theological content. One might arrive at erroneous conclusions, but if those . . . were reached after an earnest endeavor to ascertain the meaning of the scriptures, and . . . could be backed up by a plausible biblical argument, one could not justly be called a heretic” (130-31).

Even more radical than this procedural reinterpretation was Hobbes’ genealogical one, adroitly expounded by J. A. I. Champion by way of a reading of Hobbes’ neglected *Historical Narration Concerning Heresie*, published posthumously in 1680 but evidently completed in 1668 and “published” in scribal form during the later years of Hobbes’s life in the mid-1670s” (224). I leave to my reader the pleasure of following Hobbes’ wittily anti-clerical tracing of the term heresy from “private opinion” (228) among the ancient philosophers to sect then to creed, this last a tool for self-seeking prelates to enforce their interests by the most extreme means. As Coffey summarizes the development, “heresy was a device originally employed to denote diversity that had been turned into a powerful weapon of priestcraft” (232). There was of necessity no objective source of truth (or of its opposite): what mattered was what the civil sovereign prescribed.

Champion’s piece, the gem of a good set of articles, concludes with a discussion of Thomas Barlow’s unpublished “Animadversions on a MS. tract concerning Heresy” of 1676. Barlow takes issue precisely with the Hobbesian genealogy—no fool Barlow, who recognizes how much depends on what we take the necessity of *haereseis* to mean.


In this text on the English architect Inigo Jones, author Giles Worsley provides a needed re-evaluation of the topic of seventeenth-century classicism, which to date has been a little-studied area of European architectural history. Baroque architecture has for the most part been defined largely by the Roman architecture that coincided with the Counter-Reformation and that can be characterized as theatrical, monumental, ornate and sculptural. The Baroque is thought to transcend the more narrowly-defined Renaissance principles of Vitruvius to embrace a more eclectic style. Early scholars such as
Heinrich Wölflin (in his Renaissance und Barock, 1888), who first gave this era its stylistic category and did much to dispel its negative connotations, considered the Baroque the antithesis of Renaissance style, and although this formal definition is largely outdated, a lingering misunderstanding of seventeenth-century classicism has remained. Within this traditional framework, then, the classicizing style of Inigo Jones can only be seen as either a delayed attempt to emulate the Renaissance style or as an incredibly progressive anticipation of mid-eighteenth century Neo-Classicism. Worsley instead argues that Inigo Jones was not an anomaly, but rather he was very much a product of his time period and led the way in the shift from Mannerism toward a “purer” form of classicism that drew upon the ideas of a variety of classical architects such as Vitruvius, Alberti, Bramante, Raphael, Palladio, Serlio, Sanmicheli and Scamozzi. John Summerson, in his Architecture in Britain 1530-1830 (1953), and Rudolf Wittkower, in his Palladio and English Palladianism (1974), both established a clear connection between Palladio and Jones, a comparison that Jones himself capitalized upon, but Worsley goes further to provide a fuller range of sources for Jones. Specifically, Inigo Jones wanted to develop the ornate Jacobean architecture in England toward a simpler version of classicism found not only in Italy, but also in France, Germany and the Netherlands in the early seventeenth century. Furthermore, what Inigo Jones added to this style was an intellectual framework that included a discussion of decorum and its relationship to function and patronage, whereby the richness of a building’s design was to be proportional to its status and inhabitants.

In developing his thesis, Worsley first clarifies Jones’ early years to provide a fuller understanding of his career within the court prior to his mid-life shift toward architectural design. Jones traveled extensively before his 1613 Italy tour, likely within a court entourage to France, Germany, Italy, and Denmark. During these formative years, Jones began to study architecture, focusing on Vitruvius, Palladio, and on the more practical and technical aspects of construction needed for his role as a royal masque designer in England. From this foundation Jones then began to grapple with the differing architectural needs of seventeenth-century England, arguing that one must first learn the rules of proportion, and only then can one begin to make such adjustments to the overall design. Jones’ tour of Italy then allowed him to look at classical buildings first-hand, and it was this trip that helped Jones to establish himself as an architect in addition to an architectural theorist. Worsley carefully tracks
these visits from archival records, notations found in Jones’ numerous texts, and the notations of his student, John Webb, in order to trace a much fuller reading of Jones’ design influences. Through travel correspondence, Worsley provides suggestions of where the royal entourage might have stayed, to include the Villa Molin, recently completed outside Padua by Scamozzi. Although most interested in Rome and the Veneto, Jones also spent time in Milan and Naples, where Worsley details buildings likely studied by Jones that might have influenced his later work. Royal patronage through Italy would have allowed Jones access to many places, including private homes, government buildings, and churches. Here Jones began to develop not only an interest in classicism, but also a particular notion of sovereignty that he applied to his buildings back in England.

North of the Alps, classicism began to take hold in the early seventeenth century, and despite the lack of extensive research on this style in Germany, Worsley demonstrates how the commissioning of classically-inspired buildings by several wealthy southern German families led the way in this stylistic development. Although it is not possible to confirm where in Germany Jones traveled, several drawings in the Jones-Webb collection suggest a possible trip through Germany. For example, two drawings of Elias Holl’s Augsburg Rathaus, begun in 1615, were perhaps acquired by Jones during his return to England from Venice, the likely route of which could have brought him through Augsburg. Documentation confirms that Jones traveled quite extensively through France, where classicism was more fully developed than in Germany, whose classical tradition was cut short with the advent of the Thirty Year’s War in 1618. In France, the Mannerist tradition was more widely acceptable than in Germany and England; nonetheless, a more restrained classicism, as seen in the work of Jones’ contemporaries Salomon de Brosse and Jacques Lemercier, offers some intriguing parallels with Inigo Jones’ work. Worsley then focuses on early seventeenth-century Netherlandish architecture to demonstrate how Dutch classicism was far more widespread there than traditional scholarship suggests. For example, the church of San Carlo Borromeo in Antwerp, designed by François d’Aguilon and Pierre Huyssens beginning in 1613, is described today as a Baroque building due to its opulent façade, but in its day it was considered Vitruvian, and that is the way Jones likely understood the building through contemporary descriptions he was certainly privy to.
Next, Worsley focuses not only on Jones’ annotated edition of Palladio’s *Quattro Libri*, which has been widely studied, but also on his unpublished annotations to the texts by Vitruvius, Alberti, Serlio and Scamozzi. Expanding upon Gordon Higgott’s studies of Jones’ design principles, Worsley offers a fuller understanding of Jones’ sources. For example, his most famous building, the Banqueting House at Whitehall (1619-22), which is perhaps his clearest Palladian building, also reflects Scamozzi’s hierarchy of orders, with the Composite order placed over the Ionic order in a system not seen in any of Palladio’s designs. In addition, Jones’ Queen’s House at Greenwich (1632-38), recalls the cubic massing found in the Villa Medici at Poggio a Caiano, built in the 1480s by Giuliano da Sangallo, and in Scamozzi’s Villa Molin outside Padua, where Jones likely stayed in Italy.

Finally, Worsley concludes his discussion of Inigo Jones with a full examination of the use of the portico and the Serlian window configuration, called the *serliana*, as symbols of sovereignty. In England, Jones’ use of the portico, which harks back to the early Christian church, was reserved for royal buildings or churches that received royal patronage, while the *serliana* served as a reference to papal authority. Its origins can also be traced back to antiquity, and are seen in Imperial residences such as the Palace of Diocletian in Split. This imperial symbolism, then, confirmed the authority of the English monarchy during a politically tumultuous time period. Ultimately, Whitehall Palace must be understood in this context, as one aspect of a broader architectural campaign to aggrandize the reign of Charles I at a time of civil war, military losses to France and Spain, and persistent tensions between the monarchy and Parliament.

This study provides a scholarly and engaging account of Inigo Jones’ style, motivations, his inspirations, and the broader historical and architectural context of his career. It is an innovative work that contributes greatly to the examination of English Baroque architecture. Unfortunately, this book also serves as the conclusion to Giles Worsley’s fruitful career due to his death from cancer at age forty-three, merely a few weeks after the completion of this text.