

Pliny. In that erudite company, Raphael (occasionally joined by his collaborator Giovanni da Udine) was the lone artist among scholars and literati. This underscores the literary underpinnings of his interest in antiquity, so it is fitting that La Malfa's conclusion invokes Baldassarre Castiglione, who gave poetic voice to Raphael's ruminations on the subject.

Raphael's project in his last years to map all of ancient Rome was his most ambitious and demanding undertaking in this arena, making its only perfunctory mention here surprising. A few, more-minor objections: it is by no means certain that the portrait of a nude woman apocryphally known as *La Fornarina* represents Raphael's mistress (9) (a persuasive alternative is that this is an artistic invention mirroring poetic formulations of ideal beauty, an antique-inspired literary conceit); Raphael's final illness was longer than three days' duration (9); and while his contemporaries were undoubtedly aware of Raphael's extraordinary gifts, the claim that his works were "praised by Leonardo, Michelangelo, Dürer, Lorenzo Lotto, Sebastiano del Piombo and Titian" (8) is mystifying. The aggrieved Michelangelo expressed only antipathy for Raphael; Sebastiano del Piombo intended no compliment when he said of Raphael's *Saint Michael* that the figures looked like they "were made of smoke, or even shining iron, all light and all dark" (John Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources, 1483–1602* [2003], 352), and Leonardo, Lotto, and Titian said nothing at all. Only Dürer, who annotated a drawing Raphael sent him, expressed admiration that the others may have shared but never pronounced.

Linda Wolk-Simon, *Institute of Fine Arts, New York University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.216

Lettera a Leone X di Raffaello e Baldassarre Castiglione.

Francesco Paolo di Teodoro.

Serie 1: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografica 503. Florence: Olschki, 2020. xii + 72 pp. €23.

Unlike his contemporaries Leonardo and Michelangelo, Raphael wrote very little. What survives does not boast the same breadth or facility that we often associate with the artist's counterparts. It is this relative poverty that makes the so-called Letter of Leo X so exceptional and important. Composed in collaboration with Baldassarre Castiglione, the letter represents a humanistic thesis on the reconstruction of Rome's ancient landscape. The latest entry in the study of this significant work, Francesco Paolo di Teodoro's *Lettera a Leone X di Raffaello e Baldassarre Castiglione* is the synthesis of decades of extensive and original research: combining scrupulous paleographic analysis with lucid historical discussion, the volume offers a fresh and accessible reading of the letter's rich intellectual strata.

Beginning with his doctoral dissertation, di Teodoro has distinguished himself as a prolific authority on the letter's history and interpretation. His 1994 publication represents the first critical edition of the letter and its witnesses; a second edition, which

appeared in 2003, includes an updated bibliography and new essays on the letter's relationship to Vitruvius and Alberti. Shorter and more general in its scope, the present volume opens this history to the wider public, although it makes no sacrifice of scholarly rigor. It also enters into this analysis an important new document. In 2015, di Teodoro recovered another version of the letter from a private archive in Mantua. Probably prepared in 1583 or 1584 from a lost intermediary, this witness is likely the one cited by Bernardino Marliani, who was commissioned by Castiglione's son Camillo to rehabilitate his father's reputation. The author's meticulous assessment of this and other documents paints a compelling picture of the letter's genesis: whereas John Shearman posited that initial drafts were penned around 1516, di Teodoro persuasively dates this work to autumn of 1519—an opinion shared by Christof Thoenes. Notably, the earliest version of the letter, the autograph in Mantua's State Archives, is reproduced in high-resolution color.

Most of the volume, which takes the form of an extended essay, focuses on the sources that shaped the letter's structure and its contents. As it was originally conceived, the letter served as a preface to Raphael's drawing of ancient Rome. Since this project does not survive, the letter represents the most compelling testimony of Raphael's approach to architectural drawing and the reconstruction of ruins. To situate these themes, di Teodoro begins with the missive of the Venetian Marcantonio Michiel, a rare eyewitness account, which lends valuable context for framing the letter's place in the reception of antiquity. It also supplies a tantalizing detail, that one of the regions of Rome was "finished" before the artist's death, although, as di Teodoro notes, the language here is open to speculation (10). In what follows, di Teodoro surveys the humanist literature that informed the letter's substance and readership, from Ptolemy, to Poggio Bracciolini, to Pietro Bembo. Recognizing that the letter belongs to the tradition of archaeological compendia, he suggests that Raphael's pursuit of Roman antiquity was both material and literary. In the artist's own words, his expertise was justified because he diligently searched for artifacts and compared his discoveries with the writings of ancient authors. The letter, di Teodoro maintains, is not only a sophisticated architectural treatise but also a humanistic celebration of the papacy, as the riptide of Luther's Reformation drew near.

For all of its literary richness, the letter also raises important questions about the conventions of architectural drawing, and di Teodoro attends in particular to the "three modes" recommended by the text—plan, section, and elevation—arguing that this system, reminiscent of Vitruvius, enabled the artist to "draw like the ancient Romans" (35–37). It is the description of orthogonal projection, moreover, that di Teodoro connects to the intellectual legacy of Piero della Francesca and the perspectival grid. As the author shows, this intersection of media belongs, on the one hand, to a long cultural discourse; on the other, it gestures to the emergence of new strategies of representation. Indeed, the relationship of drawing to antiquity, and of architecture to

painting, is enjoying a flourish of academic interest, including recent studies by Alina Payne, Sabine Frommel, Cammy Brothers, and Mari Yoko Hara.

Both handsome and timely, the volume rewards close reading; it includes a precious gold mine of references to ancient and early modern sources, which will appeal to seasoned scholars and recent initiates alike. In the present context especially, a book like di Teodoro's fills an important gap. The current pandemic has upended many planned celebrations of Raphael's life and career, not the least of which was the quincentenary exhibition at the Scuderie del Quirinale, where an entire room was dedicated to the letter and its contexts. Di Teodoro's volume is a welcome commemoration of the artist's legacy, inviting fresh consideration of the words, images, and conversations that once brought Raphael's Rome to life.

Tracy Cosgriff, *The College of Wooster*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.217

Van Dyck's Hosts in Genoa: Lucas and Cornelis de Wael's Lives, Business Activities and Works. Alison Stoesser.

2 vols. Pictura Nova 19. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018. 1,024 pp. €250.

The export of massive quantities of Dutch and Flemish painting in the seventeenth century, to cities extending from Stockholm to Cuzco, depended not only on highly organized artists' workshops but also on networks of dealers, collectors, and connoisseurs. These middlemen (and in many cases, middlewomen) have received greater academic attention in recent years, as scholarship in the field has begun to shift its focus from the monographic study of elite artists to broader questions of the marketplace, network theory, and globalization. The work of economic historians John Michael Montias, Hans Van Miegroet, Neil de Marchi, and Filip Vermeylen has provided a broad panorama of early modern art markets, increasingly supplemented by accounts of individual market actors. A 2011 anthology edited by Marika Koblusek and Badeloch Noldus offered an important series of case studies of early modern "cultural brokerage." Individual dealers have now received their own monographic treatments, such as Christina Marie Anderson's 2015 study of the Venice-based merchant Daniel Nijs. The work under consideration here, Alison Stoesser's study of Lucas and Cornelis de Wael—Flemish brothers who combined the roles of artists and dealers in Antwerp, Genoa, and Rome—contributes an impressive amount of archival research to this ongoing trend.

The De Wael brothers owe what little attention they have received in the past to their immortalization in one of Anthony van Dyck's most celebrated portraits, painted as a testament of gratitude to his Genoese hosts. Here the stout, mustachioed siblings appear in poses of winning nonchalance, mingling raffishness and affection. Stoesser's choice of title reveals the ineluctability of Van Dyck's portrait in any discussion of the