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This is also true of “The Origins of Sketching,” which derives in part from work published in Origins, Imitation, Conventions. But in this case, the thesis of the essay is substantially new. Here, Ackerman demonstrates how sketching served a range of purposes well beyond those described by Vasari and Dolce in the mid-sixteenth century. He also contends that the rise of sketching occurred because of the greater availability of paper as well as a conceptual change in the nature of art production. But since the discussion is limited to only a handful of figural and architectural examples, the analysis remains impressionistic. For instance, the role of metalpoint drawing on prepared surfaces, a fixture of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century workshop practice, is not discussed. More problematic is the argument that “art in the medieval west meant craft, and concepts of self-expression, artistic experiment, and recording visual experiences did not exist” (4). Sketching by this logic could only exist in the Renaissance as medieval artists had neither the tools nor the creative disposition to make rapid visual statements. This epochal divide is reiterated again in his subsequent essay, “On the Origins of Art History,” in which Ackerman outlines how the historical understanding of art developed out of progressively refined concepts of imitation and mimesis in the Renaissance. That said, in his “Art and Evolution” (originally published in 1965), he also pushes against the teleological conception of art historical change.

The book is handsomely produced with numerous high-quality images. But it also contains several frustrating typographic errors, from the incorrect spelling of Pritzker to the egregious misdating of drawings by Giuliano da Sangallo, Donato Bramante, and Michelangelo. The same drawing by Palladio is even reproduced in two versions and assigned different dates. These criticisms aside, Origins, Invention, Revision is engaging, clearly written, and easily accessible. It is also surprisingly personal. From his experience as a young soldier to his encounter with the Jain temple at Ranakpur long after his retirement, which serves as the starting point for a meditation on the nature of narrative in sacred architecture, this volume brings the reader closer to a great architectural historian, one who remained curious till the very end.

Michael J. Waters, Columbia University


The planning, design, and construction of New St. Peter’s in Rome in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have been treated in a wealth of literature, ever since Heinrich von Geymüller published the early design drawings for a new St. Peter’s in 1875. This flow of research projects and a corresponding ocean of literature mostly focuses on specific topics of architectural history: the chronology of the drawings and of the design process; the con-
tributions of successive famous architects like Bramante, Raphael, Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, Michelangelo, and others; and the changing architectural ideas that were funneled into this enormous project. Much less attention has been given to the interior decoration of New St. Peter’s, especially in its early phases, as Kaspar Zollikofer rightfully mentions. He has chosen the Cappella Gregoriana for a thorough and rich book, and this choice of course makes much sense.

When Pope Gregory XIII decided in 1578 to have the chapel richly decorated, the construction had already been going on for six years. It would be the first of the four chapels of New St. Peter’s that surround the main altar space in the center of the building. Even though it has never been a chapel closed off from the main space of the church, it was treated as such in the early phases of its existence. Both arms that connect it to the rest of the church were initially closed off with bronze fences, and on the medal that was struck at the occasion of the inauguration the Gregoriana is shown as a chapel in its own right. The architecture is dominated by the aedicula niches, which were originally designed by Antonio da Sangallo and later on further developed by Michelangelo.

Zollikofer gradually unfolds his very rich and sometimes very dense history of this chapel, which then begins to explain the fascinating depth of layers of meaning of the Gregoriana, not only because of the intentions of Pope Gregory XIII, but also because various relics were involved with specific and interconnected meanings. The high altar houses the Madonna del Soccorso, which was brought as a relic from a nearby position in the Old St. Peter’s, where it ended up when its original position near the altar of Leo the Great at the west wall of the south transept was given up in the time when the western part of the old basilica was torn down. In the sequence of topics, the interplay between the chosen altars, the decoration of the Cappella Gregoriana, the relics, and the specific order of these ingredients, Zollikofer is able to reconstruct the original ideas of Gregory XIII and the underlying meanings that direct the content of the project for the chapel. One of the lines in the program is about the relics. With relics of both Latin and Greek church fathers, a balance between East and West was planned, not accidentally in the two western chapels and the two eastern. This ambition has not been realized completely, however. The concept is reflected in the decoration, with two Eastern and two Western church fathers represented in the mosaics of the pendentives. Relics of Pope Gregory’s namesake, Gregory of Nazianzus, were given a position in the new chapel in 1580, but the idea to bring relics of Saint John Chrysostom to the southeast chapel—the present Cappella Clementina—was never realized.

A leading concept for Gregory XIII must have been to realize a geographical and spatial ideal of Christian ecumenism for New St. Peter’s as a whole. Although this ambition was not fulfilled, the Cappella Gregoriana is masterfully explained by Zollikofer in all its aspects. The only weakness of the book—which is published in a beautiful manner, with very good illustrations, more than adequate annotations, and a thorough bibliography, as well as some seventy pages of written source documents—might be that no real conclusion follows the exciting analyses and interpretations, which makes it a tough job for
the reader to knit the whole program together again. That said, this book is a very welcome addition to the research on St. Peter’s.

Lex Bosman, *Universiteit van Amsterdam*


Few enterprises challenge architectural historians more than studying a building in the absence of materials documenting design, construction, even the identity of the architect, something no less vexing for being common in the early modern period. Amedeo Belluzzi and Gianluca Belli found just such a case with the late Renaissance Villa dei Collazzi in the Tuscan hills south of Florence. The current owners’ archives include materials dating back to the Renaissance, unfortunately mostly lacking those that architectural historians yearn to find. Yet the villa described by Edith Wharton as “the most splendid stately villa” (vii) certainly merited study, not least to determine the veracity of the long-rumored attribution to Michelangelo.

An existing owner’s dwelling provided the foundation for the Villa dei Collazzi, something common to many sixteenth-century rural villas, but here graced with a significantly more noble character. Four drawings, two plans copied from originals by Giorgio Vasari the Younger and two elevations from between the sixteenth and eighteenth century, offer some evidence of the original project, modified during construction and brought to completion three centuries later. These delays depended in part upon changes of ownership, although for more than 250 years, the villa belonged to the prosperous and well-connected Florentine Dini family. It ultimately passed through the hands of four different owners, the current being the Marchi. As the Dini accumulated wealth and status over the course of the sixteenth century, the authors trace their property transactions inside and outside of Florence and the marriage alliances they crafted.

Discovering what there is to know about the property from written records constitutes one part of the authors’ project; they also discuss the changes the structure itself underwent over the centuries and hazard an attribution for the architect. They carefully consider the possibility of Michelangelo’s participation, ultimately dismissing it for lack of physical or documentary support. The authors instead propose the prominent painter Santi di Tito, with a twofold basis for the attribution. On the one hand, they explore Santi’s relations with prominent Florentine painters and patrons: commissions for paintings and documentary evidence for architectural commissions, including the remodeling of his own house on Via delle Route. Diligently plunging into archives, Belluzzi and Belli located evidence that demonstrates the network of Santi’s activities that help support