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Abstract

“In all inuencions of C[a]ppresious ornaments on must first designe yᵉ Ground, or yᵉ thing plaine, as y¹ is for youse, and on that, varyt yt, addome yt. Compose yt wᵗh decorum according to the youse, and ye order yt is of... for as outwardly euery wyse ma[n] carrieth a grauiti in Publicke Places, whear ther is nothing els looked for, & yt inwardly hath his mind [sic] Imaginacy set free... So in architecture yᵗ outward ornamentes oft to be Sollid, propsional according to the rules, masculine and unaffected”.

Inigo Jones, Roman Sketchbook note dated “Friday ye 20 Januay 1614”.¹

As his Roman Sketchbook notes imply, Inigo Jones adapted Vitruvian ideas on Decorum, concerning appropriate architectural expression, to suit the artistic preferences of Stuart royalty, dependant as these preferences mostly were on shifting attitudes towards Catholic toleration. Of the many and varied books that Jones studied and annotated, the link between the expressive characteristics of the five Orders and religious and moral qualities was made most expressive in the Renaissance treatises on Architecture by Palladio, Scamozzi and, most notably, by Serlio,. In this paper we shall consider Jones’s understanding of this link through a detailed study of his marginalia annotations in these treatises - in his copies of Palladio’s I Quattro Libri Dell Architettura, Scamozzi’s L’idea dell’architettura universale, and Serlio’s Libro Primo [-Quinto] D’Architettura.
We shall see that Jones, in his application of Decorum through ornament, might be seen to have been guided by the expression of conflicting moral virtues that is at the heart of Serlio’s writings on the Orders. This expression contrasted gravity with imagination, honesty with irreverence, virtue with vice, and, most significantly in the context of Reformation Britain, Protestantism with Catholicism.

Decorum in I Quattro Libri Dell’Architettura Di Andrea Palladio

“One must describe as suitable [commodo] a house which will be appropriate to the status [qualità] of the person who will have to live in it and of which the parts will correspond to the whole and to each other. But above all the architect must observe that (as Vitruvius says in Books I and VI), for great men and especially those in public offices, houses with loggias and spacious, ornate halls will be required… similarly, smaller buildings of lesser expense and ornament will be appropriate for men of lower status”.

- Palladio, I Quattro Libri Dell’Architettura, Book II, Chapter I.²

“Loges and large halls in great me[n]s houses.
for meaner Gentleme[n] lesser houses”.
- Jones, annotation in right-hand margin.

In his specifications for the appropriate uses of ornament Palladio largely concurs with Vitruvius and Serlio. Palladio’s passage on statio - the principle that formed the backbone of Vitruvius’s theory of the appropriate use of the Orders - is located in Book IV on temples, but is, as Payne notes,³ not connected to Palladio’s chapters on the Orders themselves. As Payne explains, “the same is true of all other decor references that occur in his discussion of various building types where he addresses the specific demands, functional and society-driven, that accompany every commission”.⁴ Thus, Palladio severs Decorum from the
invention stories of the Orders that Vitruvius used to explain the development of the column types, and uses it solely to explain how the overall appearance of a building – which included its scale and proportioning as well its ornamentation – should be related to the external conditions of the commission. Like Vitruvius, Palladio’s principal concern in this was the viewer’s response, but this was a concern that was underpinned by the practicalities of building. His conception of ornament was informed, therefore, primarily by the notion that usefulness [utilità] and durability [perpetuità] should constitute the architect’s guide. This, as Payne further explains, is especially evident “in his treatment of the Orders and their assemblages: the injunction that they display structure and its behaviour designates perpetuità as the necessario of ornament”.5 Thus, for Palladio, neither genders nor occupations, the human body nor character observably determine the form and proportions, and therefore the employment of the Orders. Consequently, Jones did not learn a great deal that was original about their appropriate use, and he was acutely aware of this, for alongside Palladio’s chapter on the design of temples he made one simple note referencing the source of Palladio in Vitruvius: “Decorum Se Vitru: Li fo.”

Jones’s annotations in his Palladio are more numerous than in the Vitruvius, the Alberti or the Serlio. They are, however, the least speculative and philosophical, as might be expected from the practical character of I Quattro Libri. We could even view Jones’s subsequent studies as a quest that aims to look beyond I Quattro Libri to discover the sources of its theories. Yet, the desire remains to construct a convincing explanation of Jones’s interpretation of Palladio. For instance, Gordon Higgott has examined the connections between the notions of Decorum expressed in the Roman Sketchbook and the concept of ‘varying with reason’ that Jones made notes on in Palladio’s Book IV.6 The principle expressed in the notes is that the architect should look to the antique for the best models, but should still be free to vary from these models in a reasoned way.7 Although reasoned choice required the judicious selection and adaptation of ornament to suit the needs of a particular building, in Palladio, as Higgott points out, such selection largely involved the principle of
optical correction rather than the application or reinterpretation of Vitruvius’s principle of statio. Although the viewer’s response is one of Palladio’s fundamental concerns, this, as Payne notes, depended on the placement and proportioning, rather than the Order, of the individual members.\(^8\) Concerns with proportioning could, however, overlap with Decorum theory if, as Higgott notes, it was necessary to express characteristics such as ‘strength’ and ‘slenderness’ in the ornamentation of a building.\(^9\)

Immediately following the brief chapter on Decorum in private buildings in Book II of Palladio there is a short paragraph on the anthropomorphic analogy. Here, Palladio makes a comparison between the concept of commodità and the human body. Combining functional and aesthetic considerations, he recommends that the most beautiful parts of a building should be displayed, whilst the ugly but necessary parts should remain hidden. Jones makes a marginal summary, “Comparison to a mans body the most beautiful parts of a mans body most exposed to sight so in building”.\(^{10}\) Palladio had applied this analogy to the planning (compartimento) of rooms in private houses. It was within a few years of reading this that Jones in his Roman Sketchbook would use a similar metaphor to elucidate his thoughts on Decorum. However, this analogy would not be based on the physical characteristics of a man, but rather on his behavioural characteristics. We shall see that for Jones the rules that defined the use of ornament were analogous to moral rather than natural philosophy. This is a distinction that we shall see explored by Jones in his Scamozzi, and one he noted there. In his Palladio, Jones learned only of the assemblage of architecture based on the appreciation of visual beauty rather than the appreciation of moral appropriateness — the principles of which he was to examine, as his annotations imply, elsewhere.
Morality and the Orders:  
Inigo Jones’s Annotations on Decorum in Scamozzi, Palladio and Serlio

Decorum in Vincenzo Scamozzi’s L’idea Dell’architettura Universale

We can be sure that when Jones met Scamozzi in 1614 they discussed Scamozzi’s forthcoming treatise, for Jones wrote in his copy of Palladio, “Scamozzi utterly dislikes this desine of Paladio and hath maad on wch must comm fowrth in his book as far in my opignion from Vitruvius as this”.11 We know that Jones had a copy of Scamozzi’s treatise soon after its publication, for he marked the date March 25, 1617 on the title page.

Scamozzi’s L’idea dell’architettura universale was conceived and planned in ten books (broken down into two parts) that address subjects ranging from theoretical precepts to construction techniques.12 Much of this content is annotated in Jones’s hand. Scamozzi deals with the Orders in Part II, which, following Palladio’s pragmatic conception of ornament, is essentially concerned with the practicalities of building - namely materials, construction techniques, finishes and renovations. Unlike Palladio, however, Scamozzi devoted much of his text to placing architecture on a firm philosophical footing. As Payne notes, the treatises had always oscillated between either the presentation of the practicalities of architecture or the philosophical principles that underpinned its theory, “with Alberti and Barbaro on one side, Serlio on the other, and everyone else somewhere in between”.13 Yet, Scamozzi, in his Aristotelian tone and ambitions – already revealed in the marginalia he made in his copy of Barbaro where every passage indebted to Aristotle is highlighted - goes beyond his predecessors.14 If, Scamozzi explains, painting and sculpture are paired with poetry and history then architecture straddles two worlds, just as firmly based in the theory of rhetoric as it is in mathematics and natural philosophy.15 His definition of Decorum is closely aligned to that of Vitruvius:

“And finally the Decorum, being typical of the aspect of ornament, also related to the purpose of the building… therefore one can see very clearly how architecture in all these parts follows moral and natural philosophy”.16
In the last line here Scamozzi makes explicit what was merely implicit in Vitruvius’s description of the subject, and this, as we have noted, Jones duly translated as “architecture holds much of philosophy moral and natural”. Decorum in L’idea is therefore dual faceted. As Payne concludes, Scamozzi on the one hand acknowledges “the morality based aspects of decorum/prepon that provide a useful bridge to rhetoric and its theories of style”, and on the other he signals the link to architecture of the filosofia naturale. After defining Decorum, Scamozzi explains the various parts of buildings, why they were adorned, and what they represent. Here Jones makes annotations throughout that summarise Scamozzi’s rules on Decorum. Jones notes, for example, Scamozzi’s recommendation that “ornamente of on kynd of building not mixt with an other as sacred secular & private”.

At the beginning of the second volume of L’idea Jones carefully annotates two chapters. The first is entitled “Della diffinizioni de gli ornamenti sopra alle colonne: e Frontispici, e Tetti, e Pedestili, e Piedamenti de gli edifici”, and the second “D’alcuni, che doppo Vitruvio hanno trattato molto differentemente de gli ordini: I quali deono esser cinque, e non piu”. Scamozzi gives a series of general rules and reasons, closely annotated by Jones, for the need for ornament in buildings and why these rules should correspond to what can be observed in nature:

“because in setting out the precepts of the Orders, we will observe that in their overall body as in their parts and members they move gradually from one to the other, beginning with the firmness of the Tuscan order, and passing to the others until one reaches the delicacy and grace of the Corinthian; thus imitating nature. Which, in living bodies as well as in plants always maintains the species identity step by step… it changes imperceptibly a few small parts that slowly impact the others, and those more robust and strong, become softer and more delicate: and
finally more graceful, and beautiful to view. Which undoubtedly we must also seek to do with the architectonic Orders".\textsuperscript{19}

The language Scamozzi uses here is certainly Vitruvian, and Jones no doubt would have recognised the extremes of ‘firmness’, or rather, as he would have it – ‘solidity’ - and ‘delicacy’ that are applied here to the Tuscan and Corinthian.\textsuperscript{20} Indeed, Jones used these terms – ‘solid’ and ‘delicate’ - when describing the Tuscan and Corinthian Orders in his \textit{STONE-HENG Restored}.\textsuperscript{21}

What matters to Scamozzi is that architectural form, like the Orders, should undergo change in subtle increments, thus imitating the smooth transitions within species from variety to variety that is characteristic of nature. This incremental change should be clearly reflected in the building as a whole so that in its ornamentation, as Jones translates, “the Aspecte of the fro[n]t more adorned the[n] the sydes and least behind”.\textsuperscript{22} Since Scamozzi saw the Orders as species, he ultimately, Payne notes, saw his buildings as “live things, assembled carved and built like a human anatomy”.\textsuperscript{23} Indeed, he says as much in his Discorsi (1582):

Scamozzi’s anthropomorphism is firmly rooted in the domain of natural philosophy. The interior physiology of the body therefore becomes an analogy for what happens behind walls and columns. As such, ornament becomes part of the shell - a protective coating. This is consistent with Palladio’s view that ornament should be expressive of a building’s structure, and perhaps explains why Scamozzi, like Palladio, felt that the assemblage of ornament should be a visible expression of how buildings are constructed. The view expressed by both, that the most ornate face of a building should be its most public face – which, for Scamozzi, was its principle exterior façade - is a natural extension of this. Jones did not share this view. Indeed, he believed just the opposite – namely that a building should be
most ornate inside.\textsuperscript{24} The reason for this becomes clear in the light of Jones’s study of the moral ethics of Decorum - as demonstrated by his annotations in the antique Greek texts (in his copies of Plato’s Republic, Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics and Plutarch’s Moralia): namely, that Jones was to view ornament in terms of moral rather than natural philosophy,\textsuperscript{25} and therefore came to identify the building not with the body, but with the mind. The connection between appropriate ornamentation and morality was, as we shall see now, made explicit in Books II and IV of Serlio. Indeed, the connection is extended to make a link between religious denomination and ornament – or more precisely, between Catholicism and the Corinthian order. Significantly in light of Jones’s use of ornament in an ecclesiastical context,\textsuperscript{26} this is a connection that Jones noted.

**Decorum in Libro primo [-quinto] d’architettura di Sebastiano Serlio**

Book IV was the first published of Serlio’s books on architecture.\textsuperscript{27} Containing the first systematic analysis of the rules governing the design of all five Orders,\textsuperscript{28} it is according to Serlio, “more relevant and more important than the others for the understanding of the different styles of buildings and their ornaments”.\textsuperscript{29} Jones was studying his copy of Serlio as early as 1610,\textsuperscript{30} but although his edition contained Libro primo - quinto, during this early stage of his studies only Serlio’s writings on the Orders interested him.\textsuperscript{31} In fact at this time only one passage tempted him to annotation. This can be found in chapter vi, where Serlio merges Vitruvius’s decor passage with distributio and the origin stories in a bid to define an appropriate use of the Orders. Here, visual analogies are applied that are far more complex than those suggested by Vitruvius:

“When we have to build a temple consecrated to Jesus Christ our Saviour, or to St. Paul, St. Peter, St George or other similar Saints, since they not only professed to be soldiers, but were also manly and strong in leading out their lives in the faith of Christ, the Doric type is suitable for Saints of this sort. And it is not only suitable for divinities. If a building (public or private) is intended for men of
arms and robust [robusto] character, the more appropriate is work of greater solidity [soda]. If, on the other hand, this man, however warlike, also has a delicate side to him, then the work could be carved with some delicacy [delicato], as will be described in its place.\(^{32}\)

Jones translates this as, “the Ancients dedicated This Doric Order To [the] most Roboustious good[s]. Christians to saints of the like nature. Also to Soldierly and Robustious persons of what Condition soever”. This leads to the conclusion: “and vary ye work in Delicacy or strength according to ye person”. Thus, to ‘vary with reason’ here is to vary the Order according to the characteristics of the patron.

In chapter vii, Serlio’s thoughts on the Decorum of the Ionic Order continue in much the same vein:

“We Christians, however, if we have to build a sacred temple in this Order, dedicate it to those male Saints whose lives were half-way between robust and delicate, and in the same way to those female Saints who led matronly lives. If you have to make a building, whether public or private, for men of letters and of a quiet life – not robust, but also not delicate – this Ionic Order would be suitable for them. This style would also suit if you had to make anything for matrons.”\(^{33}\)

When considering what Order to use when building for a married woman we are therefore left with little doubt. Of course, the only orders ornamenting the latter Queen’s House at Greenwich are the Ionic columns framing the balcony openings in the central loggia of the south front. Serlio also followed Vitruvius’s recommendation that the Ionic should be used for buildings dedicated to Diana – the Roman goddess of the hunt – an identification made by
Jones in his STONE-HENG RESTORED and one well suited to the function of the Queen’s House as a rural retreat for hunting built for the consort of Charles I.

We can see that the notion of appropriateness introduced by Serlio refers primarily to the ornamental characteristics of a building’s divinity or patron: strong men require the solid Doric, athletic woman and less athletic men the Ionic, and – as Serlio goes on to explain in the next chapter – graceful and delicate bodies the Corinthian. Thus, using the concept of a scale from sodo to delicato, Serlio is able to show in these passages that the ornamentation of a building can be matched in a very precise manner not only to character, but also to the ‘professional’ activities of a patron.

For the Tuscan Order, Serlio did not have a Vitruvian origin story or a paradigm in a particular body form to refer to. He therefore makes the Tuscan part of the same logical sequence that he uses to characterise the other Orders. Hence the Tuscan becomes the most solid [sodo] and:

“least ornate [ornato] Order… which is the most Rustic [rustico], the strongest and of the least delicacy or gracefulness… They say therefore that Tuscan work – as it seems to me – is suitable for fortresses; for example, for city gates, fortified hill towns, castles…”

It is plain what Serlio means by all these terms except rustico. This is soon explained:

“Although it is indeed true that Rustic work – that is, different bonds of roughly worked stones with several others a little more delicately cut because of the pleasure which the sculptors derived from it - was sometimes mixed by the
ancients with Doric, sometimes even with Ionic and Corinthian work, nevertheless, since Tuscan work is really the roughest, least ornamented of all the others, it seems to me that Rustic suits and is more fitting to Tuscan work than to any other".35

Thus, Rustic work becomes intrinsically linked with the Tuscan – the least ornate Order.36 The identification is elucidated by the principles set out in Book II, which are based by Serlio around the tripartite division of antique drama. The final illustrations in the Book are three woodcuts depicting the Tragic, Comic, and Satiric stage scenes (Figures 3, 4, and 5). As his masque scenery clearly demonstrates, Jones was certainly interested in Serlio’s writings on this subject.37 We shall look at these writings in some detail now, for in them ornament becomes firmly associated not only with body types, but also with ‘moral’ types.

Satiric stage scenery, explains Serlio:

"is for performing Satires, a type of drama in which all those who live dissolute and devil-may-care lives are criticised (or rather they are mocked); in ancient satire the corrupt and the criminal were practically identified. However, it is understandable that this sort of license was granted to characters that spoke their minds, that is to say, rustic folk."38

The scene clearly illustrates what buildings are appropriate to an idyllic rural life: scattered in a forest are thatched huts of timber and rough-hewn stone, while loose unfinished rusticated blocks lie spread in the foreground. This is a rustic architecture that Jones was to evoke in an early design for the first Queen’s House at Greenwich – which, in contrast to the latter building he designed for that location (still standing in an altered form today) was initially conceived as a thatched rural hunting lodge for Anne of Denmark.39 Also reminiscent of the
buildings of Serlio’s Satiric scene are the only small-scale rural buildings (we know of) that Jones designed; a “new stable for the greate horses, a new dog house with lodgings over it a new brewhouse & riding house and a store house” to accommodate King James at his Newmarket Lodging during the hunting and racing seasons.

Buildings for Serlio’s Comic stage scenery should be “private houses; that is belonging to citizens, merchants, lawyers and parasites and other similar characters. Above all there should be a bawd’s house and an inn”. Finally, Tragic stage scenery, Serlio explains, should be composed of buildings for:

“those characters of high rank, because disastrous love affairs, unforeseen events and violent and gruesome deaths (as far as one reads in ancient tragedies, not to mention the modern ones) always occur in the houses of noblemen, Dukes, great Princes or even Kings. Therefore (as I said) in scenery of this sort there should only be buildings that have a certain nobility”.

As we can see, Serlio’s commentary on the three settings develops into a general critique that compares city to rural life. The rustic Satiric scene embodies the qualities of nature untamed. The crude materials and construction of the houses depicted in the scene can, as Rykwert notes, be seen as akin to the architecture of the ‘primitive hut’ - in which Vitruvius had identified the virtuous origins of building and antique ornament. In their rustic and outlawed behaviour, as Serlio describes it, the characters that dwell in the scene echo the lives of those that devised and improved upon the first hut – those whom Vitruvius characterises as primitive and savage. In the primitive construction of the first hut there is embodied an authenticity that Vitruvius used as a model for the correct ornamenting of the Orders, which, he explains, should not be unfaithful to their timber origins. Indeed, the link
between integrity - constructional and moral - and rustic architecture is reflected in those dwelling in Serlio's Satiric scene - the truthful nature of whom it is to 'speak their minds'.

There is as we move from the country to the city a sense of moral decline. At the opposite end to the Satiric is the Tragic. The Tragic is the scene of “violent and cruel deaths”, which are set against an architectural backdrop that is, Onians suggests, as urban and “correctly classical” as the Satiric is rural and rustic. Forming the entrance to the Tragic scene, and at the end of a vista of colonnaded palaces, there is a triumphal arch. It is framed by the most ornate Order – the Composite. Traditionally composed of ornament of all types that was, as Payne explains, quite “literally piled up into ever more copious compositions”, the triumphal arch constituted the most extreme case of licentiousness in architecture. This, of course, was a characteristic quite appropriate to the actions acted out in the Tragic scene.

The nature of life in the Comic scene is indicated by its inhabitants; these are members of the commercial classes who are joined by the innkeeper and prostitutes. As Onians notes, the Comic is thus depicted as intermediate between tragedy and satire, in terms of both social and moral values. This is accurately reflected in its architecture, the style of which lies halfway between rustic and Classical. There are astylar houses - classically proportioned but free of all'antica ornament - Tuscan colonnades and even gothic arches on a building adorned with heraldic shields. The most ornate structure is the temple, ornamented both with Ionic and Corinthian pilasters, but even religion shows signs of neglect here, for there are weeds growing from the tower.

Reinforcing the link between religious architecture and the Corinthian Order, Serlio states in Book IV that if an ecclesiastical building was constructed in that Order it should be dedicated:
“to the Mother of our saviour Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, who was not only a virgin before, but was a virgin during and also after giving birth. In the same way this Order, having such character, is suitable for all those Saints, male and female, who led a virginal life. Also monasteries, and convents which cloister maidens dedicated to divine worship, should be built in this style.”

The one line underscored by Jones in this passage is: “the Mother of our saviour Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary.” This, it could be argued, is highly significant, for not only does Serlio Christianise all’antica ornament here; he, more particularly, effectively Catholicises the Corinthian by dedicating it to the Virgin. In this Serlio may only have been reflecting what for many architects in Italy had become common practice. In Rome, for instance, where naturally the influence of the Catholic Church was greatest, most public buildings were required to conform to the authority of a government sanctioned by the Papacy. Significantly, Michelangelo ornamented the Capitoline palaces with the Corinthian, and this was the same Order used by Bramante at the new St. Peters. As Onians has suggested, in Italy, by the middle of the sixteenth century, the choice of which Order to use in an ecclesiastical context was largely resolved, for the Corinthian had become recognised, primarily through familiar association, as an emblem of the Catholic faith and the Counter-Reformation. The most ornate structures in the city were therefore more often than not those of Roman Catholics, and it became increasingly rare to use the Corinthian or Composite columns on buildings other than Catholic churches. As Onians concludes, the Corinthian and Composite became in Italy essential attributes of the Catholic Church, and this, we might assume, would not have escaped Jones’s notice, particularly when he visited Rome.
Conclusion

Of course, it is doubtful that Serlio deliberately meant to Protestantise the Tuscan/Rustic when he Catholicised the Corinthian. However, following the moral distinctions of English treatise writers, Jones would use the Tuscan for the first Protestant church built with the Orders in Britain, namely St. Paul's at Covent Garden (1633). Taking Serlio as his lead, and as his Roman Sketchbook implies, Jones in his application of Decorum through ornament might be seen to have been guided by the expression of conflicting moral virtues. This contrasted gravity with imagination, honesty with irreverence, virtue with vice, and, most significantly in the context of Reformation Britain, Protestantism with Catholicism. As reported elsewhere, Jones was to use ornament in a manner consistent with this notion of Decorum in all his ecclesiastical designs. From his sparing use of the Corinthian and Composite Orders in the context of religious repression - at the Catholic chapels at St. James’s Palace (1623-26) and Somerset House (1632-35) - to his use of the Tuscan on the façade of the Protestant St. Paul’s church at Covent Garden (1630-31), and finally to his use of four Orders in his ecumenical resurfacing at old St. Paul’s Cathedral (1633-42).

Endnotes

1 Inigo Jones’s Roman Sketchbook, Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth, fols. 76b and 76r respectively. The notes are dated: “Thursday ye 19 January 1614” and “Friday ye 20 January 1614”, but as J. A. Gotch has shown (Inigo Jones, 1928, 72-73, 81) the days referred to indicate that the year was 1615 by the new calendar, when Jones was in London. The new Gregorian calendar was not adopted in England until 1752, when it was necessary to drop 11 days. Another reform that the Gregorian calendar effected was the general adoption of January 1 as the beginning of the year. Until then, some nations began it with December 25, others with January 1 or March 25 (as England did before 1752).
4 Ibid.
7 “But in my opinion Palladio Imitates ye Best Bacementes of these antiquities as ye Tempels of Pola. Of nerva. Of fortune. Of Scicci. But alwaes the libbery of Composing wth reason is not Taken
awaye yet [sic] but who followes ye best of ye ansientes can not much earr” (Jones’s I Quattro Libri, Book IV, 98).


10 ll. 3.

11 ll. 69.

12 The treatise was incomplete due to Scamozzi’s untimely death. Thus, only Books I-III and VI-VIII appeared in print in the seventeenth century.


14 See Payne, Ibid.

15 “Laonde si vede, che l’Architetto non si confà in parte alcuna con cotali professori: mà si potrebbe piu tosto paragonare al Mathematico, & al Filosofo naturale quâto alla speculatione, & alle forme, e quanto poi all’universale dell’altra parti all’Oratore essendo, che l’uno, e l’altro conuengono hauere cognizione di tutte le forme, e nature delle cose, iche si conferma da Quintiliano, così dicendo; nam ea in omnibus quæ sunt edificio utilia, versatur: benche in diuersi modi: e si come l’Oratore vsa molta arte per acquistar la gratia de gli ascoltanti: così all’Architetto fà dibisogno far questo per via del merito, per acquistar la gratia con quelli ch’egli tratta: accioche le siano credute quelle cose, ch’egli propone, in publico, ò in priuato.” Scamozzi, L’idea della architettura universale, Part I, Book I, Chpt. 13, 43.

16 My own translation of: “E finalmente il Decoro, anch’egli riguarda il fine dell’edificio; essendo proprio vn’aspetto ornato, e senza diffetto; di modo, che rende maestà, gratia, e bellezza: la qual cosa auuiene, allhora, che tutte le parti sono fatte con ragione, & approbate da’ termini limitati, e che soggiacciono all’Arte, secondo il genere, e le modulazioni della cosa, e non fatte à caso; la onde si vede chiarissimamente quanto l’Architettura in tutte queste parti tenghi della Filosofia morale, e naturale” (I.1.2., 8-9).

17 “E qvanto all’applicar essi ornamenti l’Architetto dee far la distintione d’un genere dall’altro; in modo, che in parte alcuna non siano misti, ne confusi insieme; applicandoli come ricerca il genere di ciascuno d’essi, la qualità dell’edificio, e la conuenienza del bisogno. Perche chiara cosa è, che à tutti gli edifici non si conuengono gl’istessi ordini, ne per consequenza anco i medesimi ornamenti, come molti inconsideratamente fanno; essendoche altri richiedono gli edifici publici, e molto differenti i Sacri, da Secolari, & altri poi conuienisi à quelli de priuati”. Ibid., II.6.3., 8. See Payne, op. cit., 222.

18 Against the text: “E qvanto all’applicar essi ornamenti l’Architetto dee far la distintione d’un genere dall’altro; in modo, che in parte alcuna non siano misti, ne confusi insieme; applicandoli come ricerca il genere di ciascuno d’essi, la qualità dell’edificio, e la conuenienza del bisogno” (Jones’s underlining). Scamozzi, Ibid.

19 “Perçiò nel disporre i precetti de gli Ordini, osseruaremo così nel tutto de’ loro corpi, come anco nelle loro parti, e membra, che dall’uno all’altro vadino di grado, in grado incominciando dalla sodezza dell’Ordine Toscano, e passando ne gli altri, fino, che si peruenghi alla delicateza, e leggiadria del Corinto; imitando in questo la Natura, la quale, tanto ne’ corpi animati, quanto anco nelle piante, mantiene sempre di grado in grado la propria specie, ne mai tramutata in vno istante la forma, ài numero, ouero il sito, à di materia le parti essentiali; perché allhora sarebbe del tutto cosa violenta; mà insensibilmente và alterando alcune particelle trà quelle; lequali à poco, à poco riducono le altre, e più robuste, e più sorti, à delle volte, e più morbidi, e più delicate: e finalmente molto più leggiadre, e belle da vedere; iche indubitatamente debbiamo far anco noi ne gli Ordini dell’Architettura”. Ibid., II.6.10., 29-30. Translation as cited in Payne, op. cit., 223.
Scamozzi’s references at the beginning of Part II to the gigantic and Herculean when describing the Tuscan and Doric would find an echo in Shute’s The First and Chief Grounds of Architecture, where the Doric is rendered by Shute as a club-carrying savage cloaked in a lion-skin (the standard emblematic costume of Hercules). See Shute, J., The First and Chief Grounds of Architecture (London, fol. Xiii, 1563). For a discussion of Shute’s depictions of the Orders see Hart, V. Paper Palaces, 300-306.

The passage on the Tuscan reads: “If observe their Order in Building; the only Order of Architecture, which Italy may truly glory in the Invention of, is the Tuscan Order, so called, because first found out by the Tuscons, that in a more than ordinary Manner they might reverence their Deities in Temples composed thereof, (Janus their first King, according to the common Opinion of divers ancient Historians, being the first of all others, that built Temples to the Gods.) Which Order, though first used by the Tuscons, certain it is, the Romans took from them, and brought it in use with other Arts, in several Parts of the World, as their Conquests led them on. Now of this Tuscan Order, a plain, grave, and humble manner of Building, very Solid and Strong, Stone-Heng principally consists” (STONE-HENG RESTORED, p. 44). Jones then on page 50 writes that: “The Order whereof this Temple consists, according to the Rules of Art observed by the ancient Romans in Works of this Kind, is mingled of Greek and Tuscan Work. For, as the Plainness and Solidness of the Tuscan Order appears eminently throughout the whole Antiquity, so the Narrowness of the spaces betwixt the Stones visibly discovers therein the Delicacy of the Corinthian Order”.


Six were published during his lifetime. These are, in order of publication:
Book IV: Regola generali di architettura sopra le cinque maniere degli edifici… con gli essempi dell’antichità, che, per la maggior parte concordano con la dottrina di Vitruvio, Venice 1537.
Book III: Il Terzo Libro di Sabastiano Serlio Bolognese, nel qual si figurano e descrivono le Antichità di Roma..., Venice, 1540.
Book V: Il Quinto libro d’architettura… nel quale se tratta de diuerse forme de tempij sacri secondo il costume Christiano, & al modo Antico..., French translation by Jean Martin, Paris, 1547.
Libro Extraordinario: Extraordinario libro di architettura nel quale si dimostrano trenta porte di opera rustica mista..., Lyons, 1551.

The three published posthumously are:
Morality and the Orders:
Inigo Jones’s Annotations on Decorum in Scamozzi, Palladio and Serlio

Rosci; Ms in the Avery Library, Columbia University; published by Myra Nan Rosenfield, New York, 1978.

It should be remembered that Vitruvius speaks only of three ‘genera’; the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian, not accepting the Tuscan Order as a ‘genus’ and referring only to ‘tuscanae dispositiones’ (IV.7). Alberti (7.6) had been the first to recognise the Composite as a distinct Order, which he called the ‘Italian’. On Serlio’s conception of the Tuscan Order, see Ackerman, J. S., “The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language of Architecture”, Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, XLII, (1983), 15-34.

And according to the chronology of Jones’s handwriting as determined by John Newman, Jones began making notes in his Palladio some time between 1601 and 1610. Towards the end of this period he was also making his first notes in his copy of Barbaro’s Vitruvius and his folio edition of Serlio’s Libro primo [-quinto] d’architettura di Sebastiano Serlio Bolognese, (Venice, 1559-62. Now housed at Queen’s College Library, Oxford). See Newman, J., “Italian Treatises in Use: the significance of Inigo Jones’s Annotations”, 436.

The influence of Serlio’s precepts of stage design is clear in much of Jones’s masque scenery. Compare, for instance, Jones’s scene for ‘A Street in perspective’ (Figure 27), from The Vision of Delight (1617), which is quite clearly based on Serlio’s ‘Tragic Scene’. The following paragraphs on Jones’s annotations in Serlio on the Doric and Corinthian Orders were first reported in Hart and Tucker on this in detail - Hart V., and Tucker R., “Ornament and the work of Inigo Jones”, Architectura-Zeitschrift Fur Geschichte Der Baukunst, 32:1 (2002), 36-52.

For a detailed discussion of this, see Ackerman, op. cit.
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mutules are modelled with sloping carving; and this imitates the rafters. For they are necessarily put sloping because of the rainfall. Therefore in the Doric style the detail both of the triglyphs and of the mutules arose from this imitation of timber work”. IV.2., 2-3.

45 Onians, J., Bearers of Meaning, 284.
47 Onians, op. cit., 285.
49 See note 29.
51 Ibid., 313.
Chapter Five, “The Hand of Inigo Jones,” comprises an examination of handwriting technique and the transmission of information and ideas through the writing and drawing of Jones. It also considers the dialogue between the living Jones and the dead Palladio through Jones’s annotation of Palladio’s text. Chapter Six, “A More Masculine Order,” examines Jones’s quest to find an architectural style which embodied the best of his predecessors’ work, gleaned from their texts and architectural output, but which also demonstrated a new, idiosyncratic, and English style. This pursuit underlies Vincenzo Scamozzi Research Papers on Academia.edu for free. This effort undertaken by the magistrates and the aristocracy of the Republic, was also a consequence of the events that reduced the role of Venice in the maritime domain of the Levant. From the first humanism of Petrarch, who found the Arquà renewed taste for the otium related to rural life, the book illustrates the most significant examples of this cultural heritage, starting with the first villa-castles Porto-Colleoni at Thiene and Giustinian at Roncade. The new architectural language of the Renaissance is visible in the classicism of the works of G.M. Falconetto, A. Cornaro, G. Trissino an