Damiano Acciarino, ed. *Paradigms of Renaissance Grotesques*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2019. 597 pp. + 153 illus. $49.95. Review by Livia Stoenescu, Texas A&M University.

The literature on ornament yielded significant results with Alina Payne's books *The Architectural Treatise in the Italian Renaissance: Architectural Invention, Ornament, and Literary Culture* (1999), *From Ornament to Object: Genealogies of Architectural Modernism* (2012), and *Histories of Ornament: From Global to Local* (2016). Notable contributions also came from, but were not limited to, Alessandra Zamperini's *Ornament and the Grotesque—Fantastical Decoration from Antiquity to Art Nouveau* (2008), Frances S. Connelly's *The Grotesque in Western Art and Culture* (2012), Clare L. Guest's *The Understanding of Ornament in the Italian Renaissance* (2015) and Damiano Acciarino's own *Lettere sulle grottesche (1580–1581)* (2018). Alexander Nagel put the ideas about ornament in devotional context in *The Controversy of Renaissance Art* (2011), in which discussions of ornament are correlated to Italian Renaissance initiatives to replace images with marble ornament at Vicenza Cathedral and other Italian monuments in the wake of the Reformation. The edited collection of Damiano Acciarino brings new insights into the debates over the role of the ornament in the ecclesiastical cultures of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, in the particular case of *grottesche* (grotesques) that drew critical attention when iconoclasm clashed with the emerging grotesque art of the Renaissance (30). Even though the Protestant polemics against images did not castigate the grotesques as deceitful images, the rhetoric of Andreas Karlstadt gave the Catholics stern warnings about the danger of hidden and arcane meanings inherited from classical sources. The critique of the Protestant Reformation eventually succeeded to turn the grotesques over to the censorial eye of the Counter-Reformation. Cardinal Gabrielle Paleotti's *Discourse on Sacred and Profane Images* (1582) focused on the matter of decorum, urging the Roman Church that the grotesques be excluded from the liturgy and removed from the sacred art because they were profane and idolatrous (41). These ideas form the substance of the introductory chapter by Damiano Acciarino, who sets the tone for some stimulating discussions.

The volume is broken down into Part I, Theoretical perspectives; Part II, Practical applications; and an appendix comprising of the letters of Ullise Aldrovandi, Pirro Ligorio, Giambattista Bombelli, Egnazio Danti, Federico Pendasio, and Alfonso Chacón. Several chapters, however, digress from the goals and ambitions highlighted by Acciarino and instead offer interesting research about the development of ornament in Italian Renaissance art in a post-Reformation age. The undisputable value of this edited collection lies in the chapters that engage with the relevance of ornament to the underestimated concerns over whether the figurative and non-figurative grotesques transgressed the Catholic dogma. These chapters indeed mark exceptional steps forward in challenging our perceptions that Roman Catholicism feared only the figurative visual language of the Renaissance culture that gravitated around the anthropologically-charged image. Alternative forms of hybrid or non-figurative art, to which the grotesques belonged, were equally targeted as the arched enemy of the Counter-Reformation.

In Part I, Alessandra Zamperini's *Grotesque and the Antique. Raphael's Discovery of the Fourth Style* underscores the interests in the Neronian grotesques, first used by Pinturicchio's funerary monuments in Rome's Santa Maria del Popolo and Ara Coeli, and brought to the stage of creative intervention by Raphael in his undertaking to recreate the Domus Aurea grotesques as faithfully as possible. Dorothea Scholl's *"Sense of Nonsense" A Theology of Grotesque* stands out for a thorough examination of a "theology of grotesques" in the context of the Counter-Reformation's fraught associations with the Renaissance and Reformation. The Christian humanist culture of the Italian Renaissance embraced the teachings of Marsilio Ficino that Orpheus was the theological instructor and harbinger of a divine order of creation, hence inspiring grotesque decorations to help "antiquate" Christianity in Renaissance humanism (89). Scholl has argued that "in this perspective, grotesques are not merely decorative frames or elements suitable for embellishing empty spaces; they are intimately linked to "poetic theology" and express theological insights (91) while being remarkably exemplified, among others, by Luca Signorelli's depiction of Empedocles's vision of the universe as a reflection on the theology of grotesques (92).

The waning of Christian humanism coincided with the rise of the Counter-Reformation's authoritative positions against the corruption of Christian thought with paganism. Cardinal Paleotti took particular interest in gathering an array of sources on the grotesques by the foremost specialists of his time, including Ulisse Aldovrandi, Pirro Ligorio, and Giambattista Bombelli. His purpose was to document and then dismiss the conceptions of grotesque art as expressions of demonic and heretical ideas, which having existed only in the artists' imagination injure the Catholic dogma. With remarkable erudition, Philippe Morel's *Laughing with the Grotesques in the Renaissance* examines the lapsing of the grotesques into the categories of carnivalesque, macaronic, parody, folly, and paradox. Such derogatory characterizations yielded intricate and alternative meanings, which exposed the relative merits of the grotesques even more arcane than they were commonly accepted to be. Clare L. Guest's *Plato's Stag Goats: Sophistic Heritage in Renaissance Grotesques* elaborates on the role of the grotesques in the cultural tension between illusion, idealism, and mimesis (174). Efforts to salvage the grotesques from accusations of triviality and falsehood diverged into interpreting their symbolic character as expressions of symbolic theology. Maria Fabricius Hansen's *Telling Time: Representations of Ruins in Grotesques* investigates the temporality of grotesques as a paradigm for the transformation from the stage of form to that of formless in the case of ruins. Hansen remarkably intertwines her observations about the treatment of ruins and dilapidated architecture with Renaissance painting and ornament which similarly devolved from form to formless due to the intervention of time: "Therefore, what is at stake in representations of ruins seems to be at stake on a more general level in grotesques intended as a compositional device: the visualization of passages between a form and the formless, or between culture and nature, with change and movement as key concepts. In this sense, the frequent prospects with ruins are in perfect alignment with the conditions of image-making governing grotesques in general" (205). We learn more about the aesthetics of the grotesques in Simon Godart's *Grotesque Poetics: Michel de Montaigne's Use of Grotesques in De l'Amitié (I: 28).* Writing and painting share an affinity to grotesques by means of intertextual recombination: the painter combines heterogenous elements to create unnatural life forms; the writer, in turn, transplants to his own text borrowings from monstrous transformation (227). Montaigne's *De l'Amitié* adapts Horace's *ut pictura poesis* to reconstruct intertextual combinations of language and style that mirror the properties of grotesque painting in writing. Drawing the matter of the grotesque on the associative meanings of the arabesque, which became the modern term used to describe the figured ornament known as *grottesche* in the Renaissance, Frances S. Connelly's *Unwinding the Arabesque: Grotesque Ornament and Modern Meaning* illustrates the fascination with grotesque expressions as an enduring feature of art over the centuries. The modern age expanded on Horace's *ut pictura poesis* so as to include ornament and reach beyond the focus on literal texts and images. Disagreement between Winckelmann's theory of an ideal beauty far removed from the grotesque expression and the modern artists' preoccupation with full assimilation of ornament into their works led to a parting of the ways (249). The modernists called the ornaments "arabesques" and recognized them as conveyors of a new symbolism inspired by non-Western geographical territories. The painters Paul Gauguin and Philipp Otto Runge alongside the poet and cultural critic Charles Baudelaire, writer John Ruskin, and philosopher Friedrich Schlegel argued for a reconciliation of figurative and ornamental expressions that placed a premium on the arabesque as the server of argument.

In Part II, Kathryn Blair Moore's *The Logic of Grotesques in Renaissance Art: Marian Figuration at the Limits of Representation* focuses on Pinturicchio's frescoes in Rome's Santa Maria del Popolo where the grotesques helped embody the devotional meaning of Mary's presence in the decoration of the chapels of Giovanni di Montemirabile and Domenico Della Rovere. Pope Sixtus IV (1471–84) heralded a Golden Age of devotional renewal under the auspices of Mary (268); the pope's ambitions must have inspired artists such as Pinturicchio to use the transformative and illusionistic character of grotesques from the frescoes of the Domus Aurea to describe the regeneration in the earthly realm. The regenerative significance of the grotesques was thought, in a culture of reform, suitable for representing the state of miraculous metamorphosis and Incarnation associated with the mystical sense of Mary's body.

A more careful editing job would have been necessary to avoid repetition in Part II and to make several chapters cohesive reading. Luke Morgan's *"Nocturnal Fowl Disoriented by Sunlight": Grottesche and Gardens in the Late Sixteenth Century* takes us back to discussions of the Counter-Reformation critique of *grottesche* from Part I, but concludes with a new subtopic: *mescolanza*, a defining feature of the hybridity of *grottesche*, in architecture and gardens. We learn from Veronica M. White's *Ridicolosa Rassomiglianza: The Art of Exaggeration in the Carracci's Caricatures* that Carracci's caricatures took on a different approach to Leonardo da Vinci's studies of grotesque heads as exaggerated and abnormal forms (474). In Annibale's and Agostino Carracci's work and in the drawing practice they taught at the Carracci Academy, the effects of vividness and humor were based on the observation of the live model so as to discourage the portrayal of a mere imaginative monstrous physiognomy, which was considered to be detrimental to the religious meaning of art advocated by Cardinal Paleotti's *Discourse* (1582).

The volume concludes with an appendix broken into three sections, each containing letters by famous counter-reformatory humanists who replied to Cardinal Paleotti's reluctance to admit the grotesques to devotional art. The letters are newly published sources in English translation, aiming to elucidate the controversial nature of the grotesque in a sixteenth-century culture dominated by a solid admiration of classical antiquity and simultaneous mistrust for the residual paganism of classical sources in the arts. In Ulisse Aldovrandi's *Five Letters on Painting* (translated by Thomas DePasquale), the grottos, as the space in which the grotesques were painted, are "the remains of the Golden House of Nero, which, as Suetonius testifies, was of such great size that it occupied both the Palatine and Caelian hills, extending to the Esquiline, reaching all the way to the Gardens of Maecenas so that it resembled a large city" (506). For Aldovrandi, the grotesques are the errors of painters who put their imagination above the imitation of nature: "painters delighted in making many paintings according to their imagination and whim, which in nature are not found, just like the grotesques of our modern painters" (513). Culling from Plato and Aristophanes, Aldovrandi goes on to dismiss the grotesques as having "no correspondence to actual things" and thus different from the imperfections of nature which “sometimes produces monsters because she is impeded from achieving her end, for she has no intention of producing monsters” (523). The next corpus of letters in the appendix is Pirro Ligorio’s *Three Letters on Grotesque Painting* (translated by John Garton). Pirro Ligorio (1512–1583), a humanist with a deep passion for Roman antiquities and an architect, painter, and antiquarian, maintains that the aesthetic irregularity of the grotesques is the antithesis to the harmony of the classical order. Ligorio mentions Vitruvius to substantiate his argument against the grotesques: “Vitruvius did not praise them in [his treatise on] Architecture, calling them things of weak composition like dreams, like deformities with respect to the majestic, strong, beautiful composition that architecture brings together” (536); and “Whence, not without cause Vitruvius does not admit them among the stable and most eternal things of orderly buildings, but places them with vain things and among things weak and unstable and related to the vain desires, among things hazy and irrational,” (537). Ligorio’s definition of the grottos is sweeping and includes the Christian catacombs: “Now then, the grottos, take many forms and go by many different names, they are likely to be called caves, crypts, caverns (*spelei*), or cryptoporticos and catacombs, in whichever fashion, all were painted with grotesque things, dedicated to the Sun and to the Moon, to Hecate or to Persephone. But the grottos of San Sebastiano and those of San Lorenzo, those on the Via Appia and on the Tiburtina, are sepulchers that served in part nobles and in part Christians and our early martyred saints,” (539). Ligorio seems to express serious doubt about the reassignment of the Christian catacombs from spaces displaying pagan pictures to places for Christian worship: “… one sees in the parts used by gentiles some paintings, and the parts that were used by Christians are white and without pictures, and in some places, one sees the older encrustation from the pagans, above the non-painted layer” (557). An anticipated counterpoint to Ligorio came from the no-less-learned humanist Giambattista Bombelli, whose *Three Letters on Grotesques* (translated by Sylvia Gaspari) are included next in the appendix. Bombelli echoes the sixteenth-century ideas about melding classical antiquity and Christian humanism in order to bend the zeal of Ligorio; he states: “… I do not know upon what Signor Ligorio bases his understanding in this last discourse in writing to describe, as he does, the particular places of these crypts …" (566) and "So that it seems to me that either Signor Ligorio has misunderstood or he knows more than Vitruvius" (566). Bombelli endorses the surreal meaning of the grotesques as the invention of the artists' imagination and admires them for their recognized role in decorating ancient and contemporary houses: "… their grotesques, which in themselves have no order or specific end, and are just that abused license of the painters of which Flacco spoke in his Poetics … it seems to me superfluous to go on, as they are clearly the dreams and phantasmas of painters, painted in every part of ancient houses as decorations and embellishments, as is in use even today" (568).

Camillo Paleotti (1520–1594) was in close contact with the literati of his time who decided to send him their works: Ulisse Aldrovandi, Francesco Barozzi (who dedicated his *Rythmomachia* in 1572), Bartolomeo Ugolino Pacini (who chose him as recipient of the *De iuris scientiae laudibus* in 1574), and Count Giuliantonio Ercolani (who in his treatise on calligraphy of 1571, dedicated to Gabriele Paleotti, uses the name of Camillo among the examples of application of *cancelleresca* writing). The relationship between Camillo Paleotti and the intellectuals then active in Bologna, or linked to it in various ways, is codified in the *Tumulus* (Bologna, G. Rossi, 1597), a collection of poetic compositions in his honor compiled, a few years after his death, by Giulio Segni and addressed to Cardinal Cinzio Aldobrandini. In Acciarino's appendix, Egnazio Danti's (1536–1586) *Letter to Camillo Paleotti* (translated by Sylvia Gaspari), the effort was to clarify aspects of the interrelatedness of Christian practice and pagan ritual in the case of the Roman catacombs. Danti, an Italian mathematician, geographer and brother of the sculptor Vincenzo Danti, believed that the moderns gave the name grotesque to a certain sort of painting "because Vitruvius does not call them by this term" (570). In sync with the popularity of decorum in the Counter-Reformation, Danti attached the outlandish appearance of the grotesques to the improper function of the space: "I believe that they made such paintings rarely and of little importance and of monstrous things, since these grottos were monstrous themselves and were made use for the dissolution that took place in those baths" (570). The appendix concludes with the letters of Federico Pendasio (1525–1603) to Giovanni Francesco Arrivabene (b. 1515) and of Alfonso Chacón (1530–1599) to Camillo Paleotti, both translated by Sylvia Gaspari. A Spanish Dominican scholar in Rome and Greco-Roman classicist, Chacón relates the grotesques to the exotic art brought by the military campaigns of the Roman empire: "… when [the Romans] returned victorious from various ventures on land and sea, they also liked to paint their residences with fantastical animals and monsters that were found in the conquered countries, that in Rome were new … and enticed by the desire of this variety, the painters began (with their freedom and that of the poets) to add falsity to the truth, painting various fantasies, such as men with serpents for arms and other limbs, and fantastical acts" (574).

Enhanced by impeccable illustrations and abounding in intriguing research, *Paradigms of Renaissance Grotesques* is a noteworthy contribution to the study of Renaissance culture in the aftermath of the Reformation. Though inevitably part of a particular intellectual configuration, this edited collection owes more to Italian Renaissance experts than to the heterogenous group who studied the grotesques, for instance, in Renaissance Spain. Yet the goals, ambitions, and standards so eloquently outlined in this edited collection will unquestionably spur other scholars on to develop the topic of *grottesche*.

Stephen Rose. *Musical Authorship from Schütz to Bach*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. xvi + 243 pp. + 14 b/w illus. with 2 tables and 12 music examples. $99.99. Review by TIM CARTER, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL.

Who is the "author" of a musical work? It will seem an odd question for those accustomed to listening to "Beethoven's" Fifth Symphony or "Verdi's" *La traviata*, although anyone following Roland Barthes' notion of the "death of the author" (or Foucault's nuancing of it) will be aware of its undertones. As so often happens, music is also a special case given that for the most part it lives and dies in the moment of performance. So one might better modify the question: What constitutes a musical work? Or perhaps better: What work is