MEDIEVALIA ET HUMANISTICA

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE CULTURE

NEW SERIES: NUMBER 35

Scales of Connectivity

EDITED BY
PAUL MAURICE CLOGAN

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC.
Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC.

Published in the United States of America
by Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
A wholly owned subsidiary of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowmanlittlefield.com

Estover Road
Plymouth PL6 7PY
United Kingdom

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

The Library of Congress has cataloged this serial publication as follows:

Medievalia et humanistica, fasc. 1–jan. 1943–;
New ser. No 1– 1970–
Totowa, N.J. [etc.] Rowman & Littlefield [etc.]
no. 29 cm
Annual, 1943–
"Studies in medieval and renaissance culture."
Vols. for 1970–1972 issued by the Medieval and neo-Latin society;
1973– by the Medieval and Renaissance Society.
Key title: Medievalia et humanistica, ISSN 0076-6127.

ISBN: 978-0-7425-7018-4
eISBN: 978-0-7425-7019-1

Library of Congress (8108)

Printed in the United States of America

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Cammy Brothers, *Michelangelo, Drawing, and the Invention of Architecture.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2008. Pp. xi, 259.

This book offers an interpretation of Michelangelo's architectural drawings, not in the traditional sense of identifying the authoritative blueprints from which the buildings spring, but as a body of work in itself, with an internal dynamic—the creative process—that sets Michelangelo apart from almost any other architect of his time. Brothers argues that the relatively new practice of sketching on paper combined with Michelangelo's habit of conceptualizing in terms of fragments to result in a type of free-associative technique. For example, although like his contemporaries Michelangelo studied ancient buildings, he did so largely secondhand, relying in particular on the drawings from the so-called *Codex Corner*, Bernardo Volpaia's volume of studies compiled around 1515. Moreover, he was happily selective and untroubled that his eventual formulations might seem incorrect to an antiquarian: as Brothers aptly puts it, Michelangelo "took advantage of existing research by pursuing it as little as possible" (48). Disassembling fragments, Michelangelo made them whole again by reference to the formal language of their components, following not the guide of archaeology but the judgment of the eye and the manual rhythm of pen and chalk.

Brothers proposes that much of Michelangelo's architecture derived from thinking on the page, what today's art teachers might call drawing as research, which resulted in innovative compositions—hence the "invention" of the title. This was unexpected, as her interest in rhetoric had me anticipating that "invention" would be the *inventione* found in rhetorical manuals, that is, the initial conceit. The surprise was nevertheless welcome, for Brothers's use of the word is in tune with what occurs, then and now, in an actual studio. Indeed, threaded through the book is her general interest in the sense of drawing as creative thinking. She is also sensitive to its practical demands, often noting how pen produces affects different from those of chalk. For example, she notes of Michelangelo's life drawing that "he used soft black chalk to render the body as if it possessed the sheen of polished marble, while he returned to cross-hatching to suggest the scraping motion of his chisel across a marble surface" (144; although the point is vitiated by the fact that the two supporting drawings cited are both chalk). Later, she applied the idea to architectural drafting: "[In the Medici Chapel] he used pen for the swift expression of an idea and red chalk to study effects of light"

(163). The implication is that Michelangelo's architecture comes to life on the page, before it is built. No less significantly, the way Michelangelo handles his implements goes to her general thesis of invention; rarely using square or compass, almost all Michelangelo's drawings, even those detailed studies normally depicted as combinations of geometrical forms, are drawn freehand, which limits their value as templates for masons, while maximizing their value as expressions of the hand.

Here Brothers might have invoked the critique of Michelangelo as a champion of the irregular. Vincenzo Scamozzi likely had Michelangelo in mind when in *L'idea del architettura universale* (1615) he railed against architects who think "they can design [in free-hand] the details and limbs of their figures just like painters, thus producing [works that are] deformed . . . those who want to achieve close to perfection in matters of mouldings and profiles . . . must not form them with any other rule and method, nor hope to find a more perfect theory, than that of provided by the compass and the square" (6:147). In contrast, in a 1701 book on turnery, Charles Plumier praised Michelangelo for designing with the eye, which ensured that his *génie* was invested in the work (in J. Connors, "Ars Tornandi, Baroque Architecture and the Lathe," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtald Institutes* 53 [1990], 226). His drawing practice would thus become a touchstone in the eventual contrast between romantic and mechanical approaches to classical design, the one prioritizing the supple line of the body, the other the rigorous line of geometry.

The book's content is also unexpected. Instead of a monographic account of Michelangelo's architectural drawings, from the studies of San Lorenzo's facade in Florence to the Porta Pia in Rome forty years later, Brothers delivers a four-part essay. Chapter 1 examines, in reference to the Sistine Chapel ceiling, the narrowness of his sculptural and pictorial figures, how all too frequently they are variants of each other, differing (rotated, reassembled, reversed) manifestations of a singular graphical vision. Chapter 2 transfers this pictorial approach to the composition of architectural details, particularly profiles, which he drew with the same restless obsessiveness that animated his figural studies. Chapter 3 explores, via San Lorenzo and the Medici Chapel, how the graphic dialogue between sculptural body and architectural frame gradually resulted in the dissolution of the boundary between the two, by which she means that architectural members increasingly operate as part of a pictorial display, a dissolution achieved more emphatically in the drawings than the executed buildings. Chapter 4 applies the results of the earlier chapters to the library of San Lorenzo, providing an uncommonly illuminating account of the building's bizarre and enthralling energy: Brothers conveys how the library engages the whole body of the

viewer, how its ornamental parts "act out" their roles of architectonic representation, and indeed how the vestibule wakes you up, forcing you to see (on which point she quotes Cellini). Chronologically, the book ends in the early 1530s, just in fact as Michelangelo's architecture was beginning to take off. Brothers's justification is that by this stage Michelangelo has found his method and she has made her point; fair enough, even rather bold, yet still I craved to see how her thesis might play out over the Campidoglio, St. Peter's, and other late masterworks.

The text is of uniformly high quality and in several respects makes major contributions to Renaissance architectural history. For example, the account of profiles, assemblages of moldings comprising the base and cornice of the orders, offers a much-needed discussion of a vastly important but little understood topic, one that would eventually be commonly cited as the mark of architecture. Brothers argues that Michelangelo took little interest in discovering a canon of profiles, as his moldings are rarely annotated (torus, scotia, astragal, etc.) nor provided with measurements. Instead, he treated them as visual compositions, assembling and reassembling them in novel arrangements until he achieved the right contour and/or shadowing. Thus while having negligible influence on theory, compared to those, say, of Vignola or Palladio, Michelangelo's profiles raised the expressive potential of such details. Perhaps on this subject the comparison with the drawings of Peruzzi (80–81) could have been developed further. I would also have liked to hear more about Michelangelo's exploitation of shadows, mentioned elsewhere (172) but not explored at length. Michelangelo was a master of defining lines with shade, which perhaps owed something to the sculptor's practice of working in sharply directional light; this aspect of profiles would later be known as *skiagraphy*, becoming one of the principal justifications of moldings. Similarly, although Brothers avoids symbolic interpretations, her reading of Michelangelo's renowned profile with eye sketched onto a fillet above the scotia (Casa Buonarroti, inv.10Ar; figure 92 in Brothers) might have done more with the root Greek meaning of *scotia* as *obscurity*. Scotia as mouth/shadow suggests Michelangelo's desired conceit was that of death, at least its grotesque representation, which would fit the tomb context for which the profile was destined.

Brothers, like Peter Hicks, Vaughan Hart, David Hemsoll, Alina Payne, and Caroline van Eck, is one of a number of architectural historians who have emerged since the mid-1990s with a marked interest in rhetoric. Such scholars demonstrate how Renaissance theory is imbued with concepts derived from classical rhetorica, while also exploring the perspective of buildings as culturally articulate, mainly via decoration

(*elocutio*), perhaps a new variation of the old *architecture parlante*. Such scholarship has tended to find a middle ground, blending traditional approaches with the revisionist views developed in art history at large over the last thirty years, especially the attentiveness to linguistics and intertextuality. Brothers, however, has a distinctive voice, with just a hint of formalism; although she makes, for example, good ground analyzing the Petrarchan motifs of Michelangelo's poetry, I was struck by the repeated references to overinflated interpretations of the staircase in the vestibule of the Laurentian library (on page 185 she refers to "hyperbolic descriptions" of the stairway; on page 189 it becomes "outlandish descriptions"). It revealed a sensibility impatient with those who do not put the physical/visual reality of architecture before other levels of meaning, who think, perhaps, that architecture is above all a matter of embodied concepts.

This is a fine book. The color illustrations are excellent, the text is clearly written, and the nuance and complexity of the argument suggest it has been honed over many years. It will provide a new perspective on Michelangelo and perhaps on architectural drawing generally.

Michael Hill
National Art School, Sydney

Patrick Cheney, *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. xxv, 296. 9 b/w illustrations.

You have to take a crow's-eye view of Patrick Cheney's publications to appreciate his full achievement. Cheney's big picture affords an extraordinarily thorough account of early modern authorship. He has mapped Spenser's, Marlowe's, and, most recently, Shakespeare's literary trajectories, and each case is enriched by complex reference to the others. What emerges is a vision of authorship as strenuously negotiated and achieved and yet also ultimately inimitable. Cheney's is a tough-minded humanism that celebrates sheer literary labor and the more delicate singularity that is sometimes its paradoxical fruit.

These strangely twinned qualities of dogged perseverance and sensibility are as characteristic of Cheney's work itself as they are of the careers he analyzes. Thus to read *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship* is to admire the