

## CASTIGLIONE'S PORTRAIT OF RAPHAEL

by John Shearman

The purpose of this paper is to re-examine, reattribute, and reinterpret a document which has become absolutely central to our understanding of Raphael, a document which stands practically alone in providing evidence of Raphael's culture.<sup>1</sup> It is the letter that was presented by Lodovico Dolce in 1554 as written by Raphael to Baldassare Castiglione.<sup>2</sup> Among all the documents to do with Raphael, this one probably has the longest bibliography, and certainly the most interesting one. After reprinting and re-editing by Dolce himself in 1559, and by Bernardino Pino in 1574 and 1582 (always attributed to Raphael), it has repeatedly been anthologized.<sup>3</sup> Its critical history begins c. 1610-15 with Monsignore Giovanni Battista Agucchi, who clearly borrowed its phrasing in a discussion of ideal beauty.<sup>4</sup> And it continued with Giovanni Pietro Bellori's lecture to the Roman Academy, *L'Idea* of 1664, with the Jonathan Richardsons' *Essay* of 1715 and their *Traité* of 1728, and with Johann Joachim Winckelmann's *Gedanken* of 1755 and his *Anmerkungen* of 1767.<sup>5</sup> After that intellectual tradition was exhausted the letter had renewed significance for the German Romantics, first in the opening essay, *Raphaels Erscheinung*, of Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder's *Herzensergießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders* (1796), and then in Wilhelm von Schlegel's somewhat critical review of Wackenroder's fantasy, and in Johann Gottfried Herder's poem *Das Bild der Andacht*.<sup>6</sup>

In this century the letter was accorded a position of anomalous and curiously trivialized prominence in Erwin Panofsky's *Idea* of 1924. And in Fritz Ertl's dissertation of 1933, still the most serious study of literary relations between Raphael and Castiglione, we have the point succinctly put: "Der Brief aber ist vom künstlerischen Standpunkt aus unstreitig das berühmteste erhalten gebliebene Dokument des Urbinaten; denn es enthält Äußerungen nicht nur über Arbeiten seines eigenen Bleistifts und Pinsels, sondern auch über seine echt antike Auffassung vom Problem der Schönheit."<sup>7</sup> How can we do without such a paragon of a document? How could Ernst Gombrich do without it when called upon in 1983 to deliver the quincennial address on the Capitol in Rome?<sup>8</sup> Should we simply ignore, as most do (but not Gombrich, in this instance), the doubts that have been cast upon it? Those doubts began in 1841 with Gasparoni, who said it had either to be apocryphal, or rewritten by "qualche letterato". That last thought was then developed by Crowe and Cavalcaselle in 1885 in a passage of remarkable criticism from which one cannot come away complacent. And in 1919 Wanscher roundly denounced it as a forgery.<sup>9</sup>

I have the impression that the general disregard of Dolce's first edition of the text (1554), and the customary citation, from Bellori to Golzio and beyond, of the second edition (1559), or even of the third and fourth, has deflected criticism of the document. For in his second edition Dolce suppressed some very striking orthographic idiosyncrasies, including one that had militated against his own spelling in his superposed *Argomento*, in favour of conventions which broadly respect the teaching — the Tuscanizing — of Pietro Bembo. Dolce revered Bembo's example.<sup>10</sup> Clearly, since Dolce was an experienced and activist editor, some question must remain even about the first text that he published; yet it must have more authority (in all senses of the word) than the second one, and in the absence of a manuscript tradition it must be the prime object of study. It is an absurd paradox that the *berühmteste Dokument* has generally not been read. I repeat it here as similarly as I can.<sup>11</sup>



## AI LETTORI, LODOVICO DOLCE

NON essendo arte veruna di nobiltà piu vicina alle lettere, di quello ch'è la Pittura, nel mezo di questi huomini per altezza d'ingegno e di dottrina Illustri, ci è paruto mettere alcune Lettere di tre chiarissimi lumi della Pittura, Michele Agnolo, Rafaello d'Vrbino, e Titiano Vecellio, acciò che si vegga, quanto oltre all'eccellenza dell'arte loro, nella quale è da credere, che essi in questo nostro seculo, habbiano vinto gliantichi, sarebbono anco riusciti mirabili in quella della penna, se havessero o voluto, o potuto porvi cura.

[publishes Michelangelo's letter to Pietro Aretino, undated, acknowledging (ironically) his advice on how to paint the *Last Judgement*]

LETTERA DI M.  
RAFAELLO DA VRBINO  
PITTORE ET ARCHITETTO

\*

ARGOMENTO

Manda al Conte alcuni disegni, scrive della cura datagli dal Papa, e mostra quanto facesse stima del suo giudizio.

AL CONTE BALDASAR CASTIGLIONE

SIGNOR Conte. Ho fatto disegni in piu maniere, sopra l'inventione di V. S. E sadisfaccio a tutti, se tutti non mi sono adulatori; ma non satisfaccio al mio giudicio, perche temo di non satisfare al vostro. Ve gli mando. V. S. faccia eletta d'alcuno, se alcuno sarà da lei stimato degno. Nostro Signore con l'honorarmi, m'ha messo un gran peso sopra le spalle. Questo è la cura della fabrica di S. Pietro. Spero bene di non cadervici sotto: & tanto più, quanto il modello, ch'io n'ho fatto, piace a S. S. & è lodato da molti belli ingegni. Ma io mi levo col pensiero piu alto. Vorrei trovarle belle forme de gliedifici antichi; ne so, se il volo sarà d'Icaro. Me ne porge una gran luce Vitruvio: ma non tanto, che basti. Della Galatea mi terrei un gran maestro, se vi fossero la metà delle tante cose, che V. S. mi scrive. Ma nelle sue parole riconosco l'amore, che mi porta: & le dico, che per dipingere una bella, mi bisognaria veder piu belle, con questa conditione, che V. S. si trovasse meco a far scelta del meglio. Ma essendo carestia, e de' buoni giudicij, e di belle donne, io mi servo di certa Idea, che mi viene nella mente. Se questa ha in se alcuna eccellenza d'arte, io non so: ben m'affatico di haverla. V. S. mi comandi. Di Roma.

This enquiry has its roots in a broader examination of cultural relations between Raphael and Castiglione, which must be restricted here to literary relations. An understanding of the letter, *Signor Conte*, may only be reached within this larger understanding where, in any case, there is much that is in fact not familiar. *Signor Conte* shares this broader heuristic field with the so-called *Letter to Leo X*, a scarcely less important or less problematic text. They will be treated, so far as possible, as free-standing problems here — both, as it were, *sub iudice*. Both letters tend to be read in a haze of myth and sentiment which, I think, needs to be dispelled, or at least acknowledged for what it is, a useful convention unsupported by any evidence. As an example of what I find unbelievable there is Vittorio Cian's opinion, to which I suppose many implicitly subscribe, that Castiglione "dovette tenersi lusingato di diventare interprete fedele del grande pittore e, in certo modo, suo segretario. Un segretario veramente a secretis [...] ufficio da lui compiuto di modesto collaboratore."<sup>12</sup> That is not the personality I find in the letters and other manuscripts of Castiglione, and it is not the one described by his biographer, Antonio Beffa Negrini.<sup>13</sup> Further, a reading of the manuscripts



suggests that the last thing one should expect of any extensive text drafted by Castiglione, like the *Letter to Leo X*, is that it would be evolved in a short period; and the first draft in Castiglione's hand indeed suggests that it alone was composed and revised in diverse times and moods, and that its material comes to him in different ways, much of it from his own inspiration.

In the early twenties, before his final departure from Rome, Castiglione kept in Mantua (or at the family estate nearby, Casatico), his portrait — probably the one now in Paris — and the *Holy Family* inherited from Bibbiena, and also some manuscripts, including papers of Raphael's.<sup>14</sup> It would be of the highest interest to know what they were and how he got them. All we know so far is that on 13 August 1522 Francesco Maria della Rovere, Duke of Urbino, wrote to Castiglione in Rome asking him to send Raphael's letter "dove el describe la casa che fa edificare monsignor R.mo de Medici" (that is, Villa Madama). Castiglione acknowledged that he had it, but had no copy in Rome, "perche mi restò a Mantua con molte altre cose mie"; Francesco Maria, he thought, should be able to get a copy from Raphael's cousin Don Girolamo Vagnini, at that moment on his way to Urbino.<sup>15</sup> The implication of the remark, "il quale estimo che abbia copia di essa lettera", seems to be that Don Girolamo had (not unnaturally) inherited the literary *Nachlaß*.

Why, then, did Castiglione have the text of Raphael's letter at Mantua? It is germane to this question that Castiglione seems to have had information about Villa Madama that is not recorded in any document known today. For Luigi Pungileoni, who published the letter to Francesco Maria, knew another unpublished letter of Castiglione's, so far as I know still untraced, which can scarcely be the same, and which has not been taken into account in recent literature on Villa Madama: "Da lettera inedita di Baldassar Castiglione", wrote Pungileoni, "con più certezza apprendiamo, che il primo schizzo [for Villa Madama] si debbe attribuire a Raffaello, ed a Giulio l'esecuzione della fabbrica e gli abbellimenti in pittura, toltine i grotteschi di Giovanni da Udine."<sup>16</sup> But to keep with the documents we have. It has been said that Raphael's letter was addressed to Castiglione himself, who was in fact absent from Rome at the probable date of its composition, in the first months of 1519.<sup>17</sup> But the recipient is *Vostra Signoria* — alas, a term that could be used of almost anybody, including a woman — and its very lack of specificity should make one include, among possibilities, nobody in particular. In other words, because it is an epistolary exercise imitating Pliny's architectural *ekphrasis* (*Epistolae* II.xvii and V.vi), a *Kunstbrief* and not a news-bulletin, its very form requires an apostrophe to some second person, without there being the need of a true correspondent.

In the letter on Villa Madama the condescending explanations like "dyeta ... che così la chiamano li antiqui" could not, I think, be addressed by a close friend to Castiglione, who had probably been reading Vitruvius for longer than had Raphael.<sup>18</sup> It has been suggested that Andrea Fulvio or Fabio Calvo collaborated on the text we have, collaboration for which I can see little justification or necessity.<sup>19</sup> The text is not fluently or stylishly written; in fact it sometimes borders on incoherence, and it reads like a thought of luminous clarity, the organizational clarity of a great architect, expressed with a stutter. Nor is it literary in a sense that exceeds a knowledge of (as it were) professional sources — Columella, for example — which Raphael had to have mastered before he could design the villa. It is to be remembered that there remains nothing of Raphael's own composing that was written since almost five years before, nothing to give us a measure of his epistolary style since the letter to Simone Ciarla of 1 July 1514, after which one could reasonably expect some improvement.<sup>20</sup> Castiglione, in his reply to Francesco Maria in 1522, implicitly concurs with the latter's attribution to Raphael of the letter on Villa Madama, but, of course, courtesy could have prevented a correction had one been due. That the letter, in the version we have, was



not polished by Castiglione is painfully clear. But it remains worth reflection that such an intention would explain why the original was among his papers in Mantua.

Raphael's name appears four times in the definitive Aldine edition of the *Cortegiano*, 1528, as is well known. But since the dialogue's text went through many revisions — perhaps eight can now be distinguished — after the first draft of about 1508, it is of the highest interest to establish when each of the four passages was introduced. None of them has a place in the fragments of the first draft, divided between Palazzo Castiglione in Mantua and the first of the Valenti Gonzaga (ex-Castiglione) manuscripts, now Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms. Vat. Lat. 8204.

Since this section, and the last, on the letter *Signor Conte*, will make frequent reference to the Valenti Gonzaga manuscripts, and also to the one in the Biblioteca Laurenziana prepared for the Aldine press, it will save much time and space to have at hand a schematic catalogue. Initially I adopt the alphabetic reference which Vittorio Cian and Ghino Ghinassi have made standard:<sup>21</sup>

- A: first draft of *Cortegiano*, autograph by Castiglione, c. 1508-1509, fragments divided between Castiglione family archive in Mantua and BAV 8204.<sup>22</sup>
- B: BAV 8204, some pages of A retained, mostly revised pages in the hand of an amanuensis, c. 1513.<sup>23</sup>
- B<sup>''</sup>: Castiglione's corrections and additions to B, c. 1515-16.<sup>24</sup>
- C: BAV 8205, third draft, by several amanuenses, one Tuscanizing, 1516 ff.
- C<sup>''</sup>: Castiglione's corrections and additions to C, 1516 ff., and more submitted by Bembo and others, 1518-19.<sup>25</sup>
- D: BAV 8206, fair-copy of C and C<sup>''</sup>.
- D<sup>''</sup>: Castiglione's corrections and additions to D, c. 1520-21.<sup>26</sup>
- EL: Bibl. Med. Laur., Ms. Ashburnham 409, the fair-copy prepared for the printer. Colophon: *In Roma in Borgo adi / xxviii di Maggio / MD.xxiii*.<sup>27</sup>
- EL<sup>''</sup>: Castiglione's revisions to EL, 1524 ff.
- F: BAV 8207: *Copialettere*, Castiglione to Mantuan chancery, 1521-22.
- G: BAV 8208: *Copialettere* of Castiglione, 1522-23.
- H: BAV 8209: *Copialettere* of Castiglione, 1524-26.
- I: BAV 8210: *Copialettere*, Castiglione mostly to family, 1499-1513, 1519-24.
- J: BAV 8211: letters to Castiglione, 1513 ff.
- K: BAV 8212: letters to family, not from Castiglione, arranged alphabetically.

Subsequent references to these manuscripts will give Letter and folio, as for example B<sup>''</sup> 35v, which is BAV, Ms. Vat. Lat. 8204, fol. 35v.<sup>28</sup> My editing of the texts will be confined to introducing modern capitalization and diacriticals, and minimal changes to punctuation.

The four passages in the *Cortegiano* referring to Raphael each have different histories. The first (to take them in their order in the 1528 edition) comes in the dedicatory epistle addressed to Don Michel de Silva: "mandovi questo libro, come un ritratto di pittura della Corte d'Urbino, non di mano di Raphaello, o Michel'Angelo, ma di pittor ignobile, & che solamente sappia tirare le linee principali, senza adornar la verità de vaghi colori, o far parer per arte di prospettiva quello che non è."<sup>29</sup> This is the least interesting of the four passages — the use of the Ciceronian metaphor, the 'portrait of past time', will concern us, but the choice of names, while sincere, is not very revealing — and it is also the latest; like the whole dedication, composed in Spain in 1527, it is missing from the manuscripts.<sup>30</sup>



The second passage occurs in Lodovico Canossa's Ciceronian defence of variety, in musicians and artists as in writers. This passage is missing from B, and makes its appearance at C 46v-47r, that is, about 1516: "[il Conte:] ... varie cose anchor' ugualmente piaciono agliocchi nostri: tanto che difficilmente iudicar si può, quai più gli siano grate. Eccovi che nella pittura sono excellentissimi, Leonardo Vincio: el Mantegna: Raphaello: Michelangelo: Giorgio Castel Franco; nientedimeno tutti sono tra sé nel fare dissimili, di modo che ad alcuno di loro non pare che manchi cosa alcuna in quella maniera: perché si cognosce ciascuno nel suo stile essere perfectissimo ..." Subsequent development of this passage is minimal, except stylistically.<sup>31</sup>

The third passage is the most important. It occurs in the long *paragone* of painting and sculpture debated between Canossa and Gian Cristoforo Romano. In B 81r (c. 1513) the *paragone* is extremely cursory: "[il Conte:] ... benché diversa sia la pittura dalla statuaria, pur l'una et l'altra da un medemo fonte, che è il buon disegno, nascono; però come le statue sono divine, così anchora credere si può che le pitture fossero, et tanto più quanto che\* di maggiore artificio capaci sono, et maxime per la varietà de gli colori; per le cose scritte, anchor se conoscono alcune scintille de l'opere de gli excellenti pittori, et intendesti quanto fossero appresso gran Signori et Republiche sempre honorati, però si legge che Alexandro ..." (then follows the story of Alexander, Campaspe, and Apelles).

In B" (c. 1515-16) a drastic revision is made: the sentence is truncated at the point \* above (and that first part survives little changed in 1528), but then two folios, with three sides of new text, are inserted with the essential parts of the final argument clearly laid out, except that crucial names are missing: "... di maggiore artificio capaci sono, et come più capaci d'artificio'. Rispose messer [blank \*\*]: 'non credeti voi che la statuaria sia, et di più fatica et di più arte, et dignità, che non è la pittura?' 'Non credo io già', rispose il Conte, 'excetto che per essere le statue più durabili si potria forse dire che fossero di più dignità, per ché essendo fatte per memoria satisfanno più a quello effetto per che son fatte che la pittura; ma oltre alla memoria sono anchor et la pittura, et la statuaria, fatte per ornare, et in questo la pittura è molto superiore, la quale se non è tanto diuturna come la statuaria, è però molto longeva, per dir così, e tanto che dura è assai più vaga.' Rispose allhor messer [blank \*\*]: \*\*\* 'Parmi che l'una et l'altra sia una artificiosa imitatione di Natura, ma non so come potiate dire che più non sia imitato il vero, e quello proprio che fa la Natura, in una figura di marmo, et di bronzo, nella quale sono le membra tutte tonde formate et misurate come la Natura le fa, che in una tavola, nella quale non si vede altro che la superficie, et quegli colori che ingannano gliocchi; né mi direte già che più propinquo al vero non sia lo essere che lo apparere. Estimo poi che la marmoraria sia più difficile, per ché se un errore vi vien fatto non si può più correggere, ché'l marmo non si ritacca, ma bisogna riffare un'altra figura<sup>32</sup>, il che nella pittura non accade, che mille volte si può mutare et giongervi et sminuirvi, migliorandola sempre'. Disse il Conte: 'Voi\*\*\*\* dite vero che et l'una et l'altra è imitatione della Natura, ma non è già così che la pittura appaia, et la statuaria sia, che avegna che le statue siano tutte tonde come il vivo, et la pittura solo si vedda in superficie. Alle statue mancano molte cose che non mancano alle pitture, et maximamente i lumi, et l'ombra, per ché altro lume fa la carne et altro fa il marmo, et questo naturalmente imita il Pittore al [autograph corr. to: col] chiaro et scuro, più et meno secondo il bisogno, il che non può fare il marmorario; et se bene il Pittore non fa la figura tonda, fa quelli muscoli et membri tondeggianti di sorte che vanno a ritrovare quelle parti che non si veggono con tal maniera che benissimo comprendere si può che'l Pittore anchor quelle conosce et intende; et a questo bisogna un'altro artificio maggiore in fare quelle membra che scortano et diminuiscano a proportion della vista con ragione di prospettiva, la quale per forza di linee misurate et di colori et di lumi et d'ombre vi mostra anchora in una superficie di muro



dritto il piano et il lontano, più et meno come gli piace. Parvi poi che di poco momento sia la imitatione de gli colori naturali in contrafare le carni, gli panni et tutte l'altre cose conserale [autograph corr. to: colorate]? Questo fare non può già il Marmorario, né meno esprimere la gratiosa vista de gliocchi negri o azurri, col splendore di quelli raggi amorosi; non può mostrare il colore de' capelli flavi o biondi, non il splendore dell'arme, non una oscura notte, non una tempestate di mare con quelli lampi et saette, non lo incendio d'una città, non il nascere dell'Aurora di color di rose con quelli raggi d'oro et di porpora che illustrino il mondo et allegrano ogni cor humano; non può in somma mostrare il Cielo, il Mare, la Terra, monti, selve, prati, giardini, fiumi, città, case, il che tutto fa il Pittore. Per questo parmi la pittura più degna et capace d'artificio che la marmoraria; et penso che appresso gli antichi fosse di suprema excellentia come l'altre cose, il che si conosce anchor per alcune piccole reliquie che restano, maximamente nelle grotte di Roma. Ma molto più chiaramente si può compre[n]dere per gli scritti antichi, ne gli quali sono tante honorate, et frequenti mentioni, et delloperare et di maestri; et per quelli intendesi quanto fossero appresso gran Signori et republiche sempre honorati. Però ..."<sup>33</sup>

This long interpolation is incorporated into C 63r-64r, but at that point (1516 +) "Io Christoforo Romano" is identified at the two blanks \*\*, and there is a new passage inserted at \*\*\*: "Credo io [Gian Cristoforo] veramente che voi [Canossa] parliate contra quello che avete in animo, et ciò tutto fate in gratia del vostro Raphaello; et forse anchor parvi che la excellentia che voi cognoscete in esso della pittura sia tanto suprema che la marmoria non possi giognere a quel grado. Ma considerate che questa è laude di uno artefice, et non dell'arte; né difetto è della marmoria se in essa non se ritrova così eccellente mastro come è Raphaello nella pittura.' Doppoi soggiunse: 'a me pare bene che l'una et l'altra sia una artificiosa imitatione di Natura: ...'"

Finally, in C" (1516 +, 1518-19), at \*\*\*\*, in another marginal addition, Canossa answers Gian Cristoforo's point: "[Disse el Conte ... ridendo]: 'io non parlo in gratia di Raphaello. Né mi dovete già riputare per tanto ignorante che non conosca la excellentia vostra nela marmoraria; ma io parlo de l'arte e non de li artefici, e voi bene dite vero che l'una et l'altra è imitatione della Natura ...'" This structure survives, with minor changes that do not concern us here, through to the printed text.<sup>34</sup> To summarize: Raphael is given the rôle of paragon of Painting, in an argument complete without him in its version of about 1513, and it happens in two stages, in about 1516 and in 1518-19; and at both those points he is represented as Canossa's protégé.<sup>35</sup>

The presentation of Raphael as 'Canossa's' — *il vostro Raffaello* — must have a certain verisimilitude, yet it is ambiguous. For in the cut-and-thrust of the dialogue Canossa's is the voice of Castiglione himself, just as Fregoso's is the voice of Pietro Bembo. So far as we can tell the shaping of the first draft (Ms. A) into the first redaction of the dialogue began in the fragmentary and composite Ms. B at about the time when Castiglione first settled in Rome, late February through July 1513, as agent of Francesco Maria della Rovere. The first surviving letter to him, during this residence, from his mother, 1 May 1513 (J 200v), gives his address: "In Roma In Borgo in casa del R.do Messer Ludovico da Canossa Veschovo di Tricharico", and Francesco Maria uses the same when writing to him on 30 June (J 511v). There develops a close friendship between these self-conscious Lombards, in fact distant cousins, a friendship which has literary and artistic aspects: Canossa carried a manuscript of the *Cortegiano* from Mantua to Rome in August 1518 (probably Ms. C), and the drawing for Francesco Gonzaga's tomb from Rome to Mantua in June 1519, and conversely Castiglione looked after the arrival in Lombardy of Canossa's *quadro*, probably Raphael's *La Perla*, in May 1520.<sup>36</sup> If we try to decode the voices in the *Cortegiano*, so as to transfer *il vostro Raffaello* from Canossa back to Castiglione himself, that may be to separate the two *fautori* unnecessarily.



The fourth passage in the *Cortegiano* in which Raphael is protagonist is the one most difficult to appreciate today, for it appears among those tiresome and often seemingly tasteless examples of wit (*arguti motti*) in Book II; indeed this one was a little ruder when it first appeared in the manuscripts. It was at the latest c. 1516+, when Raphael was first introduced into Canossa's *paragone*, that he was also enlisted to produce an *arguto motto*, at C 149r: "Di questo modo rispose anchora Raphaello pittore a dui Cardinali, gli quali, come ignoranti della pittura, tassavano in presentia sua una tavola che egli havea fatta, dove erano un San Piero et un San Paulo, dicendo che quelle due figure erano troppo rosse in viso. Alhor Raphael [*sic*] subito disse: 'Signori non vi maravigliate che io questo ho fatto a sommo studio, perché e da credere che San Piero e San Paulo siano come qui gli vedete, anchor in paradiso, così rossi, per vergogna che la chiesa sua sia governata da tali Homini come sete voi.'" <sup>37</sup> In the early 1520s, at D" clxxxvii v, the "dui Cardinali ... ignoranti della pittura" are changed to "dui Cardinali ... soi domestici", which is how they remain in the Aldine edition. <sup>38</sup> The sudden access of tact, after Raphael's death, is perhaps the only convincing reason for reading this story as grounded in the reality of Raphael's life. <sup>39</sup> Much ingenuity has been misspent in identifying the pictures of Saints Peter and Paul in question; to me it seems more likely that the *tavola* was Castiglione's fiction. <sup>40</sup> In either case it is a curiously unidealized picture he gives of a courtier-painter.

We have seen that Castiglione calls his memoir of the court of Urbino a *ritratto di pittura*, and that with extravagant modesty he says it will lack the qualities of one by Raphael or Michelangelo. <sup>41</sup> The literary portrait is a topos, of course; the great model may be in Lucian's *Eikones*, the mock-modesty of Lycinus whose word-portrait cannot succeed where even Apelles, Zeuxis, or Parrhasius might fail. <sup>42</sup> The *Eikones* was certainly the model for a sustained imitation by Giangiorgio Trissino, *I Ritratti*, finished in March 1514 and published in Rome in 1524; here, in a dialogue, Vincenzo Macrè praises the *cose di fuori, cioè la effigie*, of Isabella d'Este, and Pietro Bembo undertakes the literary portrait of the inner person, *uno ritratto de l'anima*. <sup>43</sup> But these are descriptions. A different kind of portrait, the moral portrait of Laura, is signalled by Trissino's calling Petrarch *il nobilissimo di tutti e pittori*, which is a graceful return on Petrarch's having called Homer the first of painters. <sup>44</sup> The metaphor of the poetic character-portrait is the basis of innumerable claims in the Renaissance that painting is unable to compete with poetry, "mores animumque effingere", in Martial's formulation. <sup>45</sup> And it is the basis of the first quatrain of Tebaldeo's sonnet, probably of 1516, thanking Raphael for his painted portrait: "If, Raphael, excellence had been granted to my writing equal to yours in painting, you would see your likeness described by me no less than is mine by you"; in the second quatrain he reverts to the poets' almost incurable habit of saying that words are more durable than pictures. <sup>46</sup> And when in April 1520 Tebaldeo addressed his sonnet to Castiglione, begging him to immortalize the now dead Raphael, he comes back to the same two points; but this time he thinks, naturally, of Raphael making Castiglione's portrait, and of Castiglione making Raphael's: "If he expended paint for you, and you expend ink for him, although his works have an end, they can be eternal under the protection of your writing." <sup>47</sup> Tebaldeo must then have seen the result, the lament *Quod lacerum*, as Castiglione's reciprocal portrait of Raphael, conferring immortality; indeed, they must both have seen it so. <sup>48</sup>

Letters are also portraits, *animorum imagines* in Giovanni Pico's beautiful phrase. He was writing to Paolo Cortese about letters in general, and compared their scope with that of portraits: "The difference between a portrait and a letter seems to me this", he wrote: "the former portrays the body, the latter the mind; the one describes externals, the other expresses and portrays the inner person; the one represents to us, as it were, the tunic and robe of



the friend, the other the real friend; the one imitates (so far as possible) the likeness and the colours of flesh, the other the thoughts, the advice, the sorrows, the joys, the cares, and finally every mood. And it speaks almost as if present, and transmits faithfully the secrets of the soul to the absent friend. In sum, the letter is an alive and efficacious likeness, the portrait is as if dead and dumb. Let us therefore exchange these portraits of the mind."<sup>49</sup> Pico rests his case on Martial's, perhaps — in any case on a topos which Castiglione had plainly abandoned when he wrote about Raphael's painted portrait of himself in the *Elegy* of 1519.<sup>50</sup>

Now to the so-called letter from Raphael to Castiglione. Since I do not think that that is a proper title for it, I shall refer to it as *Signor Conte*. As it happens the Conte is not named in the letter (except by Ludovico Dolce, its first editor), and it has been a temptation to think of the Conte of the *Cortegiano*, that is, Canossa, but that seems an unfruitful scepticism, and I think Dolce was right. Castiglione was Count of Novellara from September 1513.<sup>51</sup> The date of composition must be later than that, since reference is made to Raphael's recent appointment as architect of Saint Peter's, an event of Spring or Summer 1514.

Why is *Signor Conte* not what it seems to be, a letter from Raphael of about that date? Why may we not take it at face value? It seems a sound principle that whenever we wish to interpret a text (or a work of art) complexly, the burden of proof is first upon us to prove that a straightforward reading will not do. I think that procedure is mandatory here, and that it can be carried through.

The letter — in the mode defined by Cicero as *familiare et iocosum* — purports to exchange pleasantries, concepts, and thanks, and it contains but one news-item: "Nostro Signore con l'honorarmi, m'ha messo un gran peso sopra le spalle. Questo è la cura della fabrica di S. Pietro. Spero bene di non cadervici sotto: & tanto più, quanto il modello, ch'io n'ho fatto, piace a S. S. & è lodato da molti belli ingegni."<sup>52</sup> This honour was made official (and public) in a Papal Brief of 1 August 1514; but it was being discussed earlier in the Summer, and must have been known to Raphael's friends since April.<sup>53</sup> Bramante had died on 12 March 1514. But Castiglione was continuously in Rome from January 1514 until at least 17 August, and probably later, so that he simply did not need to be told this news in a letter: not before he left the city, nor afterwards.<sup>54</sup> We know, from the correspondence on Isabella's *quadretto*, what we would in any case have guessed, that Raphael writes to Castiglione when he himself is in Rome and Castiglione is somewhere else. The redundancy of the news-item is proof — I think rather convincing proof — that the letter is *not* straightforwardly what it pretends to be. To the extent that this may be agreed, the point also removes from further consideration the many readings of it which propose that the letter is genuine in its content, but that its prose-style may be attributed to someone else.

These earlier discussions of attribution, however, need to be looked at, critically, because it is seldom that an argument can be trusted that rests on a single point. The problem of attribution has arisen because of the profound gulf that separates the manner of *Signor Conte* from that of Raphael's letter to his uncle Simone Ciarla, dated 1 July 1514. The contrasts of literary competence as well as of syntax and vocabulary are inescapable to any critical reader, and one would like to be able to say that they cannot be ignored; experience, however, shows otherwise. But we might begin again with Gasparoni who, in 1841, was very explicit about the problem. He said that *Signor Conte* was either apocryphal or re-written for Raphael by "qualche letterato" such as Fra Giocondo.<sup>55</sup> This position was restated by Gaetano Guasti in his notes to the Italian edition (1882) of Passavant's monograph, and it must be significant that, once again, neither Passavant nor Guasti was reading the first text of 1554,



but Pino's of 1582, where the idiosyncracies of language had been ironed out.<sup>56</sup> In the same year Crowe and Cavalcaselle — one supposes particularly Cavalcaselle in this case — subjected the text to more searching and more sensitive criticism, and came out with the same conclusion, except that they recommended Pietro Aretino as the literate friend.<sup>57</sup> It is notable that, discussing matters of language, they thought the letter was expressed 'in Tuscan' — they, too, were reading Pino's text — and so Aretino was a sensible suggestion; moreover they quite rightly cited Dolce's dialogue *L'Aretino* as evidence for Aretino's claimed intimacy with Raphael.<sup>58</sup>

The attribution to Aretino has had a lot of success. It should be said, however, that a careful scholar of the same years whom few now read, Marco Minghetti, who may have been the first to notice the *Urtext* of the 1554 edition, was also struck by the contrast with the letter to Simone Ciarla, but formulated the problem in a logically different way which allows once more Gasparoni's radical thought: *if* the letter to Castiglione is to be held to be authentic, he said, it is necessary to suppose either that Raphael, writing to *il Conte*, took more care, or that he took help from a friend, about whose identity Minghetti declined to speculate.<sup>59</sup> Such scruple was rare, however, and more typical, more influential, was Adolfo Venturi, who ignored Dolce's first edition, and gave disastrous currency as if it were fact to a mistranslation in the Italian edition of Crowe and Cavalcaselle: "la minuta", wrote Venturi, "fu ritrovata dal Pino, e da lui pubblicata nel 1582, tra le lettere dell'Aretino, il che ha lasciato supporre che l'Aretino stesso la dettasse per Raffaello."<sup>60</sup> Thus did an intelligent speculation masquerade as factual, and this situation has continued, long after it has been shown that the hypothesis cannot possibly be correct. For Vittorio Cian, in a rather famous article of 1942, *Nel mondo di Baldassare Castiglioni*, subscribing to the view that Raphael needed some *letterato*, pointed out however that Aretino, "allora presso che oscuro", did not arrive in Rome until some years after the ostensible date (1514) of *Signor Conte*.<sup>61</sup> The demolition was scarcely noticed, and Aretino's identity as the hypothetical *letterato* has been repeated by several scholars to this day.<sup>62</sup>

There have been other ideas put forward. Cian himself thought Bembo, Navagero, or Beazzano plausible candidates. Eugenio Battisti, in his important study of Imitation, asserted that the substance of the letter was Raphael's, but that the *veste letteraria* was provided perhaps by Lodovico Dolce (who would have been about six in 1514), while Adriano Prandi, making the same assumption of Raphael's responsibility, thought that it was perhaps written for Raphael by Castiglione (that is, at the imputed date c. 1514, to send to himself).<sup>63</sup> Andrea Emiliani has had a more subtle and, I think, more observant thought, that the problematic letter was *distesa* for Raphael by (again) "qualche amico come il Bembo o il Navagero"; but the letter, he says, "è importante proprio perché affronta la più che famosa questione dell'Idea, e colloca il problema ben dentro le poetiche del neoplatonismo".<sup>64</sup> This formulation touches an important truth, one which undermines the validity of all those half-engaged solutions which would have the matter Raphael's but the style someone else's. For the fact is that the matter is just as literary, humanistic, poetic, as is the style — or, to put the point another way, the intellectual profile of its author is as different from Raphael's (as we know it from the letter to Simone Ciarla, or the letter on Villa Madama) as is his literacy. To say that the problem of the letter is essentially one of style, which might then be solved by finding an educated amanuensis, is to misrepresent it. The author of the letter to Simone Ciarla was mercenary, practical, self-serving, with an eye for the main chance, and really rather vulgar: in short, not quite a gentleman. The content, philosophical posture, and literary resources of the author of *Signor Conte* are by these standards anomalous, as we shall see, and so are his grace, modesty and good taste. However: not only is the matter anomalous; we have already found it redundant at the level of news.



That the attribution of the matter of *Signor Conte* to Raphael is so often asserted, in the echoing absence of *comparanda*, is one thing, and it is understandable in terms of necessity; that attributions of the style to 'some literary friend' should be made so unreflectingly is quite another, for it is as if we did not know how the several friends wrote. This route also leads, I think, to a dead end.

This argument, so far, states that neither the straightforward reading of *Signor Conte*, taking it at face-value, nor a qualified one, with a composite attribution, will do; for each case is internally inconsistent. If it is not a letter to Castiglione by Raphael, either on his own or with literary help, what else can it be? Is there any escape from some version of Gasparoni's thought that it may be apocryphal, or Wanscher's that it is a forgery? It is time to recall what we know, which is little but not unsuggestive. There is, as we have seen, no manuscript tradition, and none has ever been claimed. In a strict sense the document we have is of 1554, when it was presented for the first time by Lodovico Dolce. Now this circumstance, at first sight, looks like the proverbial smoking gun. To pursue the forensic metaphors, not only did Dolce have the motive, the means, and the opportunity, but also the text had his fingerprints on it. He produced it in a context where he needed a letter by Raphael: his anthology comprised princes and intellectuals and he wanted to represent in it the artists, to show that, if they had tried, they too could have been among the *Illustri*. His *tre chiarissimi lumi della Pittura* are precisely the three paragons of his dialogue, *L'Aretino* (1557): Michelangelo, Raphael, and Titian. To present Raphael as a paragon of letter-writing *manqué* would indeed have been difficult without this text. It looks like a very seductive, if not persuasive, case.<sup>65</sup>

But to pursue the charge against Dolce raises two solid obstacles. The first is linguistic, and to a degree philosophical: the point is hard to present, as all negative assertions are — the assertion, that is, that Dolce's known texts (such as *Le osservazioni della lingua volgare* [1552] or *L'Aretino* [1557]) simply do not resemble *Signor Conte* in matter or style; and in style and, so to speak, linguistic politics, they even represent an opposing opinion, which is that of Bembo, *padre di tutte le buone lettere*.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps these statements may stand until we have examined the letter, its morphology and its philosophy, more closely. In the meantime it should perhaps be repeated once more that the text in question is the *Urtext*, reprinted at the beginning of this study, and not the familiar one of 1559 (or that of 1582) where Dolce's intervention as editor blurs the contrast. The second obstacle is that the hypothesis, that *Signor Conte* is a forgery and Dolce was the forger, does not make sense when one tries to make it work. For why did Dolce, attempting to imitate Raphael, construct an author who looks exactly like Castiglione? I shall try to justify the similitude stated in that question.

It may be that, simply because *Signor Conte* is written in the *volgare*, we tend to read it with diminished expectations, as if its *raison d'être* were just the passing of news, and as if it were a secondary benefit that we today get a little documentation on *Galatea*. Few published Renaissance letters are like that. It has been pointed out that Renaissance letters, except in the special case of diplomatic ones, are less dedicated than modern ones to the simple transmission of news because that was often the function of the bearer, and tend to be more dedicated to literary rituals, or social rituals such as consolation; published letters, in particular, must be read for their factual information with much circumspection.<sup>67</sup> Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, as we have seen, said that letters were 'portraits of the mind'. And it was precisely the generation of Castiglione that gave to epistolography in the *volgare* the self-consciousness in literary matters previously reserved for the Latin. Anthologies like Dolce's collect the *Kunstabriefe*, in other words, and *Signor Conte* is not an exception.

I have come to believe that *Signor Conte* is a 'portrait of the mind', that it is Castiglione's definitive portrait of Raphael, written just after the artist's death, and just after the poetic



portrait in *Quod lacerum*. Now to suggest that the letter was a fiction by Castiglione of one written to himself, is to risk immediate disbelief, and the proposition would indeed be ridiculous if no parallels could be found first of all for this procedure — we come later to intellectual profile, and style — in his own work, and in the period. Yet the perfect parallel exists in the *Elegy* of 1519.<sup>68</sup> This poem was certainly written by Castiglione, but in the voice of Ippolita addressing him, and its authorship was understandably much muddled in the Cinquecento (and later). The bibliography of this poem is extremely confusing; I believe that it was first published, as Castiglione's, in the 1533 Aldine edition of Sannazaro's *De partu virginis*, and Lodovico Dolce and Julius Caesar Scaliger knew it was by Castiglione too. Isabella d'Este had a presentation-manuscript of which the author was Castiglione.<sup>69</sup> But it was also published in 1548 and twice in 1558 as Ippolita's, and the early biographers Bernardino Marliani, Matteo Castiglione, and Antonio Beffa Negrini fell into the same trap.<sup>70</sup>

We have also to remember the confusing and widespread Renaissance custom, inherited from antiquity, of writing letters *in nome di* or (not quite the same thing) *in veste di* someone else.<sup>71</sup> It is held, for example, that the *Lettere di molte valorose donne*, 'edited' by Ortensio Landi (1548) with the help of Lodovico Dolce, were all by Landi's hand (and indeed they have a monotonous consistency). In his professional capacity as courtier Castiglione was called upon to write letters over the names of Elisabetta Gonzaga and Francesco Maria della Rovere.<sup>72</sup> In 1479 Mario Filelfo sent Marchese Federico I Gonzaga an *Epistola heroidis* which he had written in the name of "la Illustrissima Vostra consorte", which Cian has proposed as an inspiration for the *Elegy* of 1519.<sup>73</sup> Guarino's preface to Strabo, as if by Lionello d'Este, praised himself; Ficino wrote to himself, as if from Cosimo de' Medici; Poliziano wrote Lorenzo's preface to the *Raccolta Aragonese*; Bernardo Bellincioni wrote two fictional exchanges of verses between his patrons; and so on.<sup>74</sup> The dance of authorship becomes a lot more complicated in the Cinquecento — as for example between Michelangelo, Sebastiano, Berni, and Il Lasca — but perhaps we do not need to belabour the point. No reading of Renaissance letters can overlook this convention; no reading of the *Letter to Leo X* should forget this context. And I think it is the proper context for a reading of *Signor Conte*. By the standards of the period, which teach us not to be credulous, it is not outrageous to propose that Castiglione addressed the letter to himself, *in veste di Raffaello*.

The argument for Castiglione as the author of *Signor Conte* will follow in three parts: the first will seek to match the intellectual profiles of this author and Castiglione, while the second will look at matters of orthography, vocabulary, and phrasing. Finally the question of chronology must be addressed; for just as it will not do to propose an attribution of a painting to Raphael without also proposing a date, so too it is essential, with an author as mobile philologically as Castiglione, to say where in his literary career a text might belong.

Learning does not lie heavily on the author of *Signor Conte*, any more than it does on the author of the *Cortegiano*; on the contrary it is carried off in each case with a certain *sprezzatura*, with art that conceals art. Four phrases have the air of literary allusion — not quite of quotation, except perhaps in one borrowing from Dante, but rather of an echo which one is flattered to believe identifiable. Yet that belief may be the reader's delusion, and it may be a mistake to propose a particular model; better, probably, to see in these echoes the unsuppressible memories of a classical education, including the Italian classics. One case is "né so, se il volo sarà d'Icaro", which I think brings to mind (for example) the punishment of poetic temerity in Horace, *Carmina* IV, ii (the opening verse):

Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,  
Iule, ceratis ope Daedalea



nititur pinnis vitreo daturus  
nomina ponto.

(Whoever strives, Iulus, to rival Pindar, relies on wings fastened with wax by Daedalean craft, and is doomed to give his name to some crystal sea.)<sup>75</sup> Another passage that carries the perfume of the classics is “Ma io mi levo col pensiero più alto”, which seems to be an echo of Petrarch, *Canzoniere* 302 (again, the opening verse):

Levommi il mio penser in parte ov'era  
[quella ch'io cerco, et non ritrovo in terra;]

(My thought raised me to the level where was she whom I seek on earth, but do not find). More resonant still is the veiled, seemingly casual “per dipingere una bella, mi bisogneria veder più belle”, which is incomprehensible without (as a gloss between the lines) a memory of some version of the story of Zeuxis and the maidens of Croton — from Xenophon, Cicero, Pliny, or Alberti.<sup>76</sup> In the *Cortegiano* the author's voice, Canossa, asks the company and, in effect, the reader: “... non haveti voi letto che quelle cinque fanciulle da Crotone, le quali tra l'altre di quel popolo elesse Zeusi pittore per far di tutte cinque una sola figura eccellentissima di bellezza, forno celebrate da molti Poeti: come quelle che per belle erano state approvate da colui che perfettissimo iudicio de bellezza haver dovea?” (B” 84r, c. 1515-16 — not in B, c. 1513).<sup>77</sup> Our fourth echo, of Dante, will best appear later in this argument.

The surface of casualness conceals a thought freighted with a considerable theoretical load, for — after an intervening pleasantry and a typically Castiglionean complaint of *carestia* — the eclectic Zeuxian option, being inadequate, leads to the modifier: “io mi servo di certa Idea, che mi viene nella mente.” The first thing to notice about this developing thought is that *certa Idea* is an exact translation of *Idea quaedam* in Giovanni Francesco Pico's first tract against Bembo, *De imitatione* (1512), where, too, linked directly with it, the resort of Zeuxis to the several maidens of Croton appears as metaphor of the model of perfect literary style, “forma ipsa seu species absoluta eloquentiae”.<sup>78</sup> In these discussions of Imitation *forma* and *species* are used in their Platonic but more directly Ciceronian sense, as synonyms for *Idea*.<sup>79</sup> One begins to reflect back on ‘Raphael's’ earlier aspiration: “Vorrei trovar le belle forme de gliedifici antichi; né so, se il volo sarà d'Icaro.”<sup>80</sup>

But this ‘Raphael’ avails himself of “certa Idea, che mi viene nella mente”, and that also is not as casual as it looks; for it refers proximately to Giovanni Francesco Pico's tract of 1512 (practically translating it), and ultimately to one of the primary models of the *Cortegiano* as a whole, Cicero's *Orator* (again, significantly, to a trans-artistic metaphor): “While making the image of Jupiter or Minerva, Phidias did not look at any one model, but there settled in his mind a surpassing ideal of beauty ... so with our minds we conceive the ideal (*speciem*) of perfect eloquence, but with our ears we catch only the copy (*effigiem*).”<sup>81</sup> This situation may be summarized by noting that Giorgio De Blasi illustrated both Giovanni Francesco Pico and Cicero on Imitation by reference to *Signor Conte*.<sup>82</sup>

We cannot explore at length, here, the position of the letter in the debates on Imitation in the Roman High Renaissance, and we need only to make two simple points. The first is that the letter *does* take a position, which closely matches that taken by Canossa, Raphael's patron, in the *Cortegiano*: the position, that is, that sets Castiglione's own opinions on Imitation and language against Pietro Bembo's, represented in the dialogue by Federico Fregoso's. Pietro Bembo was the guest of Fregoso in Rome at the moment he was completing and circulating the first two books of the *Prose*, and composing his tract on Imitation (dated January 1513), in reply to the first of Pico's.<sup>83</sup> The fictional ‘Raphael’ is quite clearly,



however laconically, inscribed into the other camp at Casa Canossa, where, one recalls, Castiglione was resident in the same critical period: the camp that favours, like Canossa in the dialogue and Pico in his tract, and like Castiglione in practice, a plurality of models as a basis for one ideal.<sup>84</sup> The second point to remember — it has been made many times — is that *Signor Conte* is a strikingly Platonic text.<sup>85</sup> In that respect it is consistent both with Giovanni Francesco Pico and with Castiglione; the case has recently been made, within an argument that nevertheless attributes the letter to Raphael without question, by Giuliano Ercoli, who also distinguishes the Platonism of this group from that of Bembo.<sup>86</sup> In fact the several points in this part of the case have mostly been made individually, but not put together, not drawn to a conclusion.

The reader of the letter's passage on the *Idea* will probably most readily be reminded of Castiglione's defence, in the dedicatory letter to Don Michel de Silva, of his *idea* of the perfect courtier, which he rests on the precedents of Plato, Zenophon, and Cicero, and on their *idee* of the perfect republic, king, and orator.<sup>87</sup> But that is a composition of 1527, and it is significant that other passages on the *Idea* appeared much earlier, and indeed more frequently than in the printed text. In fact the formulation in 1527-28 falls back upon a draft of a prologue to Ms. B 11v (c. 1513) which was suppressed in manuscripts from 1515-16 onwards (this prologue was a general introduction to the "professione di questa Corteggiana [per dire così] et riduttasi quasi in arte, et disciplina"): "... io non dico chi sia questo Corteggiano, ma quale dovria essere quello perfetto, il quale io non ho mai veduto et credo che mai non sia stato, et forse mai non sarà; pur potria essere la Idea dunque di questo perfettione [*changed to*: perfetto corteggiano]; formaremo al meglio che si potrà [...] ma difficillimo è in ogni cosa esprimere quella più perfetta forma, et questo per la varietà de iudicij ..."<sup>88</sup> In other words, the Ciceronian Platonism of the Dedicatory letter to de Silva has its origin c. 1513, and its real and immediate context exactly in those years, and exactly in that Rome, of the civil exchange of tracts on Imitation between Giovanni Francesco Pico and Pietro Bembo. And I think this first formulation by Castiglione, so like Pico's in expression, also brings to mind *Signor Conte*; for his difficulty, arising from the inconsistency *de iudicij*, in attaining the *perfetta forma* (that is, *Idea*), prefigures 'Raphael's' resort to the *certa Idea*, arising from the *carestia de' buoni giudicij*.

The early disappearance of that prologue-passage was compensated in 1516 or soon after (Ms. C 43v, 48r), when Castiglione, for a time, had Canossa twice trying *Idea* and *forma* in a liberal argument about linguistic perfection: firstly, "non siamo sforzati dalla consuetudine; però ellegemo quella idea di essa [questa lingua], che più universalmente piace. E se [ne] accostiamo, come alla più nobile, alla forma di quella nella quale sono stati più singolari scrittori ..."<sup>89</sup> Secondly, against Fregoso, "non scio adonque come se sia bene [...] imitare sola il Petrarca et il Boccaccio [...]; che non si possi sperare [...] in questa lingua la quale, per anchor' è povera, inculta, et tenera, con il studio et diligentia de gli nobili ingegni non sia possibile ritrovare dell'altre Idee da dire tanto lodevoli quanto quelle [*sic*], et ampliandola farla uscire de' questi così stretti termini; ché pur' miseria sarebbe ponere fine, et non passare più avanti di quello che s'habbia fatto quasi il primo che ha scritto, et in luoco de arrichirla et darle [*sic*] lume et grandezza, farla exile, povera, arrida, et oscura, spogliandola d'ogni splendore. Ma di questo parmi che habbian' detto pur troppo ..." By a process of compression, beginning c. 1520 (Ms. D lx v), this passage becomes in 1524 (EL 41v): "Et veramente gran miseria seria a poner fine e non passar più avanti di quello che si habbia fatto quasi il primo che ha scritto, e desperarsi che tanti e così nobili ingegni possino mai trovar più che una Idea de dire in quella lingua, che ad essi è propria e naturale ..."; but in one of Castiglione's many corrections to this passage *Idea* becomes *forma bella*, and in that almost subliminal version the concept finally comes through to the *editio princeps*.<sup>90</sup>



It seems, then, that the passages in *Signor Conte* referring to the *Idea* and mimetic theory belong in the literary and philosophical cat's-cradle of Pietro Bembo, Giovanni Francesco Pico, Baldassare Castiglione, Lodovico Canossa, and Federico Fregoso in High Renaissance Rome. The letter does not deserve its reputation for a lack of seriousness, and for a distinct intellectual isolation, which is to be traced to Erwin Panofsky.<sup>91</sup> On the first count Panofsky perhaps missed its irony, and he certainly missed its *sprezzatura*; on the second, he was unaware of the history of Castiglione's ideas, and (less excusably) he did not know the published tracts of Bembo and Pico. More just, now, seems Emiliani's point quoted earlier: "è importante [la lettera] proprio perché affronta la più che famosa questione dell'Idea, e colloca il problema ben dentro le poetiche del neoplatonismo."

If we now turn to matters of vocabulary and syntax we need to notice that the evidence of the manuscripts as *comparanda* is very difficult to use, and so a certain amount of structural redundancy needs to be built into the argument so that it may survive isolated failure. Castiglione gives the impression of a man of strong views on word-forms and spelling, but inconsistent ones. There are some opinions that never change, others that swing back and forth. He is intensely engaged in the *logomachia*, Cian's felicitous expression, but he has instincts and preferences rather than dogmatic and inflexible opinions.<sup>92</sup> Moreover, there are potent external influences upon his style as it is preserved in the several manuscripts. Firstly, as diplomat he is overwhelmed by the epistolary effusions of first one chancery and then another, and so when he shifts from the service of Urbino to that of Mantua, across an interval when he is actually living for three years in Mantua, a reinforcement of his Lombard instincts is comprehensible. Secondly, the manuscripts themselves are often only on a second level autograph — the level of more or less attentive correction — and the contribution of amanuenses, themselves differently opinionated, persists as a normalizing or regressive effect.

We might begin by grasping a nettle in *Signor Conte* — one which also illustrates these difficulties, while encouraging us that they can be negotiated. We saw earlier that *satisfare* in the text of 1554 is re-edited by Dolce in 1559 as *sodisfare*. This choice touched a raw nerve in the period in either of two camps, and nothing more clearly polarized opinion. The one was held to be the noble Latin form, the other was sanctified by the authority of Dante and Boccaccio; or, negatively, the one was out-of-date, the other corrupt and ugly. For example, in an undated letter (c. 1530) devoted to polemics of language, Francesco Bellafini wrote to Marcantonio Michiel deriding the preference given to the barbarous *sodisfare* over *satisfare* — deriding, that is, Bembo's position.<sup>93</sup> But the wind was blowing the other way, and normally it was Bellafini's position — also Castiglione's — that was on the defensive. Thus the Canossa of the *Cortegiano*, as if very irritated by the word-police, is made to say in the long dispute with Fregoso on linguistics, starting in the manuscripts c. 1516 (C 50r): "poco mi curarej se da un Toscano fossi represso d'haver detto più presto lachrime che laghrime, et patrone che padrone, et satisfatto che sodisfatto, e Capitolio che Campidoglio, et hieronimo che Girolamo [C", inserted in margin: et honorevole: che horrevole, e causa che caggione, e populo che popolo] et altre tai cose." Canossa's temper improves, or is at least circumscribed, in later drafts<sup>94</sup>; but his protest against *sodisfare* survives in the Aldine text, where it is the first case he objects to.<sup>95</sup> So far as I can see Castiglione, with his own pen, was consistent in all periods in using the Latinism *satisfare*, and aberrations (in letters or in the dialogue) are the regressions of amanuenses; thus, for example, where c. 1513, at B 84r, Castiglione had written *satisfatto*, one of the amanuenses had copied *sodisfatto* at C 67v, only to be corrected back by Castiglione as *satisfatto* at C" 67v. There are many such examples.

Now *Signor Conte* is written by someone in the Castiglione-Canossa linguistic camp, against that of Bembo-Fregoso-Dolce, and there is something rather insistent about making the point



three times in one sentence. But there is that curious anomaly, where once the well-bred Latinism is compromised for a rare bastard form, *sadisfare*.<sup>96</sup> At first sight it seems that Castiglione used this form in an autograph correction in a *Cortegiano*-manuscript, but close inspection of the case shows that it arose from an aborted *pentimento*. The Tuscanizing amanuensis had *sodisfaccia* at Ms. C 42v, and, as usual, Castiglione wanted to change it, producing what appears to be *sadisfaccia*; but attention to ink-colours indicates, rather, that he began to address the offence by over-writing, giving the *o* a tail to make *a*, and then decided on a proper marginal correction; that left the apparent and unique anomaly in the text. I would suggest that a similar *pentimento* in a lost holograph used by Dolce may best explain the inconsistency in *Signor Conte*.

But there is another way of looking at that triple usage in the opening of *Signor Conte*: that is, as a stylish affectation. Structurally it is interesting, for Castiglione likes to open a letter with conceitful foreplay of just this kind. "Scrivo a V. S. [Aloisia] non perché io habbia da scrivergli [...] ma acciò che la non se maravigli ch'io non gli scriva, scrivendo ad altri."<sup>97</sup>

Imprinting in the mind the rhythms of the opening to *Signor Conte* seems to produce a close match in numerous passages by Castiglione: "havendo poco satisfatto a me stesso, penso haver molto mancho satisfatto ad gli altrui ..." (Ms. B 85v, c. 1513); "piacemi assai che la sia restata satisfatta del raporto del Signor Alexandro, e dispiacemi che l'Abatino non habbia satisfatto con quello che'l ha raportato ..." (Ms. F 23v, Castiglione to Federico Gonzaga, 4 February 1522). Or, to get away from *satisfare*: "perché talor gli omini tanto si diletmano di riprendere che riprendono ancor quello che non merita riprensione ..."; "Se ancora avessi imitato quel modo [...] parevami con tal imitazione far testimonio d'esser discorde di giudicio da colui che io imitava" (both from *Cortegiano*, Aldine edition, dedication ii).

Style and matter must be taken together in matching certain phrases which strongly characterize *Signor Conte*. The letter makes rather jerky progress, from one topic to another, as when dissatisfaction with Vitruvius is followed directly by "Della Galatea mi terrei un gran maestro ..." This is exactly the manner of the diplomatic correspondent, introducing the next *capitolo*, as when Castiglione writes to Federico Gonzaga, 30 May 1524 (Ms. H 4r): "Delle tasse vecchie e stantie nove V. Ex.tia haverà inteso ..."; he also writes to his mother in this way: "Del Gobbo non mi curo ...", or "De Evangelista s'io havesse conosciuto ..." (23 June and 15 January 1511).<sup>98</sup> Another peculiarity to be matched is the use of the contraction *S. S.* for *Sua Santità*, when customarily it signifies *Sua Signoria*. This rare usage may certainly be found elsewhere, for example in Vasari's letters, but it is much less uncommon in the Mantuan chancery and in Castiglione's *carteggio*. Good examples would be two letters to Isabella d'Este, the first from Carlo Agnello, 6 March 1516, and the second from Castiglione, 2 December 1521.<sup>99</sup> But the rarity of this practice elsewhere is nicely illustrated by Bernardino Pino's instinctive but erroneous re-editing of *Signor Conte* (1574), expanding *S. S.* as *Sua Sig.*, and making no sense.

In this letter there are, furthermore, some of Castiglione's favourite words or phrases: *carestia*, for example — which comes very frequently in the letters: *gran carestia*, *carestia de' messi*, *de' denari*, *de' cavalli*, *de vino*, *de biave*, *de mule*, *di tempo*, *di lettere*, *carestia de ogni cosa*. We might return to "io mi levo col pensier più alto", which finds an echo in a letter to Federico, 22 February 1522 (F 33r): "il qual mi levo di grandissimo fastidio." And "Nostro Signore ... m'ha messo un gran peso sopra le spalle" seems to draw upon another of Castiglione's most favoured metaphors: "per non tenere [...] questo carico [...] sopra le spalle, or gran peso parmi [...] che posto sia sopra le spalle vostre" (B 36r, 97v, both spoken by Canossa), and so on. Anxiety about adulation is a preoccupation in the letters and the *Cortegiano*. And finally, two little phrases which one carries away from the letter as most



typical of its expression, & *tanto più quanto*, and *ma non tanto che basti*, may be matched word for word, the first in the discourse of Canossa, again (B 81r), and the second in a letter of Castiglione's to Federico, 13 February 1521.<sup>100</sup> Yet the context in our letter, "Me ne porge una gran luce Vitruvio, ma non tanto che basti", is the closer to its source, and this brings us back to the high literary quality of this little work. For it is a memory of that passage in *Purgatorio*, xxviii, 79-84 where Beatrice tells Dante how he may dispel his confusion by the light of a text:

ma luce rende il salmo Delectasti,  
che puote disnebbiar vostro intelletto.  
E tu che se' dinanzi e mi pregasti,  
dì s'altro vuoi udir; ch'i' venni presta  
ad ogne tua question *tanto che basti*.<sup>101</sup>

To know the source is then to read the passage in *Signor Conte* differently: not "ma non tanto, che basti", but rather "ma non tanto che basti".

Spelling as an indicator of chronology has to be used very carefully. For example, at some point between May 1524 and publication in 1528, but presumably simultaneously, in fact on a single page, he changed in the Laurenziana fair-copy (EL 46v) *Franza* to *Francia*, but *Francesi* to *Franzesi*. There are, however, some generally consistent patterns of preference, and these may be set against the choices made in *Signor Conte*. The most obvious idiosyncrasy in the letter, *dissegno*, is one of these, and it is recognized mainly as a Lombard form.<sup>102</sup> It is not admitted by the Accademia della Crusca. But it is, for example, found on the engraved bird's-eye view of Ferrara, 1490.<sup>103</sup> The more usual *disegnare* (or *designare*, *disignare*, and compounds) are always found in the early letters of Castiglione's, until 1514 (eight cases). After that point the chronology is obscure because of the dearth of letters, 1514-19, but by the end of this period he is consistently using *disegnare* (or *dessignare*) until 1522 (sixteen cases). There then follow two more isolated cases of the Lombard form in April and May 1524, but otherwise, starting in 1522, he has reverted to convention (eight cases).<sup>104</sup> An interesting problem is set by the undated first draft of the *Letter to Leo X*, for the extremes of dating now argued, 1514-19, coincide exactly with the obscure period in which a change-over occurred: here, *disegnare*, *dessignare*, and compounds appear twenty-seven times, *designar* twice.<sup>105</sup> The former is, naturally, very frequently found in Mantuan chancery and friends' correspondence (Ms. J, *passim*), the latter very rarely indeed. Thus, if *Signor Conte* were in fact written by Castiglione, the idiosyncrasy would be easy to match 1519-22, but very unlikely after about 1524.

A generally similar result comes from considering a few other spellings, but the samples are smaller. *Signor Conte* has *giudicio*, or *giudicij*, which is the form preferred in letters of the 1520s and in autograph corrections to the Laurenziana *Cortegiano* manuscript (EL"), whereas early letters and drafts of the dialogue mostly have the Latinism *iudicio*.<sup>106</sup> Similarly, *maniera* seems to replace the dialectical *manera* after about 1519.<sup>107</sup> *Vorrei* can be found occasionally in early letters where, however, *vorei* is the common form; *vorrei* is used consistently in letters 1518-23, and in the final version of the *Cortegiano*. The elision of article and noun as in *gliedifici*, certainly common enough in other authors of the period, is only occasionally found in Castiglione's corrections to early drafts of the *Cortegiano*, as *gliocchi* in B" 80r (1515-16), but it is a consistent editorial decision by the time he gets to EL" (1524+).<sup>108</sup>

Now the lack of precision in these separate cases is clear, and in practice the possibility of error and omission is high. Nevertheless it may be said that the separate cases do share a general tendency as evidence: they indicate that the linguistic character of *Signor Conte* is



most readily matched in Castiglione's writing between about 1519 and about 1522-24. And there is no contradiction from the study of phraseology, for while some *comparanda* are not unnaturally spread over the whole career, two of the most particularizing examples, *io mi levo* and *non tanto che basti*, are precisely matched 1521-22. It seems to me immensely to fortify an attribution to Castiglione if an approximate date for the composition of the letter can also be argued, and not only as a matter of methodological principle: that is, the same principle that demands that an attribution of a picture to Raphael must convince specifically as to chronology. For the feasibility of a chronological location for the letter also greatly reduces the likelihood that some other author might be in play, whose lexical and semantic mobilities followed the same choreography. Finally, the examination of language has reinforced the matching of experiential profiles between the author of *Signor Conte* and Castiglione, for it reveals choices favouring Latinisms, Lombardisms, or even specifically Mantuan dialect-forms. So one now recalls not only Castiglione's classical education in Milan, and the re-immersion in Mantuan culture after 1516, but also the linguistic opinions *à rebours* expressed in maturity in the *Cortegiano*. They are expressed dialectically (in both senses of the word) by the Lombard Canossa and his occasional ally Bibbiena against Bembo's disciple Fregoso and the more moderate Giuliano de' Medici; but they are very clearly expressed, too, by Castiglione in his own voice, and with passion and wonderful clarity, in the dedicatory preface of about 1527:

Non ho ancor voluto obligarmi alla consuetudine del parlar toscano d'oggi; perché il commercio tra diverse nazioni ha sempre avuto forza di trasportare [...] nuovi vocabuli [...] E, perché, al parer mio, la consuetudine del parlare dell'altre città nobili d'Italia [...] non deve essere del tutto sprezzata; dei vocabuli che in questi lochi parlando s'usano, estimo aver potuto ragionevolmente usar scrivendo quelli che hanno in sé grazia ed eleganzia [...] benché non siano toscani [...] Oltre a questo usansi in Toscana molti vocabuli chiaramente corrotti dal latino, li quali nella Lombardia e nelle altre parti d'Italia son rimasti integri e senza mutazione alcuna [...] Perciò non penso aver commesso errore, se io scrivendo ho usato alcuni di questi e più tosto pigliato l'integro e sincero della patria mia che'l corrotto e guasto della aliena. Né mi par bona regola quella che dicono molti che la lingua vulgar tanto è più bella quanto è men simile alla latina [...] né credo che mi si debba imputare per errore lo aver eletto di farmi più tosto conoscere per Lombardo parlando lombardo che per non Toscano parlando troppo toscano.<sup>109</sup>

No doubt many questions remain. Salient among them must be the question of motive, which would have been so clear had Lodovico Dolce been the author, rather than the editor, of this text. If Castiglione is the author, however, two different kinds of answer come to mind. But in passing we might notice that Dolce was probably in a good position to lay his hands on an unpublished letter among Castiglione's papers in Mantua. At about the time when he was putting together the *Lettere di diversi eccellentissimi huomini* (1554) he was also preparing an edition of the *Cortegiano* (1552), which he described on the title-page as "Nuovamente con somma diligenza corretto, & revisto per il Lodovico Dolce, secondo l'esemplare del proprio autore", a statement which must presumably contain a grain of truth.<sup>110</sup> And then in *L'Aretino* (1557), when commenting on Castiglione's *Elegy*, he showed that he knew that the portrait by Raphael was then in Mantua where, indeed, he is known to have been in 1543.<sup>111</sup>

I do not think there is any real evidence as to the motive for writing *Signor Conte*, beyond what the letter is, and what its effect has been, the latter a notoriously unreliable guide to intention. But an hypothesis that answers the question on one level is derived from



circumstantial evidence. The proposition that Castiglione wrote *Signor Conte* would make little sense if it were assumed that he would keep it to himself. And that it might have been intended for publication, which is suggested by its artfulness and polish, is sustained by a circumstance on which I have found no comment, that in the mid-twenties Castiglione seems to have been preparing for publication a volume of letters, a volume which would have preceded those of Pietro Bembo, beginning in 1535 with the *Epistolae Leonis decimi*, and Pietro Aretino's, starting in 1538; but, of course, it would have followed long after the *Auree epistole* of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1502). The reason for thinking that there was such a project is that two of the Valenti Gonzaga manuscripts now in the Vaticana, one containing copies of letters of 1522-23 (Ms. G), the other containing principally the letters as *nunzio* in Spain (Ms. H), received careful correction by Castiglione — in fact they are castigated in exactly the same way, though not as frequently, as is the Laurenziana manuscript of the *Cortegiano* in preparation for the printer.<sup>112</sup> It is a *labor limae* hard to understand in the absence of a project to publish.

I suggested above that *Signor Conte* could be read as a moral portrait, a 'portrait of the mind' in Pico's phrase, or "mores animumque effingere" in Martial's. That it has served us well, even indispensably, in this capacity is all too clear: "Der Brief aber", we remember Ertl said, "ist vom künstlerischen Standpunkt aus unstreitig das berühmteste erhalten gebliebene Dokument des Urbinaten; denn es enthält Äußerungen nicht nur über Arbeiten seines eigenen Bleistifts und Pinsels, sondern auch über seine echt antike Auffassung vom Problem der Schönheit." It has become what it was perhaps supposed always to be, the primary testimony to Raphael's moral and intellectual character — modest, urbane, gifted with the grace and *sprezzatura* of the ideal hero of the *Cortegiano*, on the one hand, and literate, philosophically informed, engaged with the theoretical issues of the day, on the other.

Castiglione, if I am right, inscribed his dead friend into his own camp, making him consistent, in polemical issues, with his voice in the dialogue, Lodovico Canossa, 'whose Raphael' he was there. And he made Raphael write as a protagonist of his party in linguistic politics. He commemorates his friend as a man of culture, a Ciceronian Platonist by instinct or persuasion, and a critical person who has mastered Vitruvius and found him wanting.<sup>113</sup> He commemorates, too, the painter of a great secular work, *Galatea*, and the architect to whom had been entrusted the greatest artistic enterprise of the age — but an artist, too, who had an easy relation with aristocracy yet a deferential, advice-seeking, relation to the aristocracy of the mind, a fulfilment of Alberti's ideal.<sup>114</sup> On reflection, it is remarkable how rich this portrait is. I think, however, that it is an affectionate fiction, a posthumous construction, to be read with much care. *Una certa idea* was the subject of an engraving by Johannes Christian Riepenhausen (1816) in a set illustrating Raphael's biography.<sup>115</sup> But the letter's value as document may need to be shifted, from the study of the artist's creativity to the study of his reception, and of the initial formation of the canon and the legend.

In the end we need, I think, to scale down to more sensible proportions our own portrait of Raphael as man of culture, while preserving, and even enhancing, our boundless measure of his intelligence. "Dolse la morte sua precipue alli litterati" wrote Marcantonio Michiel in his diary, and he meant that here was an artist and antiquarian who could have commerce with scholars and humanists. Nobody would wish to deny that. But, just as Castiglione's portrait, for these reasons, cannot be absurdly false, so also it cannot be supported in its generous extent by any other testimony from the not inconsiderable amount generated in letters and poems at about the time of Raphael's death. One falls back upon the next most informative, which is Celio Calcagnini's letter to Jakob Ziegler about the company of intelligent men he keeps in Rome, a letter he seems to have written soon after his return there in October 1519, apparently while Raphael was still alive.<sup>116</sup> Some wariness in the



reading of this document, too, is prompted by the thought that the text that we have was published in 1544, so that it may represent a version reworked for publication, with some *amplificatio* in response to the intervening poetic tradition (Calcagnini died in 1541). Raphael, in this account, is the Prince of Painters, whether from the practical or the theoretical point of view, and the fertile architect to make all others despair. "I leave aside Vitruvius, whom he not only expounds but also with most expert reasoning both defends and criticizes — but in such a civil manner that there is no malice in the criticism." His greatest undertaking — it is unnecessary, he says, to mention Saint Peter's — is the reconstruction of ancient Rome, based on excavations and texts, to the great admiration of Pope Leo and all Romans; he is not too proud to seek advice, leaning particularly on Fabio Calvo.

Now Calcagnini's letter looks as if it might have been in Castiglione's mind (if he were indeed the author of *Signor Conte* in the early twenties), with the adjustment that Raphael's preferred source of advice was naturally himself, Castiglione; yet Calcagnini's construction of the scholarly artist is significantly more restricted, in fact convincingly restricted to just those professional studies that are mastered by Raphael, the author of the letter on Villa Madama.<sup>117</sup> And this portrait is already more generous in this respect than that of Francesco Maria Molza, whose *carmen* on the death of Raphael, addressed to Leo X, *O beato et da 'l Cel' diletto Padre*, focusses in the same way on the aborted recreation of the splendours of Rome, but as the work of an architect, not of a scholar. The same is true of Paolo Giovio's brief characterization of Raphael written about 1525. And in 1526-27 Andrea Fulvio goes so far as to note that he had pointed Raphael — "me indicante" — to the textual sources for his archaeological reconstruction.<sup>118</sup> There is consistency and restraint among these friends' characterizations of Raphael, and it is only Castiglione — for the best and most amiable of reasons — who is out of line. His portrait of Raphael is, I think, no more a veristic one, and no less an artful, idealizing construction, than is Raphael's of Castiglione.



## NOTES

I wish to express my thanks firstly to Conte Lodovico Castiglione for allowing me to study the manuscripts of Baldassare Castiglione in his possession, the first draft of the Letter to Leo X and the fragments of various drafts of the Cortegiano; and then in Mantua I have once again been indebted to the kind offices of Italo Bini, and of Dottoressa Daniela Ferrari in the Archivio di Stato. This text has been much improved by the advice of Howard Burns, Dante Della Terza, Franco Fido, Margaret Haines, and Arnold Nesselrath, and by the careful editing of Wolfger Bulst.

- <sup>1</sup> *Giovanni Mestica*, La cultura e i sentimenti politici di Raffaello, in: Nuova antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti, Ser. 4, LXXIX (CLXIII), 1899, p. 629-630.
- <sup>2</sup> *Lodovico Dolce*, *Lettere di diversi eccellentiss. huomini, raccolte da diversi libri: tra le quali se ne leggono molte, non piu stampate*, Venice (Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari) 1554, p. 226-228, re-issued with a colophon dated 1555 (see below). The attribution and interpretation suggested here was first presented publicly to the New England Renaissance Society, at Harvard, October 1987, subsequently at the Summer School of the Tweede Fase Opleiding Geschiedenis van Kunst en Cultuur, Amsterdam, June 1992. When this text was complete I read *Claudio Strinati*, Sostrato concettuale e finalità espressiva dell'universo artistico di Raffaello, in: Raffaello e Dante, ed. Corrado Gizzi, Milan/Florence 1992, p. 89, who (in spite of accepting both a false early bibliography and an altered text) has briefly stated the attribution argued here.
- <sup>3</sup> *Lodovico Dolce*, *Lettere di diversi eccellentiss. huomini, raccolte da diversi libri: tra le quali se ne leggono molte, non piu stampate*, Venice (Gabriel Giolito) 1559; *Bernardino Pino*, *Della nuova scelta di lettere di diversi nobilissimi huomini ... fatta da tutti i libri fin'hora stampati*, Venice 1574, vol. II, p. 400-401, and Venice 1582, vol. II, p. 443-444; *Giovanni Antonio/Gaetano Volpi*, *Opere volgari, e latine del Conte Baldassar Castiglione*, Padua 1733, p. 307; *Giovanni Bottari*, *Raccolta di lettere sulla pittura, scultura ed architettura*, vol. I, Rome 1754, p. 83-84 (omitting one line) and vol. II, p. 18-19 (1559 text); *Pierantonio Serassi* (ed.), *Lettere del Conte Baldassar Castiglione ora per la prima volta date in luce*, vol. I/2, Padua 1769, p. 172-173 (1559 text); *Giuseppe Piacenza* (ed.), *Filippo Baldinucci*, *Notizie de' professori del disegno da Cimabue in qua*, Turin 1770, vol. II, p. 370 (from Bottari); *Louis-Joseph Jay*, *Recueil de lettres sur la peinture ...*, Paris 1817, p. 18-19; *Bottari/Ticozzi*, vol. I, 1822, p. 116-117 and vol. II, p. 23 (1559 text); *Ernst Gubel*, *Künstler-Briefe*, [vol. I] Berlin 1953, p. 128-130; *Ernst Gubel/Adolf Rosenberg*, *Künstlerbriefe*, Berlin 1880, p. 95-96; *Leone Zanetti*, *Raffaello. Disegni e lettere*, Bologna 1924, p. 18-19 (1559 text); *Hermann Uhde-Bernays*, *Künstlerbriefe über Kunst*, Dresden 1926, p. 50-51; *Vincenzo Golzio*, *Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo*, Vatican City 1936, p. 30-31 (1559 text: see below); *Kathleen Theresa Butler*, 'The gentlest art' in Renaissance Italy. An anthology of Italian letters 1459-1600, Cambridge 1954, p. 271 (1574 text); *Ettore Camesasca* (ed.), *Raffaello Sanzio*, *Tutti gli scritti*, Milan 1956, p. 28-30 (1559 text); *Richard Friedenthal*, *Letters of the great artists, I: from Ghiberti to Gainsborough*, London 1963, p. 49-50; *Robert Klein/Henri Zerner*, *Italian art 1500-1600: sources and documents*, New York 1966, p. 32-33; *Paola Barocchi*, *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento*, Milan/Naples 1971-77, vol. I, p. 786, 883, vol. II, p. 1525, 1531-1533, 2369 (knows of the 1554 edition, but prints the 1559 text). *Emmanuele Antonio Cicogna*, *Memoria intorno la vita e gli scritti di messer Lodovico Dolce*, in: *Memorie dell'I. R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, vol. XI, 1862, p. 135-136, of course knew of the 1554 edition; he cited also a reprinting of 1558 which I have not found. *Matthias Winner*, "... una certa idea". Maratta zitiert einen Brief Raffaels in einer Zeichnung, in: *Der Künstler über sich in seinem Werk*, symposium Rome 1989, acts ed. *id.*, Weinheim 1992, p. 519 cites an edition of 1546, which I think is an error. Here I must unfortunately caution readers of *Vincenzo Golzio's* usually invaluable *Raffaello nei documenti*: he has given an erroneous and still influential bibliography of the letter: Golzio did not know the first (1554) edition, and stated that Pino published it with an attribution to Pietro Aretino; it was never doubted until the nineteenth century that the author was Raphael. Golzio's account has misled many more recent scholars, even the most scrupulous. More surprisingly, perhaps, the great Castiglione scholar *Vittorio Cian* subscribed to the same error, in: *Un illustre nunzio pontificio del Rinascimento*, Baldassare Castiglione, Vatican City 1951, p. 83. I think that both Golzio and Cian followed Venturi's careless reading of Crowe and Cavalcaselle, which is explained below, n. 60.



- <sup>4</sup> Two passages in the fragmentary *Trattato*, reprinted by Denis Mahon, *Studies in Seicento art and theory*, London 1947, p. 242-243, seem derived from a reading of the letter, which I think is already the understanding of *Winner* (n. 3), p. 527. But the letter may already be reflected in *Vasari's Vite* of 1568, in the passage new in this edition (*Vasari-Milanesi*, vol. IV, p. 373-379) on Raphael's eclecticism in Imitation – he slips uncharacteristically into 'Raphael's' spelling of *dissegno* – and in *Giovanni Battista Paggi's* passage on Raphael on Imitation in a letter of 1591 (*Barocchi* [n. 3], p. 198). A possible reflection *avant la lettre*, from a Ms., in *Giangiorgio Trissino*: see below, n. 113.
- <sup>5</sup> *Giovanni Pietro Bellori*, L'Idée del pittore, dello scultore e dell'architetto, scelta dalle bellezze naturali superiore alla Natura (the *Discorso* of 1664), in: *Le vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni*, Rome 1672, p. 6 ('Rafaele' – here like a painters' Aristotle – "il gran maestro di color che sanno"); *Bellori* reprints the letter (from Dolce's 1559 text) in *Descrizione delle imagini dipinte da Rafaele d'Urbino nelle camere del Palazzo Vaticano*, Rome 1695, p. 100; *Jonathan Richardson, Sen. and Jun., An Essay on the Theory of Painting*, London 1715, p. 165, and *Traité de la peinture et de la sculpture*, Amsterdam 1728, vol. I, p. 141; *Johann Joachim Winckelmann*, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauer-Kunst*, Dresden 1755, p. 9, and *idem*, *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, Dresden 1767, p. 35 (on the necessity of an Ideal). The significance of the letter in Roman artistic circles between Bellori and Winckelmann is now very interestingly treated by *Winner* (n. 3).
- <sup>6</sup> *Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder*, *Herzensergießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders*, ed. *Karl Detlev Jensen*, Leipzig 1904, p. 7, 10; *Wilhelm von Schlegel*, in: *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. *Eduard Böcking*, Leipzig 1846-47, vol. X, p. 369; *Johann Gottfried Herder*, in: *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. *Bernhard Suphan*/*Carl Redlich*, Hildesheim 1967-68, vol. XXVIII, p. 192-194.
- <sup>7</sup> *Erwin Panofsky*, "Idea". Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsgeschichte der älteren Kunsttheorie, Leipzig/Berlin 1924, p. 32-37, 61; *Fritz Ertl*, *Baldassare Castigliones Beziehungen und Verhältnis zu den bildenden Künsten*, Nuremberg 1933, p. 11, 13-14, 44, 59-60.
- <sup>8</sup> *E.H. Gombrich*, Raphael: a quincennial address, in: *Art History*, VII, 1984, p. 166, 171 and, with less reserve, in: *Ideal und Typus in der italienischen Renaissancemalerei*, Opladen 1983, p. 7.
- <sup>9</sup> *Francesco Gasparoni*, L'Architetto girovago. Opera piacevole ed istruttiva, Rome 1841, vol. I, p. 24; *Joseph Archer Crowe/Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle*, Raphael: his life and works, London 1882-85, vol. II, p. 200-207 (see below); *Vilhelm Wanscher*, Raffaello Santi da Urbino, hans liv og vaerker, Copenhagen 1919, p. 113-114. Much scepticism has recently been expressed by *Konrad Oberhuber*, *Monna Vanna and Fornarina: Leonardo and Raphael in Rome*, in: *Essays presented to Myron P. Gilmore*, Florence 1978, vol. II, p. 84, and total disbelief by *Christof Thoenes*, Galatea: tentativi di avvicinamento, in: *Raffaello a Roma (convegno 1983)*, Rome 1986, p. 66, and *La "Lettera" a Leone X*, *ibidem*, p. 379.
- <sup>10</sup> See below, n. 66.
- <sup>11</sup> This text comes from the British Library copy (C.29.d.10), without the 1555 colophon; I have converted every consonantal *u* into *v*. I have also consulted the copies with the colophon in the Vatican Library (BAV, R. G. Lett. it. v. 1865, and Capponi v. 261) and the Bodleian Library (Holkham f.104), where there seems to be no change in these passages except the correction of a *t* first printed upside-down in *satisfare* (which I have necessarily also corrected here), and the separation of *trovarle* into *trovar le*. *Idea* is printed as *Id/dea*, at the break of the line, and I take it to be a typesetting error. The most obvious of the changes in the 1559 text are (i) the reversion from *dissegno* (a Lombardism) to the more usual *disegno*, (ii) the replacement of the significantly inconsistent *sadiffaccio* (a bastard form), *satisfaccio*, and *satisfare* (both Latinisms) by the Tuscan *sodiffaccio* or *sodisfare*, and (iii) the regularization of the Lombard *Vitruvio* as *Vitruvio*. These changes will be discussed below.
- <sup>12</sup> *Cian* (n. 3), p. 85; also *idem*, *Nel mondo di Baldassare Castiglioni*, in: *Arch. Stor. Lomb.*, N.S. VII, 1942, p. 97: "degno segretario dell'amico Raffaello".
- <sup>13</sup> *Antonio Beffa Negrini*, *Elogi storici di alcuni personaggi della famiglia Castigliona*, ed. *Francesco Osanna*, Mantua 1606.
- <sup>14</sup> In an unpublished letter to his mother Aloisia, 9 October 1521 (BAV, Ms. Vat. Lat. 8210, fol. 372 v), he asked "che la facesse riguardare e da polvere e dai ratti li mei libri e la mia viola, e 'l mio ritratto e quelle altre pitture ch' io mandai a Mantua, le quali non vorrei che stessero in camera dove fosse foco, perché il fumo non le guastasse"; in addition to the *Madonna*, which is the so-called *Petite Sainte Famille* in Paris (the *Dovizia* cover was clearly painted for Bibbiena), the second picture which he had sent on 1 January was "una testa d'un villano".
- <sup>15</sup> The letter was first published in *Luigi Pungileoni*, *Elogio storico di Raffaello Santi da Urbino*, Urbino 1829, p. 181-182; I have retranscribed from the original: Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana, Ms. 429, *Lettere*



- d'illustri stranieri*, I, fol. 91r-v. Don Girolamo was in fact on his way to Urbino, with Girolamo Genga (Georg Gronau, Documenti artistici urbinati, Florence 1936, p. 113 n.).
- <sup>16</sup> *Pungileoni* (n. 15), p. 216-217; I think it would be gratuitous to suggest that Pungileoni, sometimes muddled but always a scrupulous scholar, fashioned a mythical letter from the somewhat similar account by Vasari – better to assume either that the similarity results from both accounts being correct, or that Vasari had access to material from Castiglione's *carteggio* (John Shearman, Giulio Romano and Baldassare Castiglione, in: Giulio Romano, atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Mantua 1989, p. 295, 300).
- <sup>17</sup> Renato Lefevre, Su una lettera di Raffaello riguardante Villa Madama, in: Studi Romani, XVII, 1969, p. 429; Stefano Ray, Raffaello architetto, Rome/Bari 1974, p. 182; Christoph Frommel, Villa Madama, in: Raffaello Architetto, exh. cat., Milan 1984, p. 311-312, 324-328; Gabriele Morolli, 'Le belle forme degli edifici antichi'. Raffaello e il progetto del primo trattato rinascimentale sulle antichità di Roma, Florence 1984, p. 69 – a bibliographically careless discussion; Thoenes, "Lettera" (n. 9), p. 373, 379; Stefano Ray, Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e Raffaello. I connotati di un confronto, in: Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane. La vita e l'opera, ed. Gianfranco Spagnesi (XXII Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura, 1986), Rome 1986, p. 47-50. That Castiglione was the addressee was already the conclusion of Wanscher (n. 9), p. 94, 111, long before the text itself was published by Philip Foster, Raphael on the Villa Madama: the text of a lost letter, in: Röm. Jb., XI, 1967-68, p. 308.
- <sup>18</sup> The young Castiglione's study of Vitruvius is recorded in a note in his Euclid (the 1491 edition): Cian (n. 12), p. 36.
- <sup>19</sup> Calvo by Frommel (n. 17), p. 311-312, Calvo or Fulvio by Morolli (n. 17), p. 261.
- <sup>20</sup> I should explain that the following documents are in my opinion forgeries: 30 July 1514, Raphael to Giuliano Leno; before 2 August 1514, a draft by Raphael of an agreement with Giuliano Leno and Domenico Bonello for foundations of Saint Peter's (now in the Elmer Belt Library, UCLA); 15 August 1514, Raphael to Fabio Calvo; 16 January 1515, Raphael to Giuliano Leno; 7 August 1515, Raphael to Lodovico Canossa; 15 December 1515, Raphael to the Captain and *comune* of Tivoli; 30 April 1516, Raphael to Galeazzo Canossa; 23 October 1516, ditto.
- <sup>21</sup> Vittorio Cian, La lingua di Baldassare Castiglione, Florence 1942, p. 35-62, and *idem* (n. 3), p. 49, 65; Ghino Ghinassi, Fasi dell'elaborazione del "Cortegiano", in: Studi di filologia italiana, XXV, 1967, p. 155, and *idem*, La seconda redazione del "Cortegiano" di Baldassare Castiglione, Florence 1968.
- <sup>22</sup> Cian (n. 12), p. 46, doubts that A is in fact the very first draft.
- <sup>23</sup> Dated c. 1515 *ibidem*, p. 48. I follow Ghinassi, 1967 (n. 21), p. 176, who notes autograph *ricordi* on the cover dated April-December 1515 (but there are also notes of 1510-15 on fols. 3r-4r).
- <sup>24</sup> References to the new French King, François I<sup>er</sup>, and anticipations of his ascendancy (cast back to the fictional date, 1507) place part of B" after January 1515; Bernardino Marliani (also Mariani), *Vita del Conte Baldassar Castiglione*, in: *Il Cortegiano ...*, ed. Antonio Ciccarelli, Venice 1584, unpag., said that the book was finished in Rome in March 1516, which I think he would not have said if that date had not been on a manuscript in the family archive; it would most probably be Ms. B-B". Ghinassi, 1967 (n. 21), p. 176 ff., takes A, B, and C as a continuous evolution of the first redaction, and gives little importance to B"; in my opinion the changes at B" are radical enough to separate this phase, and they are of great interest, not only to the art historian. For example: B (at 34r, "Voi adunque [blank] mio ...") has as yet no dedicatee, whose name is inserted by Castiglione (i. e. as part of B": "Messer Alphonso" [Ariosto]), so that in the next fair-copy C (at 20v-21r) it appears as "Voi adonque Messer Alphonso mio ..." Or again: the fiction of absence from Urbino at the date of the dialogue (5-8 March 1507), when he was in fact there, is not yet in B 12r: "recitare certi ragionamenti atti a quello che noi intendemo di scrivere, gli quali sforzarommi a puntino per quanto la memoria mi comporta ricordare"; the fiction appears in an interpolation (B"): "... che noi intendemo di scrivere, gli quali, benché io non vi fossi [sic] presente, havendoli poco di poi che forno detti intesi da persona che fidelmente li narrò, sforcerommi a puntino ..."; this version, copied in C 6v, becomes in C": "... benche io non vi fossi presenti, per ritrovarmi alhor che forno detti in inghilterra, mandato dal s.r Duca Guido: mio S.re a quello serenissimo re, havendoli poco di poi del mio ritorno intesi da persona ..." The fiction of absence was perhaps inspired by a recent reading of Pietro Bembo's drafts of the *Prose*; or, as suggested by Eduardo Saccone, Trattato e ritratto: l'introduzione del *Cortegiano*, in: Modern language notes, XCIII, 1978, p. 4, by a reading of Cicero, *De oratore*, I, vi, 23 etc. If B" is correctly dated c. 1515-16, it is significant that Castiglione sends for his *De oratore*, "comentato: e postilato in molti lochi de mia mano", in October 1514 (Guido La Rocca [ed.], *Baldassar Castiglione*, Le lettere, vol. I, Verona 1978, p. 364).
- <sup>25</sup> Cian (n. 12), p. 53, and Ghinassi, 1967 (n. 21), p. 176 ff., for Bembo's corrections. C", D, and D" are Ghinassi's "seconda redazione", 1968 (n. 21), p. vii-viii, which he dates to 1518-20; he argues that Ms. C (8205) was the one taken by Canossa to Rome in August 1518 to be read by Bembo and Sadoleto. Castiglione corrects in several different ways, apparently at several different times.



- <sup>26</sup> I take it that this is the manuscript received at Mantua (but not from Castiglione) in Spring 1521; in Ms. I 311r, there is an addendum, either to his letter to Aloisia of 3 April or to one of 6 April: "Ho piacere assai che V. S. habbia hauto il Cortegiano; la pò tenerlo così presso di sé, senza mandarmelo altramente ..."
- <sup>27</sup> Castiglione was back in Rome for the last time, 8 December 1523 to mid-October 1524.
- <sup>28</sup> References to the printed text of the *Cortegiano* will be abbreviated as follows: Roman and Arabic numerals together (as II xlvii 23) indicate Book, paragraph and line (in this case Book II, paragraph xlvii, line 23) from *Cian's* edition (I have used the corrected second edition: *Vittorio Cian* (ed.), *Il Cortegiano del Conte Baldesar Castiglione*, Florence 1916); *Opere* (1960), followed by an Arabic numeral, indicates a page in *Carlo Cordié* (ed.), *Opere di Baldassare Castiglione*, Giovanni della Casa, Benvenuto Cellini, Milan/Naples 1960.
- <sup>29</sup> *Il Libro del Cortegiano*, ed. princeps, Venice 1528, p. 4; *Opere* (1960) 8.
- <sup>30</sup> *Cicero's* "antiquitatis effigies" is in *De oratore*, I, xliii, 193.
- <sup>31</sup> Minor differences of spelling in D lix r, where the passage moves from Book II to Book I; in EL 40v a new sentence begins at *Varie cose*, and there are important spelling-changes, the latter vigorously revised and sometimes reversed by BC in EL"; I xxxvii 42; *Opere* (1960) 64. Both *Cian* (n. 28), p. 92 and *Ertl* (n. 7), p. 53 cite *Cicero, De oratore*, III, vii, 26 as the model for this passage. *Carlo Dionisotti*, Tiziano e la letteratura, in: *Lettere italiane*, XXVIII, 1976, p. 404, claims novelty for Castiglione here, in that an example from the arts is invoked in a literary polemic, but it seems to me that that is what Cicero had already done. *Martin Kemp*, "Equal excellencies": Lomazzo and the explanation of individual style in the visual arts, in: *Renaissance Studies*, I, 1987, p. 5-6, cites Lorenzo Valla and Alamanno Rinuccini already adapting this Ciceronian passage.
- <sup>32</sup> This point may have occurred to Castiglione if he witnessed the disaster, between June 1514 and Summer 1516, of the first version of Michelangelo's *Christ for Metello Vari*, which could not be repaired (see the account in *Henry Thode, Michelangelo. Kritische Untersuchungen über seine Werke*, vol. II, Berlin 1908, p. 257-272).
- <sup>33</sup> The long list of the richer subject-matter of painting recalls *Alberti* exemplifying the *copia et varietà delle cose* in *Della Pittura*, Book II (*Leon Battista Alberti, Della Pittura*, ed. *Luigi Mallè*, Florence 1950, p. 91, or *idem, On Painting*, ed. *Cecil Grayson*, London 1991, p. 75). The passage in the *Cortegiano* seems to be imitated in *Vasari's* major insertion in 1568 to the *Vita* of Raphael (*Vasari-Milanesi*, vol. IV, pp. 375-376).
- <sup>34</sup> D lxxxiii v-lxxx r; EL 56r; I xlix 37-li 5; *Opere* (1960) 82-84.
- <sup>35</sup> It was presumably this passage that *Lodovico Dolce* had in mind when in his *Dialogo della pittura ... intitolato l'Aretino*, Venice 1557, ed. *Mark Roskill*, Dolce's "Aretino" and Venetian art theory of the Cinquecento, New York 1968, p. 92, he cites (in the voice of Fabio) "il Castiglione, che gli [Raphael] da il primo luoco".
- <sup>36</sup> Castiglione in Genoa to Aloisia in Mantua, 27 May 1520, postscript: "Se occorresse che'l vescovo mandasse quello quadro, V. S. si ricordi farne quello che per laltre mie gli ho scritto, e medemamente del mio Cortegiano" (Ms. I 278r; *La Rocca* [n. 24], p. 545). In March 1520 Canossa obtained papal permission to enter the service of François I<sup>er</sup>; he left Rome about 8 April and met Castiglione in Modena on 21 April, whence they travelled together to Genoa.
- <sup>37</sup> Ms. B is interrupted at a point equivalent to C 130v, so that we cannot tell whether the *arguto motto* was already there c. 1513.
- <sup>38</sup> II lxxvi 15; *Opere* (1960) 178.
- <sup>39</sup> Thus *Cian* (n. 28), p. 260 n.: "ha un valore storico innegabile"; the anecdote from *Giovio* he produced as a parallel seems to me to show quite a different sense of humour. The anecdote in the *Cortegiano* cites *una tavola*, and there is no known Roman work which will fit the description.
- <sup>40</sup> *Mestica* (n. 1), p. 635 suggested very convincingly that the anecdote has a poetic model, Saint Peter's complaint in *Paradiso*, xxvii, 52-57.
- <sup>41</sup> *José Guidi* is surely correct in taking this disavowal as a conceit of avowal: *Festive narrazioni, motti et burle (beffe): l'art des facéties dans "Le Courtisan"*, in: *Formes et significations de la "beffa" dans la littérature italienne de la renaissance (2<sup>ème</sup> série)*, Paris 1975, p. 178. The disengaged, more distant viewpoint of the *ritratto* of 1527, compared with the dialogue itself, is the convincing conclusion of *Saccone* (n. 24).
- <sup>42</sup> *Lucian, Eikones*, 3 (The Loeb Classical Library, *Lucian*, iv, ed. and trans. *A.M. Harmon*, London/Cambridge, Mass., 1959, p. 260-261). It is worth noting that *Lodovico Dolce* in turn imitates Castiglione's pseudo-modesty and portrait-metaphor in his dedication to Pietro Aretino of *La poetica d'Horatio*, s. l. 1536.
- <sup>43</sup> *Willi Hirdt*, Gian Giorgio Trissinos Porträt der Isabella d'Este. Ein Beitrag zur Lukian-Rezeption in



- Italiani, Heidelberg 1981, p. 23-24. *Idem*, p. 45, traces the binary aspects of portraiture *ex corpore* and *ex animo* to Quintilian. For the date of completion: *Bernardo Morsolin*, *Giangiorgio Trissino o monografia di un letterato nel secolo XVI*, Vicenza 1878, p. 77.
- <sup>44</sup> *Dolce*, *L'Areino* (n. 35), p. 9: "il nostro Petrarca chiamò Homero *Primo Pittor de le memorie antiche*" (*Roskill* [n. 35], p. 100). Compare *Lucian*, *Eikones*, 8: "Homer, the best of painters"; and *Greek Anthology*, XVI, cxxv: "In Homer's verse the image [of Laertes] is painted on immortal pages."
- <sup>45</sup> *John Shearman*, *Only connect ...*, Princeton 1992, p. 110-117; the reference is to *Martial*, *Epigrams*, X, xxxii, 5-6. I have not found: *Ettore Bonora*, *Ritratti letterari del Cinquecento*, Milan 1964.
- <sup>46</sup> Se nel scriver a me fosse concessa  
 la eccellenza che a voi ne la pittura,  
 non, Raphael, da me vostra figura  
 men che da voi la mia vedreste espressa.  
 The whole sonnet in *Jean-Jacques Marchand* (ed.), *Antonio Tebaldeo*, Rime, vol. III, Modena 1992, p. 438-439; a paraphrase and context in *Shearman* (n. 45), p. 116.
- <sup>47</sup> Se il color per voi spese, voi l'inchiostro  
 per lui spendete, ché se pur avranno  
 l'opre sue fine, eterne esser potranno,  
 se scudo si faran del scriver vostro.  
*Marchand* (n. 46), p. 442-443.
- <sup>48</sup> It is usual to quote the version of *Quod lacerum* published by *Giorgio Vasari*, *Vite*, Florence 1550, p. 673; but variant texts were published by *Beffa Negrini* (n. 13), p. 432-433, and *Carlo Fea*, *Per la invenzione seguita del sepolcro di Raffaele Sanzio da Urbino*, Rome 1833, p. 13.
- <sup>49</sup> *Auree epistole Johannis Pici Mirandule*, Antwerp 1502; he has just been discussing *statua*, but I think *imago* was correctly rendered as *ritratto* by *Lodovico Dolce*, in: *Epistole di G. Plinio, di M. Franc. Petrarca, del S. Pico della Mirandola ...*, Venice 1558, fol. 127v.
- <sup>50</sup> *Shearman* (n. 45), p. 112, 135.
- <sup>51</sup> In a letter of 19 July 1515, Tebaldeo writes to Castiglione in Urbino: "Signor Conte honoratissimo ..."  
 (*Marchand* [n. 46], p. 430).
- <sup>52</sup> *Cicero's* taxonomy is in *Epistulae ad familiares*, II, 14. I do not think there is a single model in ancient epistolography for *Signor Conte*, but the much longer *Ep. fam.*, XV, xxi, to Trebonius, may be one of several.
- <sup>53</sup> The Brief has frequently been misdated 1 August 1515, following *Bottari* (n. 3), vol. VI, p. 14, and *Angelo Comolli*, *Vita inedita di Raffaello da Urbino illustrata con note*, Rome 1790, p. 75-76, occasionally 7 August 1514 or 1515, and even 1 August 1516 by *Alfred von Reumont*, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, vol. III/2, Berlin 1870, p. 405. 1 August 1514 is the correct date (the best source is BAV, Ms. Vat. Lat. 3364, fols. 169r-v, Pietro Bembo's holograph and corrected manuscript of the *Epistulae Leonis Decimi*; the Ambrosiana codex P 130 gives the date "Die primo Augusti 1514"). However, *Carlo Fea*, *Notizie intorno Raffaele Sanzio da Urbino*, Rome 1822, p. 13, rightly said that that was not the date of the appointment; when Raphael's salary as architect was paid it was back-dated to 1 April 1514 (Archivio della Reverenda Fabbrica di San Pietro, Primo Piano, Serie Armadi, vol. II, fol. 38r); and Raphael wrote to his uncle Simone Ciarla about this salary on 1 July 1514 (*Golzio* [n. 3], p. 32-32).
- <sup>54</sup> *La Rocca* (n. 24), p. 1078-1079, states that Castiglione was in Rome from January 1514 until the end of September 1514; I have no evidence later than his letter of 17 August (*ibidem*, p. 363). His custom of staying in Rome through the Summer is mentioned, I think ironically, as "la sua buona usanza" in Bembo's letter to Bibbiena of 19 April 1516 (*Golzio* [n. 3], p. 44).
- <sup>55</sup> See above, n. 9.
- <sup>56</sup> *Gaetano Guasti* (ed.), *Raffaello d'Urbino e il padre suo Giovanni Santi*, opera di J.-D. Passavant, vol. I, Florence 1882, p. 148. Guasti's note bears repeating in its entirety: "Fu impressa la prima volta nella *Nuova scelta di lettere etc.* di Bernardino Pino (Venezia, 1582, tom. II, pag. 249). - La lettera porta sottoscritto il nome di Raffaello, e veramente contiene il concetto suo, ma espresso con altra forma e con bel modo e di lingua e di stile. Laonde io credo che altro letterato e suo amicissimo la componesse per lui, e secondo il suo pensiero. Quando scriveva proprio Raffaello, si vede nella lettera allo zio: quella sì che è sua fattura, e nella lingua dove apparisce il dialetto nativo e romanesco, e nello stile, che è d'uomo che nulla o poco sapeva di lettere. Dovendo scrivere in risposta ad una lettera del Castiglione, uomo letteratissimo, è naturale che il Sanzio non si arrischiasse di farlo senza l'aiuto altrui."
- <sup>57</sup> *Crowe/Cavalcaselle* (n. 9), vol. II, p. 200-207.
- <sup>58</sup> The passage in question is in *Roskill* (n. 35), p. 90-92.



- <sup>59</sup> Marco Minghetti, Raffaello, Bologna 1885, p. 142-143: "Per reputarla autentica bisogna supporre ..."; he notes Guasti's recent suggestion. Minghetti was one of the scholars who did most to assemble and criticize the documents.
- <sup>60</sup> Adolfo Venturi, Raffaello, Rome 1920, p. 64. In the first, English, edition Crowe/Cavalcaselle (n. 9), vol. II, p. 206, had said: "It is curious that the letter to Castiglione should have been printed at Venice, the very place where *it might have been found* amongst Aretino's undated drafts." In the first Italian edition (Raffaello, la sua vita e le sue opere, vol. II, Florence 1890, p. 285) this passage is rendered as: "E conferma questa congettura il fatto che la lettera diretta al Castiglione fu stampata appunto a Venezia, *dove fu ritrovata* fra i manoscritti senza data dell'Aretino." This accident seems to be the origin not only of Venturi's reading but also (perhaps by way of Venturi) of the influential error in *Golzio* (n. 3), p. 30 ("fu pubblicata tra le lettere dell'Aretino", "Pubblicata ... da Bernardino Pino tra le lettere dell'Aretino"), repeated *idem*, *La vita*, in: Mario Salmi (ed.), Raffaello: L'opera, le fonti, la fortuna, Novara 1968, vol. II, p. 590.
- <sup>61</sup> Cian (n. 12), p. 76; and again, *idem* (n. 3), p. 83; a date for Aretino's arrival in Rome c. 1517 is agreed by *Giuliano Innamorati*, in *Diz. Biogr. Ital.*, vol. IV, p. 91.
- <sup>62</sup> Marielene Putscher, Raphaels Sixtinische Madonna. Das Werk und seine Wirkung, Tübingen 1955, p. 26; V. Mariani, Raffaello e il mondo classico, in: *Studi romani*, VII, 1959, p. 163-164; *Golzio* (n. 60), p. 590; *Roskill* (n. 35), p. 309; *Floriana Mauro*, in: *I luoghi di Raffaello a Roma*, exh. cat., Rome 1983, p. 49; *Morolli* (n. 17), p. 36, 44-45, and *idem*, *Oltre Vitruvio: il "Trattato Nuovo" di Raffaello*, in: *Studi su Raffaello, atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Urbino/Firenze 1984*, ed. Micaela Sambucco Hamoud/Maria Letizia Strocchi, Urbino 1987, p. 258; *Ray* (n. 17), p. 51-52, 62, thinks either of Aretino or Dolce (following Battisti: see n. 63).
- <sup>63</sup> Eugenio Battisti, Il concetto d'imitazione nel Cinquecento da Raffaello a Michelangelo, in: *Commentari*, VII, 1956, p. 90-92, and *idem*, *Rinascimento e Barocco*, Turin 1960, p. 181; and Adriano Prandi, Fermenti del manierismo fra il Belvedere di Bramante e la "Loggetta" di Raffaello in Vaticano, in: *Studi in onore di Antonio Corsano*, Manduria 1970, p. 637.
- <sup>64</sup> Andrea Emiliani, L'Estasi di Santa Cecilia di Raffaello da Urbino nella Pinacoteca Nazionale di Bologna, exh. cat., Bologna 1983, p. xxxii. Similarly Thomas M. Greene, *The light in Troy. Imitation and discovery in Renaissance poetry*, New Haven/London 1982, p. 233.
- <sup>65</sup> Thus one may have sympathy with the latest position of *Thoenes* (n. 9), p. 66, that the letter is "probabilmente un falso, o diciamo una finzione della cerchia Aretino/Dolce", by which I take it he means in Venice c. 1550.
- <sup>66</sup> The quotation is from *Lodovico Dolce, Le osservazioni*, 2nd ed., Venice 1552, p. 7, from the prefatory letter to Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari; see also p. 8-9, where he promises to be a guide "verso il colle della Thoscana eloquenza", and p. 16: "... conosca indubitamente ciascuno di dover dalla assidova lettione cosi de' versi, come delle prose del Bembo ritrar grandissimo profitto, che tutti i suoi componimenti sommamente gli piaceranno ..."
- <sup>67</sup> The Renaissance genre is studied by *Butler* (n. 3), and also by *Fritz Neubert*, Einführung in die französische und italienische Epistolarliteratur der Renaissance und ihre Probleme, in: *Romanistisches Jb.*, XII, 1961, p. 67-93; *Mario Marti*, L'epistolario come "genere" e un problema editoriale, in: *Studi e problemi di critica testuale* (Convegno di studi di filologia italiana nel centenario della Commissione per i testi di lingua, 7-9 aprile 1960), ed. Raffaele Spongano, Bologna 1961, p. 206; *Cecil H. Clough*, *The cult of Antiquity: letters and letter collections*, in: *Cultural aspects of the Italian Renaissance. Essays in honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, Manchester/New York 1976, p. 33; *Amadeo Quondam*, *Le "carte messaggere". Retorica e modelli di comunicazione epistolare: per un indice dei libri di lettere del Cinquecento*, Rome 1981; and *Gigliola Fragnito*, review of *Marcantonio Flamini*, *Lettere*, ed. Alesandro Pastore, in: *Studi veneziani*, N.S. IV, 1980, p. 324.
- <sup>68</sup> *Guido La Rocca*, I ritratti di Baldassar Castiglione, in: *Il ritratto antico illustrato*, I, 1983, p. 66, dates the poem to June-August 1520; I follow *Serassi* (n. 3), vol. I, p. 74, who thought it went with Castiglione's letter to Ippolita, 31 August 1519 (*La Rocca* [n. 24], p. 484).
- <sup>69</sup> *Jacopo Sannazaro, De partu Virginis*, Venice 1533, fol. 86v; *Dolce, L'Aretino* (n. 35), p. 114; *Julius Caesar Scaliger, Poetices libri septem*, Geneva 1561, p. 307; I.M. Toscano (ed.), *Carmina illustrium poetarum Italorum*, vol. I, Venice 1576, fol. 68v; for the Ms. see *Cian* (n. 3), p. 226.
- <sup>70</sup> *Carmina quinque illustrium poetarum*, Venice 1548, p. 71, and in later editions, including Venice 1558, fol. 35r; *Olympiae Fulviae Moratae mulieris omnium eruditissimae Latina et Graeca monumenta*, Basel 1558, p. 112 ("Hippolitae Taurellae mantuanae epistola ad maritum suum Balthasarem Castilionem apud Leonem X. Ponti. Rom. oratorem"); *Marliani* (n. 24), unpag., *Vita*, which was complete by 1573 (*La Rocca* [n. 24], p. xxxvi); *Matteo Castiglione, De origine, rebus gestis, ac privilegiis Gentis Castilionae*, Venice 1596, p. 33; *Beffa Negrini* (n. 13), p. 436.



- <sup>71</sup> Horace, *Epistolae*, I, ix.
- <sup>72</sup> *La Rocca* (n. 24), p. 252, 313, 376.
- <sup>73</sup> *Cian* (n. 3), p. 222.
- <sup>74</sup> James Hankins, Cosimo de' Medici as a patron of humanistic literature, in: Cosimo il Vecchio de' Medici, 1389-1464, ed. Francis Ames-Lewis, Oxford 1992, p. 74; Bernardo Bellincioni, Rime, ed. Pietro Fanfani, Bologna 1878, p. 12, 36, 169. For an elaborate analysis of an apocryphal correspondence of the period, see Cecil Clough, Pietro Bembo, Madonna G., Berenice and Veronica Gambara, in: *Commentari dell'Ateneo di Brescia*, CLXII, 1963, p. 209.
- <sup>75</sup> I have borrowed the translation of C.E. Bennett, *Horace, The Odes and Epodes* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, Mass./London 1978 (1st. ed. 1914), p. 287.
- <sup>76</sup> *Zenophon, Mirabilia*, iii, 10, 2; *Marci Tulli Ciceronis rhetorici libri duo qui vocantur De inventione*, II, i, 1-3; *Plinius, Naturalis historia*, xxxv, 64; *Alberti, Della Pittura*, III (see n. 78).
- <sup>77</sup> Very similarly in the final text: I liii 27; *Opere* (1960) 87.
- <sup>78</sup> Giorgio Santangelo, Le epistole "De imitatione" di Giovanfrancesco Pico della Mirandola e di Pietro Bembo, Florence 1954, p. 27-28. Alberti already connected an *idea delle bellezze* with the approach of Zeuxis, but the other way round: ed. Mallé (n. 33), p. 107, ed. Grayson (n. 33), p. 90-91.
- <sup>79</sup> E.g. Cicero, *Orator*, xxix, 101: "redeoque ad illam Platonis de qua dixeram rei formam et speciem." Giovan Francesco Pico's second tract against Bembo (1518): "Has rerum formas appellat [Cicero] Ideas", from *Orator*, ii, 9, "et quid haec ipsa sit perfecta in animo species ideave dicendi" (*Santangelo* [n. 78], p. 64-66, 74).
- <sup>80</sup> In EL" 41v (1524 ff.), Castiglione changes *Idea* to *forma bella* (see below, n. 90).
- <sup>81</sup> Pico, 1512: "cum nostro in animo Idea quaedam et tanquam radix insit aliqua" (*Santangelo* [n. 78], p. 27). Cicero, *Orator*, ii, 9: "Nec vero [Phidias] cum faceret Iovis formam aut Minervae, contemplabatur aliquem e quo similitudinem duceret, sed ipsius in mente insidebat species pulchritudinis eximia quaedam [...] sic perfectae eloquentiae speciem animo videmus, effigiem auribus quaerimus." This passage is quoted verbatim by Pico in his second tract (*Santangelo* [n. 78], p. 65). The ultimate source in Cicero of the reference in *Signor Conte* was already accurately recognized by Bellori (*Winner* [n. 3], p. 528).
- <sup>82</sup> Giorgio De Blasi, Problemi critici del Rinascimento, in: *Letteratura italiana. Le correnti*, Milan 1956, p. 284.
- <sup>83</sup> Vittorio Cian, Un decennio della vita di M. Pietro Bembo, Turin 1885, p. 49-50, and Carlo Dionisotti, in: *Diz. Biogr. Ital. s.v. Bembo*, vol. VIII, 1966, p. 133-151. There is a very helpful exposition of Pico's and Bembo's agendas in *idem*, *Prose e rime di Pietro Bembo*, Turin 1966, p. 36-39.
- <sup>84</sup> *Battisti*, 1956 (n. 63), p. 90-92.
- <sup>85</sup> The point must have been obvious to Bellori (see above, n. 5); more recently: André Chastel, *Marsile Ficin et l'art*, Geneva 1954, p. 72; Mariani (n. 62), p. 164 ("segna una rapidissima maturazione del suo [Raphael's] idealismo neoplatonico"); Heinrich Pfeiffer, *Zur Ikonographie von Raffaels Disputa: Egidio da Viterbo und die christlich-platonische Konzeption der Stanza della Segnatura*, Rome 1975, p. 209; Gombrich, 1983 (n. 8), p. 8-9; Sylvie Deswarte-Rosa, *Idea et le Temple de la Peinture*, in: *Revue de l'art*, XCII, 1991, p. 32, much exaggerating the Neo-Platonism of Michelangelo, makes the 'Raphael' of the letter influenced philosophically by Michelangelo.
- <sup>86</sup> Giuliano Ercoli, Raffaello e il pensiero di Leon Battista Alberti, in: *Studi su Raffaello* (n. 62), p. 89-90. The Imitation-theory of *Signor Conte*, still attributed to Raphael, is compared with Castiglione's by Ugo Bazzotti/Amedeo Belluzzi, *Le concezioni estetiche di Baldassare Castiglione e la Cappella nel Santuario di Santa Maria delle Grazie*, in: *Convegno di studi su Baldassare Castiglione nel quinto centenario della nascita*, ed. Ettore Bonora, Mantua 1980, p. 118, its Platonism similarly by Lynn M. Loudon, "Sprezzatura" in Raphael and Castiglione, in: *Art Journal*, XXVIII, 1968, p. 53. Castiglione's Platonism is studied by Ertl (n. 7), p. 45-50, by Albert Douglas Menut, *Castiglione and the Nicomachean Ethics*, in: *Publications of the Modern Language Society of America*, LVIII, 1943, p. 310-311, and by Rita Falke, "Furor Platonicus" als Kompositionselement im *Cortegiano*, in: *Romanistisches Jb.*, X, 1959, p. 112; G.F. Pico's by Giorgio Santangelo, *Il petrarchismo del Bembo e di altri poeti del '500*, Rome/Palermo 1962, p. 38, and by Dante Della Terza, *Imitatio. Theory and practice. The example of Bembo the poet*, in: *Yearbook of Italian Studies*, I, 1971, p. 121-123. The mimesis-theory in *Signor Conte*, while still attributed to Raphael, is placed between those of G.F. Pico and Castiglione by Manfred Tafuri, *Giulio Romano: linguaggio, mentalità, committenti*, in: *Giulio Romano, exh. cat.*, Milan 1989, p. 35, and *idem*, *Ricerca del Rinascimento. Principi, città, architetti*, Turin 1992, p. 6.
- <sup>87</sup> *Opere* (1960) 12.
- <sup>88</sup> This passage in Ms. B, all cancelled at B" (c. 1515-16), leads into the familiar and lyrical opening: "Alle pendici de l'Appenino quasi al mezzo de Italia ..." Cf. I ii 1, and *Opere* (1960) 16.
- <sup>89</sup> Also Ms. D liiii r (c. 1520); I think this passage disappears thereafter.



- <sup>90</sup> I xxxvii 77; Opere (1960) 66. Not all Castiglione's corrections were in fact taken up by the printer.
- <sup>91</sup> Panofsky (n. 7), p. 32; *idem*, *Idea. A concept in art theory*, New York 1968, p. 59-60. Panofsky's judgement seems to be reflected in the isolation and metaphysical limitation claimed for the letter by Ferruccio Ulivi, *L'imitazione nella poetica del Rinascimento*, Milan 1959, p. 32, 135, 143.
- <sup>92</sup> Cian (n. 21), p. 7, 46, 51.
- <sup>93</sup> Now Archivio di Stato, Turin, Raccolta Francesconi, Libro XI, 16r: (at the end of a paragraph expressing his hatred of Tuscan, he gives two examples of corruption): "... cum quosdam audiat, qui, ut elegantiores esse videantur, in sua oratione dicunt Appo, cum Apud dicere volunt [...] et tunc mirifice se locutus putant, cum sodisfacere pro satisfacere proferunt. O aures Batavas et male purgatas!" Vittorio Cian, *Contro il volgare*, in: Studi letterari e linguistici dedicati a Pio Rajna, Milan 1911, p. 286-292, from whom I take the date. *Appo* and *sodisfare* are the only words chosen for attack.
- <sup>94</sup> Ms. D lxiii v (as in C"); EL 43v (as in Aldine ed.). The somewhat more moderate tendency expressed in this shift is to be related, I think, to Castiglione's own progression to a different, broadly synthesizing, stage of the linguistic 'question' between c. 1518 and 1527-28 (see Mario Pozzi, *Il pensiero linguistico di Baldassare Castiglione*, in: *Convegno Baldassare Castiglione*, Milan 1980, p. 82-85).
- <sup>95</sup> I xxxix, 23; Opere (1960) 69. The passage is abbreviated, but the other cases are moved to another context (I xxxv 37; Opere [1960] 61) where the Tuscanisms are, in Canossa's view, *parole corrotte e guaste*.
- <sup>96</sup> The *Vocabolario* of the Accademia della Crusca (1806 edition) has Cellini using this form.
- <sup>97</sup> 20 March 1521: *La Rocca* (n. 24), p. 757.
- <sup>98</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 293, 272.
- <sup>99</sup> Mantuan chancery: Carlo Agnello to Isabella, 6 March 1516, quoted by Alessandro Luzio, *Isabella d'Este e Leon X dal congresso di Bologna alla presa di Milano (1515-1521)*, parte prima, in: *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, ser. 5, XL (1907), p. 50-51; Agostino Gonzaga to Isabella, 18 August 1516, *ibidem*, p. 76; Federico to Angelo Germanello, 13 October 1524, cited by Carlo d'Arco/Villemo Braghinelli, *Intorno al ritratto di Leon X dipinto da Raffaello Sanzio e alla copia fattane da Andrea del Sarto*, in: *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, Ser. 3, VII, 1868, p. 188; Germanello to Federico, 24 October 1524, *ibidem*, p. 186; Giovanni Borromei to Federico, 6 August 1525, *ibidem*, p. 193. Castiglione: to Francesco Maria della Rovere, 18 June 1519, in *La Rocca* (n. 24), p. 417; to Isabella, 2 December 1521, in: *Alessandro Luzio*, *Isabella d'Este e Leone X dal congresso di Bologna alla presa di Milano (1515-1521)*, Parte terza, in: *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, Ser. 5, XLV, 1910, p. 299. Vasari to Martino Bassi, 1570, in *Bottari/Ticozzi*, vol. I, p. 503; I have also noted: Antonio de' Strozzi to Dieci di Balìa, 27 March 1512 (of Julius II), in ASF, Dieci di Balìa, Responsive 109, 205v. Another case may be, I think, in Raphael's first letter to Simone Ciarla, 21 April 1508 (*Golzio* [n. 3], p. 19): "una certa stanza dalavorare la quale tocha a sua S. de alocare", usually read as *Sua Signoria*, but see *Eva Maria Krafft*, *Die Deckenkompositionen Raffaels in der Stanza della Segnatura und der Grabkapelle des Agostino Chigi*, Ph.d. diss., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1960, p. 2.
- <sup>100</sup> *La Rocca* (n. 24), p. 716: "hora non posso confortarlo tanto che basti."
- <sup>101</sup> The phrase *tanto che basti* on a print after Carlo Maratta, *La scuola del disegno* (*Winner* [n. 3], Pl. 1), was traced to this verse of Dante's by Oswald Kutschera-Woborsky, *Ein kunsttheoretisches Thesenblatt Carlo Marattas und seine ästhetischen Anschauungen*, in: *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst* (Beilage der Graphischen Künste), XLII, 1919, p. 16; *Winner* (n. 3), p. 521, is clearly right to say that Maratta had it from *Signor Conte*, and I would only wish to add that the author of the latter had it from Dante.
- <sup>102</sup> *Francesco Cherubini*, *Vocabolario milanese-italiano*, vol. II, Milan 1840, p. 44. Another localized form, significant because it is not for once the Latin one, is *fabrica*, which is listed by *Ferdinando Arrivabene*, *Vocabolario mantovano-italiano*, Mantua 1882.
- <sup>103</sup> *Paolo Ravenna*, *Le mura di Ferrara. Immagini e storia*, Modena 1985, fig. 6.
- <sup>104</sup> For the later period my evidence is incomplete, since *La Rocca's* edition (n. 24) is most regrettably halted at March 1521.
- <sup>105</sup> The two cases of *designare* are in a technical section in which, I think, Castiglione was working on a draft by Raphael; the expository style has shifted markedly from discursive historical, cultural, and diplomatic reference to a pedagogic clarity and professional single-mindedness resembling that of the letter on Villa Madama.
- <sup>106</sup> For example, the passage on Zeuxis and the maidens of Croton begins at B" 84r (1515-16) with *iudicio*, has *iudicio* at C 67v (1516 ff.), D lxxxix v (c. 1520), and EL 59v (1524), and finally in 1524 ff. becomes *giudicio* in EL", as printed in 1528: I liii 31, Opere (1960) 87. The same history may be traced for the passage on variety of manners, I xxxvii 40, Opere (1960) 64. On the other hand at EL" 5v and 6r he has an erratic moment preferring *judicato* to *giudicato*, *judicio* to *giudicio*.



- <sup>107</sup> The forms *iudicio* and *manera* are used in the undated draft for the *Letter to Leo X*, and not *giudicio* and *maniera* as in the transcription by *La Rocca* (n. 24), p. 531, 535, which in general should be ignored. On dialects and Latinisms in this text, see *Cian* (n. 12), p. 75.
- <sup>108</sup> For example: *gli antichi* survives from B" 80r, through C 43r, D liii r, to EL 35v, and is there finally corrected by Castiglione in EL" to *gliantichi*.
- <sup>109</sup> *Lettera dedicatoria*, ii, p. 29-54, 74-77; *Opere* (1960) 9-11.
- <sup>110</sup> *Dolce's* 1552 text is not, in fact, identical to: *Il Libro del Cortegiano del Conte Baldesar Castiglione, di nuovo rincontrato con l'originale scritto di mano de l'autore*, Venice (Aldi filii) 1547.
- <sup>111</sup> *Roskill* (n. 35), p. 114, 263, who remarks that his information about the portrait was not to be found in Vasari, *Dolce's* usual source for his knowledge of Raphael.
- <sup>112</sup> Mostly these are corrections of orthography, such as *ricordando* for *raccordando*, but there are also small adjustments of sense, as *non manco* for *tanto*.
- <sup>113</sup> "Vorrei trouarle belle forme de gliedifici antichi [...] Me ne porge una gran luce Vittruuiò, ma non tanto che basti." This now celebrated passage has perhaps an early echo in *Giangiorgio Trissino's* so-called *Trattato d'Architettura* (1530s): "Havendo io letto diligentemente Lucio Vitruvio [...] trovo che [...] esso Vitruvio è malissimo inteso, e non ammaestra niuno sufficientemente di quest'arte ..." (*Lionello Puppi*, *Scrittori vicentini d'architettura del secolo XVI*, Vicenza 1973, p. 84-85); Trissino's links with Mantua were, of course, very strong. A probable source in Calcagnini for Raphael as critical reader of Vitruvius is mentioned below; yet, as Arnold Nesselrath reminds me, to find Vitruvius wanting was already the polemical position of Alberti ("ut par sit non scripsisse hunc nobis, qui ita scripserit, ut non intelligamus": *Leon Battista Alberti*, *L'Architettura [De re aedificatoria]*, ed. and trans. *Giovanni Orlandi*, Milan 1966, vol. II, p. 441), and probably Calcagnini and Trissino were as careful readers of Alberti as was Castiglione.
- <sup>114</sup> Compare "Ho fatto disegni in più maniere sopra l'inventione di V. S." with *Alberti, Della Pittura*, Book III: "molto gioveranno [poeti and horatori] ad bello componere l'istoria di cui ogni laude consiste in la inventione, quale suole avere questa forza quanto vediamo che, solo senza pittura, per sé la bella inventione sta grata" (ed. *Mallè* [n. 33], p. 104; ed. *Grayson* [n. 33], p. 88).
- <sup>115</sup> *Johann C. Riepenhausen*, 12 Umrisse zum Leben Raphaels von Urbino, 2nd ed. Stuttgart 1834, viii, repr. *Zygmunt Wązbiński*, *San Luca che dipinge la Madonna* all'Accademia di Roma: un "pastiche" zuccariano nella maniera di Raffaello?, in: *Artibus et historiae*, 12 (VI) 1985, p. 36; *Elisabeth Schröter*, *Raffael-Kult und Raffael-Forschung*, in: *Röm. Jb.*, XXVI, 1990, p. 320.
- <sup>116</sup> *Celio Calcagnini, Opera*, Basel 1544, p. 100-101; *Golzio* (n. 3), p. 281-282.
- <sup>117</sup> Another view is taken by *Stefano Ray*, *Il volo di Icaro. Raffaello, architettura e cultura*, in: *Raffaello architetto*, exh. cat., 2nd ed., Milan 1984 (a cura di *Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stefano Ray, Manfredo Tafuri*), p. 56, but his argument rests in part on documents I would not accept, including the "letter to Calvo" (n. 20 above). A generous view of Raphael's literary culture is taken by *Riccardo Scivano*, *Cultura letteraria di Raffaello*, in: *Studi su Raffaello* (n. 62), esp. p. 671-674, with a number of references in the sonnets to Dante, Petrarch, and Pulci, some more convincing than others; again, however, it seems to me that such references are based on superficial reading and belong to the genre, the job in hand, like those in the letter on Villa Madama; they do not delineate an intellectual profile, with instinctive access to deep and diverse resources, like that of *Signor Conte*.
- <sup>118</sup> *Molza's carmen* is copied in a volume of Italian poetry, c. 1530, formerly with H.P. Kraus, New York (to whom I am very grateful for the opportunity to study it) and now in the Getty Museum. It was first mentioned by *Roberto Weiss*, *The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity*, Oxford 1969, p. 96, 209, and related to the *Letter to Leo X* in *John Shearman*, *Raphael*, Rome, and the *Codex Escorialensis*, in: *Master Drawings*, XV, 1977, p. 145. *Giovio's Vita* is in *Barocchi* (n. 3), vol. I, p. 13-16. *Fulvio's* comment is in: *Antiquitates urbis per Andream Fulvium antiquarium, Romae nuperime aedite* (dated in the editor's preface by *Sadoletto* 15 February 1527), author's preface.



## RIASSUNTO

Il presente articolo studia la lettera *Signor Conte* indirizzata a Baldassarre Castiglione, pubblicata per la prima volta nel 1554 da Lodovico Dolce, che la attribuisce a Raffaello. La lettera è stata a buon titolo riconosciuta come la più probante testimonianza sulla cultura di Raffaello, e tuttavia, paradossalmente, il primo testo quasi mai viene letto; la sua interpretazione si basa abitualmente su una falsa provenienza negli scritti dell'Aretino, e viene attribuito fondandosi su una versione edita in seguito. La disamina inizia col tratteggiare i problemi relativi ad altri rapporti letterari tra Castiglione e Raffaello, in primo luogo la *Lettera a Leone X*, la *Lettera su Villa Madama*, e gli svariati riferimenti a Raffaello nel *Cortegiano*. La diversa attendibilità storica di quest'ultimo viene definita col collocare i passi in questione in otto stadi della evoluzione del dialogo.

Il carattere della lettera *Signor Conte* è delimitato dalle convenzioni epistolari del Rinascimento e riferito in particolare a ritratti letterari del periodo (la lettera come 'ritratto della mente'). Si sostiene che il testo suddetto non può essere ritenuto semplicemente ciò che pretende di essere, una missiva di Raffaello a Castiglione del 1514 circa, e che vi sono, inoltre, incoerenze interne nella conclusione abituale, ovvero che la sostanza della lettera sia di Raffaello, ma la veste letteraria dovuta a un qualche amico. Si insiste sul fatto che l'argomento è tanto improbabile, come testo attribuito a Raffaello, quanto il suo stile, e viene avanzata invece la proposta che la lettera sia opera dello stesso Castiglione, una *fiction* indirizzata a sé medesimo, di cui si adducono analoghi esempi. La nuova attribuzione risulta in parte dal sovrapporre il profilo intellettuale, rispettivamente, dell'autore della lettera e del Castiglione, e in parte su di un confronto filologico tra il primo testo di Dolce e i manoscritti delle lettere del Castiglione e del *Cortegiano*. Questo stesso esame comparativo suggerisce come probabile data i primi anni venti. Le posizioni prese nella lettera su argomenti interni alle diatribe su imitazione e linguaggio vengono definite collocandole nella cerchia di Canossa e di Castiglione. Infine, l'immagine che la lettera ci offre della cultura di Raffaello viene messa a contrasto con quella proveniente da altre fonti risalenti pressappoco alla morte di Raffaello; vengono sottolineate e l'unicità del testo e la sua fortuna; si suggerisce infine che la lettera abbia avuto poderoso successo in un senso quasi certamente previsto, ma che venga invece correttamente intesa come un ritratto dovuto, al pari di quello del Castiglione per mano di Raffaello, all'arte e all'affetto di un amico.