgraduate research on Renaissance architects' study of the antique, he was nominally supervised by Peter Murray, then librarian of the Conway Library at the Courtauld Institute in London, and practically the only historian of Italian renaissance architecture in the United Kingdom. But in international terms it was a propitious time. James Ackerman had published his exemplary thesis on the Cortile del Belvedere already in 1954, and his exciting books on Michelangelo and Palladio were coming out in the 1960s. Central to Howard's interests was the work of Wolfgang Lotz on Peruzzi and on representational methods in Renaissance architectural drawing. Arnaldo Bruschi was beginning his great work on Bramante (published 1969). And in Italy Howard found congenial, somewhat senior contemporaries: Christoph Frommel, already well advanced in his study of High Renaissance Roman palaces, and Howard Saalman (1928-1995), whose article on Brunelleschi's capital studies had appeared in 1958; a slim young Saalman appears for scale in Howard's photograph of the Palazzo Lunense in Viterbo, published in *La Roma di Leon Battista Alberti* (2005).

Like other Oxbridge colleges, King's had a system of awarding Junior Research Fellowships on the basis of submitted fellowship dissertations. In 1965 Howard was elected a fellow in this manner. Few have read his dissertation, but it can be said to adumbrate his life's work, analysing the diverse and evolving responses to ancient architecture from the late Trecento through Brunelleschi, Alberti, Francesco

di Giorgio, Bramante and Raphael, to Peruzzi, Palladio and Ligorio. His first article, on a Peruzzi drawing of the Pantheon he discovered in Ferrara (1966) is a dazzling display of visual acuity and erudition, incorporating much more than the title reveals: Frommel is reputed to have said on reading it: "now go and write some books from these footnotes." A conference on *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500-1500*, organised by Bolgar at the newly created King's College Research centre in 1969, gave Howard the opportunity to reflect in public on some of the methodological problems concerning 'Quattrocento Architecture and the Antique'. Published in the conference proceedings in 1971, this essay remains a classic.

By the later 1960s Howard was lecturing and teaching undergraduate art history students in Cambridge, bombarding them with beautifully selected pairs of his own colour slides of Italian buildings, as Deborah Howard recalls in her piece in this volume. No point was left unillustrated. A friend of Howard's, the Cambridge composer Robin Holloway, was often in the audience, borrowing ideas for constructing musicological lectures along similar lines. Soon Howard was talent-spotted by Anthony Blunt to teach at the Courtauld Insitute in London, where he was on the lecturing staff by 1969. Howard's years at the Courtauld brought him everyday contacts of huge importance to him – not just his Italian Renaissance colleagues John Shearman, Michael Hirst and Jennifer Fletcher, but also Blunt himself and modernists such as John Golding. One of Howard's first courses at the Courtauld was on *The Renaissance City*. I shall never forget the way he convinced us that the course was a collaborative enterprise to which we would contribute as much as he: this was the nicest kind of sleight of hand, since he of course knew everything already. Characteristically, he took us off during the Easter vacation for a whirlwind tour of Renaissance cities, demonstrating among other things that mastery of the Italian railway timetable which has always been essential to his life. Such research visits have remained a constant in his teaching, but his current students have more up-to-date technological methods of tracking Howard's movements. I can remember William Curtis and myself going round the Florentine Museo della Storia della Scienza so many times while waiting for Howard that all the mechanical models had stopped working by the time he arrived.

Unhappily for the Courtauld, Howard was persuaded in 1986 to take a chair at the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University,

a few years after Shearman had made a similar transatlantic crossing, moving from Princeton to the Fogg in time to be Howard's colleague once more. Harry Cobb was instrumental in Howard's transfer to Cambridge Massachusetts. This was a post which offered new opportunities: the chance for collegial interchange with architects of the calibre of Rafael Moneo, Jorge Silvetti, Spiro Pollalis and Cobb himself; the challenge of teaching students destined to be practising architects, as well as co-supervising budding art historians from the Fogg. Teaching architects gave him the chance to develop one of his notable strengths as a historian, his ability to think about problems from a designer's point of view. One dramatic result of this new life was the appearance at the Giulio Romano exhibition of 1989 in Mantua of the façade of the artist's (long-demolished) house in Rome, reconstructed by Howard's students not as a small-scale model, but life-size, at one to one. Harvard contacts, for example his friendship and collaborative teaching with the historian of Islamic architecture, Gülru Necipoğlou, also widened Howard's geographical horizons, bringing Sinan into his architectural canon. Ever alert to the potential of new technologies, Howard was able to collaborate with Bill Mitchell, former Dean and director of the Media Lab at M.I.T. on an online Virtual Museum of Palladio's villas, also developing a model for collaborations between historians and architects in their series of jointly taught courses. It was in that context that he began his collaboration with Daniel Tsai, and initiated the project of building the Centro Palladiano's website into a rich and multilayered tool.

But Howard never put down real domestic roots at Harvard, as anyone who visited him in his living quarters at Lowell House will remember. In 1994 he was called 'per chiara fama' to a chair at the University of Ferrara, but the tragic death of Manfredo Tafuri brought him in 1995 to the University of Venice (IUAV), where Tafuri had been instrumental in setting up a department for architectural history intended to develop and enhance specialisation in that field. (The concentration of Tafuri's powerful theoretical energies on Renaissance architecture from the 1980s was of great importance for Howard, as for the whole field.) Howard had in 1993 become Presidente of the Consiglio Scientifico of CISA, the Palladio Centre in Vicenza, and his personal as well as his professional life was now consolidated in Italian-speaking Europe. In Venice Howard was able to attract outstanding doctoral students many of whom have contributed to this

volume, while the proximity to Vicenza fostered his ever-burgeoning work with Guido Beltramini at the Centro Palladiano.

Howard's most recent move to a chair in architectural history at the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa has been particularly felicitous. The collegial character of the Normale, where for example it is natural for professors and students to discuss their work over lunch and dinner, is completely suited to Howard's democratic habits, while the inter-disciplinary research and teaching environment has enabled him to explore in depth his literary and philological interests. It is in some ways like a return to his academic roots in King's College.

Howard's impact on Renaissance architectural history has been immeasurable, as much through his unpublished ideas aired in lectures, seminars and conferences, as through his publications, which are listed in an appendix to this volume, and those of his students and his students' students. In the UK he can be said without exaggeration to have revolutionised the subject and its impact: his Courtauld Ph.D. students are *en poste* in university art history departments all over Britain – Cambridge, London, Manchester, Birmingham, Reading, Edinburgh – all represented in this Festschrift. In America, his time at Harvard is acknowledged as one of the indicators of a new rigour in the teaching of architecture in architectural schools. In Italy, Renaissance architectural history has been immensely enriched by his presence.

Howard's scholarship has been remarkably varied in terms of the geography of the Italian peninsula. Many architectural historians concentrate on one major city or region of Italy: Howard's purview extends from Trent to Noto (and beyond Italy, to Russia and Britain). Although he is essentially an architectural historian, he is unusually sensitive to the interaction of architecture with painting and sculpture: see for example his account of Alberti's response to Ghiberti, Donatello and Giotto ('Leon Battista Alberti', 1998), and the influence on Francesco di Giorgio of the pictorial and sculptural traditions of Siena ('Restaurator delle ruyne antiche', 1994).

Readers of this volume will hardly need reminding that Howard's contribution has been in three main areas: Renaissance architecture and the antique; Renaissance architectural drawing; and the architecture of Palladio. For him these themes are so closely interwoven

that they can hardly be separated. His approach to all these questions involves the closest and most unprejudiced scrutiny of the primary material – writings of every sort, from documents to treatises, letters, diaries and account books; representations of architecture in all media, especially drawings; and the buildings themselves. This may sound obvious, but it is actually most unusual for art historians to come to the sources without pre-existing theories or received ideas, just as it was well-nigh impossible (as Howard has shown) for the architects of the period to come to ancient architecture without pre-existing aesthetic prejudices. Equally unusual is the modesty combined with firmness of Howard's tone when writing. Not for him the standard father-killing routine, the slaughter of the sacred cow or straw man in the first paragraph. He simply ignores received ideas and considers the evidence afresh, invariably coming up with a new overall interpretation.

Howard's study of antique influence has never been just a question of source spotting – though his keen eye and extraordinary visual memory have pinpointed some convincing and surprising detailed comparisons: for example, between Alberti's capitals at the Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini and a Roman capital in Nîmes ('Un disegno', 1980, and 'Alberti', 1998); or between Michelangelo's pilaster capitals in the ducal tombs in the New Sacristy and an ancient example in the Fitwilliam Museum (*Andrea Palladio 1508-1580*, 1975). He has always looked for the 'how' and the 'why' as well as the 'what', searching for the rationale or indeed the caprice behind an architect's choices. When he writes of Palladio, 'The study of the antique was for him the study of the basic principles of design' (1975, p.7), this tells us much about his own methods too. He is particularly illuminating when comparing two or more architects' approaches to the antique: Brunelleschi and Alberti (1971 and 1977); Raphael and Bramante ('Raffaello e "quell'antiqua architectura"', 1984); Alessi and Michelangelo ('Le idee di Galeazzo Alessi', 1975), Ligorio and Palladio (1988). A selection of his articles ranged in chronological order of architect gives a near complete account of this most central subject in Renaissance architecture, its relationship to the antique.[1]

With drawings too, Howard's contribution extends far beyond new discoveries or attributions, though these have been legion - drawings

---

[1] Cammy Brothers, Mauro Mussolin and myself are preparing such an anthology of Howard's articles.

by Francesco di Giorgio, Peruzzi, Falconetto and of course Palladio, a unique sheet by Alberti, a plan of S. Lorenzo in Florence c.1500 miraculously unearthed among miscellaneous maps in Venice (1979). Of greater importance than the sum of these discoveries is a whole methodology for the study of architectural drawing (influenced by Lotz, and by Wilde's and Hirst's work on Michelangelo). Considering every mark on the paper from compass point to inscription, treating the drawing as a document, considering its function as primary to its interpretation, taking handwriting seriously, but above all studying the drawing for what it reveals of the draughtsman's mentality, not only for its sequence in an architectural project. The drawing becomes a living, breathing work, a material object, a carrier of poetic meaning. Drawings after the antique are central to this analytical method, because every mark the draughtsman makes implies an interpretation, a point of view.

In Howard's research on Palladio, too, the study of the architect through his drawings has been primary, from his first published article on the subject in the exhibition catalogue of 1973 to his most recent in the quincentenary catalogue of 2008. He has explored the political, intellectual and socio-economic context of Palladio's buildings and their construction, but has never lost sight of the individual creative process. Building on the work of Zorzi, Forssman and others, he has devised methods for resolving problems in the sources, attribution and chronology of Palladio's drawings (for example through tracking changes in handwriting), and has made countless new suggestions – for example the drawing he found at Chatsworth for the rebuilding of the Doges' Palace after the fire of 1577. Characteristic of his sensitivity to the design process is his suggestion that Palladio's employment of orthogonal drawing could generate new compositional inventions – so that the façade of the Redentore could be derived from the Pantheon transformed into a two-dimensional projection. (Similarly, he has shown how Michelangelo's habit of superimposing different solutions palimpsest-fashion on a single sheet generated his complex layered designs for doors and windows.)

In all these areas Howard's subtle, original and exacting approach has pushed the subject beyond familiar stereotypes. Architectural 'theory' had tended to be studied in terms of the printed treatise and its relationship to 'practice' considered in terms of the relationship or lack of it between built buildings and published writings, especially

in questions of proportion or the architectural orders. Howard instead has sought to find out, for example, how a designing architect's approach shapes or is shaped by his study of the antique, looking at letters as well as texts, whole treatises not just the well-known passages, and drawings, where these exist. The fruits of this approach can be seen, for example, in his exemplary essays on Alberti (1998 and 2005). To take one instance almost at random from the 2005 article, he uses the example of Alberti's passage on Alatri to show how unusual a writer he is in analysing ancient buildings from the point of view of a designer rather than a patron, theorist or antiquarian, and shows that one of the few models for this approach can be found in Julius Caesar's discussion of the fortifications of Gaul! His entirely convincing interpretation of Alberti is the diametrical opposite of the standard view of a theoretician uninterested in construction or the building site. Similarly, the essay on Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1994) packs into twenty-five pages a total reassessment of Martini's approach to painted architecture, the architecture of Siena, of antiquity, treatise writing and his own architectural projects, showing that the paradoxes of his career disappear when we see him historically, that his reliance on fantasy and invention was not in conflict with his study of the ancient buildings or Vitruvius. The same could of course be said for Peruzzi, whose architectural ideas Howard has reconstructed so exactly (1988) – though we still long to read more of him on this subject. One of his favourite quotations is Cellini's remark that Peruzzi had sought out and discovered a great variety of the 'belle maniere' of ancient architecture, and used to say that of these Vitruvius had not chosen the most beautiful (cited in 'Baldassarre Peruzzi', 1988). Howard's exploration of the extraordinary variety of approaches to ancient architecture is similarly pluralistic. His stunning account of Ligorio's reconstruction of ancient Rome (1988) not only demonstrates in detail how Ligorio used numismatic evidence, sometimes in preference to the existing archaeological remains, but also shows how he adopted antique conventions of representation in preference to modern mapping, 'correct' orthogonal drawing or perspective, and how his 'Anteiquae urbis imago' was a labour of loving historicism, carried out with 'almost amorous intensity', in homage to ancient Rome as the Petrarchan lost beloved.

Howard's contribution to the reinvention of the architectural exhibition deserves special notice. Since the 1970s he has organised or participated in innumerable such shows, which from 1997 have had

a particular focus in the beautiful spaces of the restored Palazzo Barbaran da Porto, the new home of the Palladio Centre. Anyone who remembers the two Palladio exhibitions of 1973 and 1975, the first in the Basilica in Vicenza, and the second in the Hayward Gallery in London, will have a clear idea of his imaginative reworking of the genre. The first was a straightforward array of drawings lent from the R.I.B.A., models made in Vicenza, and – as I recall – photographs of Palladio's buildings; the initial idea was to restage this in London under the auspices of the Arts Council. But Howard (and his collaborators Lynda Fairbairn and Bruce Boucher) realised that Palladio's work could be brought to life and visually enriched by an array of relevant paintings, sculpture, furniture, documents and images of country life in joy and squalor. The catalogue, *Andrea Palladio 1508-1580: The Portico and the Farmyard*, with its satisfying wider-than-square shape, wonderfully accommodating two-column grid, thick matte paper and index, remains one of the most illuminating publications on Palladio of the last century, a mine of ideas and information. Of the many fine exhibitions organised in Vicenza since 1997 with Guido Beltramini, I remember with particular admiration *Palladio nel Nord Europa* of 1999, with its highly sympathetic presentation of Lord Burlington as a figure of poetic inventiveness, and its fascinating section on Palladianism in Germany, and the lucid and beautiful villa show, *Andrea Palladio e la villa veneta: da Petrarca a Carlo Scarpa* of 2005, which covered much more than the span of its title, tracing villa culture since antiquity. Unlike many exhibitions in Italy, its argument could be followed in detail through elegant and informative labels. Howard has always been deeply engaged in every aspect of exhibition design and presentation.

Howard's qualities as scholar and teacher are hard to sum up: endless visual and intellectual curiosity; a precise and unerring telephoto eye for individual style and architectural detail, combined with a wide-angle (and perspective-corrected) view of the whole historical picture; an understanding of cold socio-economic realities, combined with a sensibility to poetics; a tendency to amused, detached observation of human folly. One of his favourite adjectives when lecturing in English was 'inventive', perhaps the quality he admires most in architectural design: it's good to see 'inventiva' appearing in his Italian texts.

The epigraph to this introduction, Serlio's tribute to Peruzzi, may be taken to sum up the debt of all the authors in this volume to Howard as a teacher. Serlio goes on to say that he will be satisfied if:

'da così minima favilla, che a Dio piaque darmi col mezzo di Baldassar da Siena, mio precettor, si vedrà uscir qualche raggio'. Rays of all sorts can be found in the following pages, issuing forth in various directions from Howard's precepts over forty years. It is gratifying that the book's geographical, methodological and biographical spread reflects so many of the areas in which Howard has focussed his own and his pupils' research.

CAROLINE ELAM

Drawing in the Void:
The Space between the Sketchbook and the Treatise

Scholars often narrate the history of Renaissance architectural drawing as a linear drive towards the creation of the printed architectural treatise. As a consequence, historians overlook interests and approaches that do not surface in treatises. Specifically, two ideas dominate the literature: first, that studies of antiquities were motivated by a desire to find corollaries among the ruins to the writings of Vitruvius; and second, as Wolfgang Lotz argued, that the apex of Renaissance representational techniques was orthogonal drawing, and that all other approaches were failed attempts to achieve this[1].

[1] W. LOTZ, *The Rendering of the Interior in Italian Renaissance Drawing*, in *Studies in Italian Renaissance Architecture*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press 1977, pp. 1-65. Other important scholarship on Renaissance architectural drawings includes: H. BURNS, *A Peruzzi Drawing in Ferrara*, in «Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz», XII, 1965-1966, pp. 245-270; I. CAMPBELL, *Ancient Roman Topography and Architecture. The Royal Collection*, 3 vols, London, Miller 2004; *The Architectural Drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and His Circle*, I: *Fortifications, Machines, and Festival Architecture*, and II: *Churches, Villas, the Pantheon, Tombs, and Ancient Inscriptions*, ed by C.L. Frommel-N. Adams, Cambridge, Mass.-New York, MIT Press 1994-2000; H. GÜNTHER, *Das Studium der antiken Architektur in den Zeichnungen der Hochrenaissance*, Tübingen, Wasmuth 1988; *Italian Renaissance Drawings from the Collection of Sir John Soane's Museum*, ed by L. Fairbairn, 2 vols, London, Azimuth

This essay will consider how sets of anonymous drawings at Harvard University's Fogg Museum and at the Canadian Center for Architecture, as well as a loose collection of anonymous architectural prints at the University of Virginia and other collections, suggest the need to revise these assumptions[2].

The drawings and prints demonstrate a fascination with ornamental details, an exploration of plans of complex geometry and ambiguous function, and an interest in experimental representational techniques. In their expansive, inclusive, and inventive response to antique monuments, they show how the contributions of Giuliano da Sangallo and Francesco di Giorgio to architectural culture have been understated in traditional historiography.

The drawings I want to discuss are not particularly original, and they are not associated with any known architect. In other words, they are precisely the sorts of objects that are typically ignored or

1998; A. Nesselrath, *I libri di disegni di antichità: tentativo di una tipologia*, in *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, III: *Dalla tradizione all'archeologia*, a cura di S. Settis, Torino, Einaudi 1986, pp. 87-147; and H. Würm, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Architekturzeichnungen*, Tübingen, Wasmuth 1984. On the study of Vitruvius in the Renaissance, see P.N. Pagliara, *Vitruvio da testo a canone*, in *Memoria dell'antico* cit., pp. 5-85.

[2] On the Fogg Codex, see H. Burns, cat. 3.1.6, in *Raffaello architetto*, a cura di C.L. Frommel-S. Ray-M. Tafuri, in collaborazione con H. Burns-A. Nesselrath, Milano, Electa 1984, pp. 412-414; and A. Nesselrath, *Codex Coner – 85 Years On*, in *Cassiano dal Pozzo's Paper Museum*, ed. by I. Jenkins *et al.*, Milano, Olivetti, vol. 2, 1992, p. 152 (with attribution to the circle of Antonio Labacco), on the Montreal Codex, see D. Booth, *A Syntax for Antiquity*, in *Architecture and Its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation: Works from the Collection of the Canadian Centre for Architecture*, ed. by E. Blau-E. Kaufman-R. Evans, Montreal, MIT Press 1989, pp. 200-201; on the Master G.A. prints, see M. Waters, *The Column Capitals and Bases of Master G.A. with the Caltrop: Prints and the Architectural Culture of Renaissance Rome*, M.A. thesis, University of Virginia 2007. Waters is also preparing an article on Renaissance architectural prints outside of treatises and the codification of the orders, and has given a talk on the subject at the Renaissance Society of America conference in 2008: *From Sketchbook, to Print, and Back Again: Architectural Prints and the Enduring Sketchbook Tradition*. Other collections which possess complete or nearly complete collections of the Master G.A. with the Caltrop architectural prints include the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal, the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and the library of El Escorial.

neglected because their anonymity and subject matter render them difficult to study. Biography continues to dominate the discipline, so that when anonymous works are considered, it is often with the aim of establishing an attribution. Furthermore, when scholars study architectural drawings, it is generally for the way in which they can illuminate the design process and chronology of a particular architect and building or the understanding of an ancient monument. Even within the narrow field of drawings after the antique, there is an understandable tendency to focus on larger books of drawings that remain bound together in something resembling their original order (the Codex Barberini, the Codex Coner, the Codex Escurialensis). This is in contrast to the drawings under consideration here, which are surviving fragments of larger books and are in loose sheets[3].

The details shown in the Fogg book and the centralized plans of the Montreal book cannot readily be related to narratives about innovation or the built environment. However, they provide information about architectural culture that we cannot obtain from other sources. The examples I have chosen are in a sense incidental – many others could illustrate similar points – but they serve to demonstrate the range of approaches and interests in anonymous books.

1. *Fragments and Ornament*

By the end of the sixteenth-century, the canon of five orders had taken on tremendous importance, as reflected in the treatises of Serlio, Palladio, and Vignola as well as in architectural practice. But the dominance the orders eventually assumed has led to a distorted view of earlier architects' ambitions – as if they had always sought to establish the orders in a canonical form (as Günther and Thoenes have already established, it was not a matter of discovering the orders, since they were themselves a Renaissance invention)[4]. Even a

---

[3] The bias is especially notable because it depends on somewhat arbitrary curatorial decisions. While the Codex Barberini is in its original Renaissance binding, the codices Coner and Escurialensis are in modern bindings, and like the Codex Barberini have been subject to multiple numbering systems over time.

[4] C. THOENES-H. GÜNTHER, *Gli ordini architettonici: rinascita o invenzione?*, in *Roma e l'antico nell'arte e nella cultura del Cinquecento*, a cura di M. Fagiolo, Roma, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana 1985, pp. 261-310.

cursory examination of late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century architectural drawings reveals a broad array of interests independent of, and in many cases contrary to, the agenda of creating a canon of the orders.

Most notably, many draftsmen demonstrated their interest in a range of ornamental details easily found among the ancient ruins but not sanctioned by the text of Vitruvius. For example, Giuliano da Sangallo's *Libro piccolo* within his Codex Barberini includes an extensive assemblage of highly ornamental bases, capitals, and architraves, gathered together loosely on the page according to type [Fig. 26]. The collection demonstrates that Giuliano selected details not on the basis of their adherence to an abstract set of principles or proportions outlined by Vitruvius, but for their ornamental richness and variety.

A set of anonymous drawings at the Fogg Museum, probably datable to before 1530, occupies a midpoint between the spirit of collecting characteristic of Giuliano's drawings and the rigorously edited set of models found in printed architectural books [Fig. 27][5]. The author embraces architectural ornament, but the range of examples shown is narrower than in the Codex Barberini. In its precise presentation of details, it resembles Bernardo della Volpaia's Codex Coner at the Sir John Soane Museum in London, but without Volpaia's passion for cataloguing multiple examples [Fig. 28].

These drawings represent architects' attempts to derive a stable set of models from the ruins themselves. For example, the collection includes a representation of the base of the Temple of Mars Ultor, which had been frequently drawn by Renaissance draftsmen [Fig. 29]. Although not conforming to any Vitruvian type, architects prized its fine workmanship; in the words of Baldassarre Peruzzi, it was «il piu' bello e lavorato di roma»[6]. The repetition of such details in multiple books of drawings had the effect of creating a tacit consensus about appropriate models outside of the orthodox examples condoned by Serlio and other strict interpreters of Vitruvius[7].

---

[5]   The date is suggested by Burns in *Raffaello architetto* cit., p. 412.

[6]   G. Clarke, *«La più bella e meglio lavorata opera»: Beauty and Good Design in Italian Renaissance Architecture*, in *Concepts of Beauty in Italian Renaissance Art*, ed. by F. Ames-Lewis-M. Rogers, Aldershot, Ashgate 1998, pp. 107-123.

[7]   As Francesco Bocchi argued in his defense of Michelangelo's architecture in *Le bellezze della città di Fiorenza…* (Firenze 1591, p. 283), architectural norms had taken shape as a result of consensus, not arbitrary rules (see also discussion in C. Brothers,

Scholars often assume that architects worked in the opposite direction, beginning with Vitruvian theory and attempting to find examples among the ruins that corresponded with his principles. These drawings attest to a different method, by which architects learned from observation of the ruins and from each others' drawings, with little evidence that their vision was shaped by preconceived ideas or categories. The existence of drawings of this kind well into the sixteenth-century may also suggest that the impact and diffusion of Vitruvianism has been exaggerated, as a result of a tendency to give greater emphasis to textual rather than visual evidence.

A set of loose-leaf prints attributed to the «Master G.A. with the Caltrop» indicates that these tastes were not limited to the medium of drawing. They include representations of bases and capitals far more elaborate than those of the Fogg Codex, and equal to the most highly ornamented ones of the Codex Barberini [Fig. 30]. While Mario Carpo has argued that it was the medium of print itself that led to the formation of a canon of architectural models, these prints suggest otherwise[8]. Rather than establish a set of norms, they perpetuated and diffused the penchant for ornament and variety evident in Giuliano's Codex Barberini. Broadly, they demonstrate a greater degree of interchange between drawings and prints than typically imagined[9].

The advent of print supplanted the usefulness of the scribe, but not of the draftsman. Even after the appearance of printed, illustrated architectural treatises, architects continued to make copies of drawings. While the job of scribes was to copy as precisely as possible, for architects it made sense to personalize their copies through a process of selection, often from multiple sources, and modification according to their own predilections. The copyist thus performed a role balanced between that of the original draftsman and the collector. As will be seen in the next section, the relation between the Montreal

---

Michelangelo, Drawing, and the Invention of Architecture, New Haven-London, Yale University Press 2008, pp. 207-208).

[8] M. CARPO, *Architecture in the Age of Printing*, Cambridge, Mass.-London, MIT Press 2001, especially pp. 42-56.

[9] Although it may seem surprising that a graphic interest in highly ornamented and idiosyncratic architectural details persisted well into the period in which Vitruvius was being studied avidly, the same interest is apparent in built architecture as well. For example, see M. BULGARELLI, *Leon Battista Alberti, 1404-1472: architettura e storia*, Milano, Electa 2008, pp. 37-67.

book and a number of drawings by Giuliano da Sangallo and Frances-
co di Giorgio suggests that the author made use of multiple sources,
making his role akin to that of a curator.

Modern scholars have failed to see the interconnections between
drawings and prints in part because the actual medium of print con-
fers an aura of authority on the representations and reconstructions
that was not necessarily the case for Renaissance readers and view-
ers[10]. In the era immediately following the invention of the printing
press, drawings probably retained much of their own authority – just
as illuminated manuscripts maintained their associations with luxury,
and continued to be desired and produced well into the era of the
printed book.

Thus, the emphasis historians put on printed treatises may be in
part a result of an anachronistic judgment that privileges the author-
ity of the printed book. The close relationship between the content
of various codices (Fogg, Coner, Barberini, Mellon and Montreal,
for example) suggests that books of drawings did indeed function as
models for a number of draftsmen, and served as an effective mecha-
nism for the dissemination of architectural ideas. The drawings in the
Fogg Codex and the Master G.A. prints also indicate that the inter-
est in assembling a wide range of ancient examples did not end with
Giuliano da Sangallo, just as the practice of drawing and copying
drawings did not end with the invention of the printing press.

2. *Centralized Plans*

Scholars have focused attention on the efforts of Renaissance ar-
chitects to arrive at a visual understanding of Vitruvius' description
of the ancient Roman house. While this is unquestionably important,
it tends to neglect less purpose driven research. In the late fifteenth
century, Francesco di Giorgio initiated an exploratory approach to
the generation of plans, inspired by ancient monuments yet free from

---

[10] An example I have written about in the past concerns reconstructions of the
Temple of Serapis by architects including Giuliano da Sangallo, Baldassarre Peruzzi,
and Palladio. Palladio's is probably the least accurate but is the one upon which
archaeologists put their trust in part because of the authority of its printed form (C.
BROTHERS, *Reconstruction as Design: Giuliano da Sangallo and the 'Palazo di Mecenate'
on the Quirinal Hill*, in «Annali di architettura», XIV, 2002, pp. 55-72).

typological constraints or the need to be faithful to the monument's original appearance [Fig. 31]. A book of anonymous drawings in Montreal demonstrates a vibrant continuation of this tradition well into the sixteenth-century. The author of the *Roman Sketchbook*, believed to date to around 1530, displays both knowledge of and distance from Roman architectural culture[11].

While only a fragment of the original book survives, more than half of the thirty-three remaining sheets depict centralized plans. Of these, ten are identifiable with known Roman monuments, while eight are not. The draftsman has included a number of plans of unusual ancient buildings, notable for their complexity, that are rarely depicted in other Renaissance drawings (such as the temple of Pompeius at Palestrina) [Fig. 32][12]. Alongside these, and featuring a number of similar components, he has represented a series of plans roughly derived from the Pantheon and Santa Costanza. He has culled other features of the plans from various ancient Roman monuments, as well as more contemporary designs, and reassembled them in unexpected ways. While the plans do not adhere to known types, they are a composite of familiar elements. For example, he conjoins two differently sized round plans, both modeled on ancient tombs, and adds a front porch [Fig. 33][13]. On another sheet, he designs a church with a modified centralized plan, and attaches a semi-circular front portico [Fig. 34][14]. One of the most complicated designs shows how the author took up Francesco di Giorgio's model of designing multi-room, symmetrical structures of ambivalent function, while also incorporating Giuliano

---

[11] The date is from Booth, *Architecture and Its Image* cit., p. 200.

[12] The temple at Palestrina is identified by Arnold Nesselrath and Ian Campbell in the entry on the database of the *Census of Antique Works of Art and Architecture Known in the Renaissance*, <http://www.census.de> (15/5/09). Some of the plans contain measurements; others do not.

[13] At least in its proportions, it resembles Antonio da Sangallo's plan for Santa Maria di Montemoro in Montefiascone (Uffizi 173 A).

[14] Conceptually, it is not unlike Antonio da Sangallo's modified centralized design for St. Peter's. The plan also resembles one in the Mellon Codex at the Pierpont Morgan Museum in New York on f. 70r, a centralized church plan with a semicircular staircase modeled on Bramante's at the Cortile del Belvedere (reproduced by R. Wittkower, *The 'Menicantonio' Sketchbook in the Paul Mellon Collection*, in *Idea and Image: Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, London, Thames & Hudson 1978, pp. 91-108, fig. 136).

da Sangallo's plan of Santa Maria delle Carceri as the centerpiece, and components akin to Santa Costanza (a round space preceded by a prominent vestibule) axially arranged on three sides [Figs 35-36].

The character of these designs makes them difficult to classify in the context of sixteenth-century culture – they exhibit fluency with the forms of antiquity, but little interest in the conventional typologies of church or palace. The irreverence with which they adapt and recombine ancient models, and the indifference to typologies imply an affinity with Francesco di Giorgio[15].

The draftsman also demonstrates his reliance on Giuliano da Sangallo's Codex Barberini. In some cases, the selection of an unusual monument for inclusion may have relied on Giuliano's example, even if the Montreal draftsman used additional sources as well to make the actual drawing. For example, both Giuliano and the Montreal draftsman represent the plan of the Canopus of Hadrian's Villa – not often represented among these books (f. 53 and f. 24r) [Figs 37-38]. Giuliano's version lacks measurements, implying that the draftsman of the Montreal codex may have been inspired by Giuliano to include the Canopus, but then sought other sources or made his own measurements directly from the monument.

In another case, that of the Temple of Minerva Medica, the Montreal author appears to have relied on an indirect copy of Giuliano da Sangallo's drawing in the Codex Coner – but he may have known Giuliano's version as well [Figs 39-41]. The author adopted the name («the temple of Caesar») given by Giuliano and then Volpaia, as well as the measurement system shared by both drawings. The latter is especially notable considering that most of the measurements in the Montreal book are in *piedi*, but this is in «braza»[16].

Volpaia and the Montreal author's dependence, directly or indirectly, on Giuliano emerges most obviously from the use of an unusu-

---

[15] The approach also bears striking similarities to that of the Mellon Codex. It features a series of centralized plans, which recombine familiar components from antique monuments – some of the same models employed by the Montreal draftsman (especially ff. 58*v*, 65*r*).

[16] The use of «braza» instead of «braccia» seems to indicate that the author is not Tuscan. The example is also discussed by Nesselrath, *The Codex Coner* cit., p. 147, with reference to I. Campbell's Ph.D. thesis, *Reconstructions of Roman Temples made in Italy between 1450 and 1600*, Worcester College, Oxford, 1984, pp. 283-287.

al convention of representation – the isolation of a single bay shown in perspectival elevation and in plan. The Montreal author's specific knowledge of Giuliano's drawing is implied by the way he follows Giuliano's labeling of the bay and its plan with an «S». The monument also attracted the interest of Baldassarre Peruzzi, who on a sheet at the Uffizi (156 A*r*) demonstrated the way in which it could be transformed [Fig. 42]. He takes the monument's basic geometry and modifies its proportions and a few details, giving it the appearance of a new design for a church[17].

Peruzzi's drawings reveal their reliance on Francesco di Giorgio, and thus also parallel those in the Montreal book. In particular, two sheets in a small sketchbook by Peruzzi at the Uffizi (436 A*r*, 440 A*r*) suggest a way of working analogous to that of the Montreal author [Figs 43-44]. They both show round plans loosely modeled after the Pantheon, but with substantial variations, similar to a series of round structures with porticoes in the Montreal book. Even in execution they resemble the Montreal drawings, in Peruzzi's use of wash to show the wall thickness. On another sheet by Peruzzi at the Uffizi (529 A*v*), Francesco di Giorgio's legacy is even more apparent [Fig. 45]. The right side of the sheet shows two regular, repeating patterns that could easily have been copied from a floor mosaic, but Peruzzi begins to add door openings and niches to one of them, reading it as a plan. The other two symmetrical designs on the sheet take this as their point of departure, further differentiating the size and shape of rooms but maintaining bilateral symmetry. This multiplication of ideas for complex, symmetrical structures based on a series of small variations perfectly reflects Francesco's approach to design, as manifest on a number of sheets of his treatises. It is also the impulse that appears to have motivated the Montreal draftsman.

While Peruzzi's way of modifying antique buildings to design new ones takes up Francesco di Giorgio's legacy and parallels the efforts of the Montreal codex author, the drawings of his son Sallustio have even stronger connections to the Montreal Codex. Sheets by Sallustio Peruzzi at the Uffizi include representations of many of the same, unusual structures as those of the Montreal book, but the exact nature of the relationship remains uncertain (Uffizi 689 A*r-v*; 684 A*r-v*;

---

[17] Another drawing by Peruzzi (Uffizi 499 A*r*) is very similar in type to the Montreal drawings. It includes elements of the Pantheon, Santa Costanza, and other ancient structures, but it appears to be Peruzzi's own design.

665 A*r*)[18]. The drawings by Sallustio provide a fascinating window into the practices of copying. He compressed onto *recto* and *verso* of a single sheet shorthand versions of nearly all of the surviving drawings of the Montreal codex [Figs 46-47]. Remarkably, he included all of their essential information, such as measurements and inscriptions. To save time and space, in many cases he shows only half of the symmetrical plans. The consistency of information between the two sets of drawings might make it difficult to discern which was the copy and which the source. However, one sketch confirms that Sallustio was copying from the Montreal book and not the other way around. A small version of one of the Montreal codex's most ambitious representations could hardly have been the basis for the larger and more elaborate drawing in the Montreal book [Figs 48-49]. On another sheet (684 A*r-v*) at the Uffizi, Sallustio used one or two of the plans (48*r*) as the basis for a series of new designs, as if envisioning how to shape them into more conventional ideas for church plans [Figs 50-51]. Considering how little is known about the authorship and early provenance of the Montreal book, it cannot be certain that these were the precise sheets from which Sallustio copied: it remains possible that he and the Montreal author shared a source. Directly or not, the shared source could be Baldassarre Peruzzi. This speculative link is significant and ironic, because Baldassarre was also the source of many of Serlio's illustrations. That the same set of illustrations could be employed for such varied purposes – as the source for inventive designs and for canon formation – parallels the varied uses of antiquity itself[19].

Despite these connections to earlier books of drawings, the Montreal drawings remain difficult to interpret – due in part to the disjunction between their mode of representation and their content. While they appear to be finished drawings in their use of ink wash, a straight edge and measurements, the content of the designs seems

---

[18] Booth noted the connection to Uffizi 689 A*r-v* (*Architecture and Its Image* cit., p. 200). Another drawing by Sallustio, on Uffizi 665 A, closely resembles the T shaped design on 689 A and Montreal 33*r*, but its measurements do not correspond, nor do all of its details.

[19] See Clarke, *«La più bella…»* cit., and H. Burns, *Baldassarre Peruzzi and Sixteenth-Century Architectural Theory*, in *Les Traités d'architecture de la Renaissance*. Actes du colloque (Tours 1-11 juillet 1981), éd. par J. Guillaume, Paris, Picard 1988, pp. 207-226.

provisional, in the sense that many do not correspond to any known buildings or projects. In purpose, this finished quality suggests presentation drawings, and indicates a possible function analogous to those of Giuliano da Sangallo's books of drawings. Representing ancient buildings next to new designs inspired by the antique, the draftsman would be able to foreground his credentials as an *all'antica* designer. This might also help explain the ambiguous function of a number of the designs since function would not be an important feature if the plans were essentially speculative. Francesco di Giorgio and Giuliano da Sangallo had already established the paradigm for placing antique-inspired, speculative designs alongside more archaeological studies of the antique, a model that Peruzzi fully realized.

3. *Representational Techniques*

The printed treatise ushered in the standardization of not only models, but also modes of representation. Since the publication of Wolfgang Lotz's essay on the representation of the interior in Italian Renaissance drawings, scholars have generally agreed that sixteenth-century architects were striving to master the conventions of orthogonal drawing[20]. However, the evidence of sixteenth-century drawings indicates a much broader range of goals and interests than Lotz implies. For example, Giuliano da Sangallo's Codex Barberini includes innovative approaches to the representation both of interiors and of details. While often characterized as highly personal or idiosyncratic, Giuliano's drawings attracted imitators – as the Fogg and Montreal drawings prove.

The most compelling evidence that the author of the Montreal Codex had seen the Codex Barberini is his attempt to imitate Giuliano's mode of representing the interior and exterior of a building simultaneously. The similarity in representational technique is enough to support the probability that Giuliano's drawings circulated more

---

[20] See C. BROTHERS, *Architecture, History, Archeology: Drawing Ancient Rome in the Letter to Leo X and in Sixteenth-Century Practice*, in *Coming About…: A Festschrift for John Shearman*, ed. by L. Jones-L. Matthew, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Art Museum 2001, pp. 135-140; and A.C. HUPPERT, *Envisioning New St. Peter's: Perspectival Drawings and the Process of Design*, in «Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians», LXVIII, 2009, pp. 158-177.

widely than has been thought[21]. The Montreal draftsman, though accomplished in a number of ways, struggled to master Giuliano's complex rendering techniques with regard to interior spaces. The awkwardness of his attempt to draw the temple of Vesta at Tivoli and the round temple of the Forum Boarium illustrates the problem [Figs 52-53]. The author aims to reproduce Giuliano's conceit of showing weathered stone falling away to reveal a cleanly cut section through the interior, but the result is muddled and difficult to read. The draftsman's limited success helps to explain why Giuliano's methods were not more broadly imitated. The diffusion of his unique mode of rendering was impeded by the basic problem of competence. It raises a crucial point surrounding the formation of a convention of representation: it has to be simple enough that draftsmen with a range of skills can imitate it. Giuliano's methods required a degree of virtuosity, limiting the possibilities that they could establish a standard. Nonetheless, their appeal was broader than scholars have generally acknowledged. In addition to the efforts of the Montreal draftsman, they were also imitated in the Mellon Codex in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York (ff. 60r, 61v, 64v, 70v), as well as in an anonymous print of the Pantheon at the Canadian Centre for Architecture [Fig. 54][22].

In the case of details as well, less successful imitations demonstrate Giuliano's accomplishment. For example, the author of the Fogg Codex sought to imitate one of the more inventive ways Sangallo and Volpaia employ to show details in axonometric perspective [Fig. 55][23]. While he succeeds in one case (f. 17r), on three other sheets his attempt to fully represent all ornamental details produces inferior results (ff. 21r-v, 22r) [Fig. 56].

Likewise, Giuliano's striking representation of the ruinous, weathered quality of the monuments translated poorly in less masterful hands. The Montreal draftsman makes a limited attempt to render the age of the ruins with a few cracks and sprouts of vegetal growth.

---

[21] Nesselrath suggests a more personal, autobiographical purpose for the Codex Barberini, emphasizing that he left it to his son Francesco (*I libri di disegni di antichità* cit., pp. 127-129).

[22] Several of these examples are illustrated by WITTKOWER, *The 'Menicantonio' Sketchbook* cit., figs 107 and 135-136.

[23] This technique was widely imitated, for example, by Peruzzi, in the Codex Coner, and in the Mellon Codex.

Compared with Giuliano's efforts, they indicate a more modest concern with this aspect of the ruins [Figs. 57-58]. The Master G.A. with the Caltrop adopts a different feature of Giuliano's approach, in emphasizing the fragmentary character of the details he represents [Fig. 59].

4. *Conclusion*

Renaissance architecture is often viewed through the twin lenses of the sixteenth-century treatise and the writings of Vitruvius. While undeniably important, the prominence architectural historians typically give to these elements tends to obscure other trends. Scholars often succumb to the temptation of reading earlier developments in light of later ones – an anachronistic approach that tends to devalue fifteenth and early sixteenth-century architecture and architects, which fall outside of the reigning narrative. Instead, the relationships suggested here register a lively tradition of exchange, in which drawings circulated among many architects and each created their own variations.

Broadly, these drawings suggest that we still have much to learn about the visual culture of Renaissance architecture – architecture as it existed beyond the building and the treatise. The Fogg and Montreal Codex also provide some sense of what was lost in the transition to print culture. They represent the continuation of an experimental, exploratory response to antique architecture that gradually diminished as the advent of the printed, illustrated architectural treatise ushered in the increasing canonization of both forms and ideas.

CAMMY BROTHERS