larger point, the text often moves rather abruptly from one topic to the next, and one senses that Anderson was frustrated by the lack of space. Although the book is written as an introductory text for students and interested nonspecialists, those more familiar with the material will be able to expand the underlying linkages and arguments. This is an important and timely book presenting Renaissance architecture for a generation less inclined to accept the reductive narrative established long ago. The study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century art and architecture has been enlivened by an expansion of the field in recent years, but the earlier periods have lagged somewhat behind. Anderson’s book, for a generation less inclined to accept the reductive narrative established long ago.

KRIStOFFER NEVILLE
University of California, Riverside

Notes

Aloisio Antinori, ed. Studio d'Architettura Civile: Gli atlanli di architettura moderna e la diffusione dei modelli romani nell’Europa del Settecento

The Studio d’Architettura Civile, published in three volumes by Domenico de’ Rossi (Rome, 1702–21), is one of the most beautifully produced architecture books of its time. It also constituted an essential reference and source of inspiration for patrons, architects, and amateurs in eighteenth-century Europe as well as comprising a powerful instrument of the promotion of Roman baroque aesthetics and vocabulary. De’ Rossi’s Studio—a facsimile of which was published in 1972—contains 287 folio plates organized into three volumes according to three thematic areas: doors and windows; chapels, altars, and tombs; and plans, elevations, and cross sections of both sacred and secular buildings. 1 Roman buildings largely dominate the plates of the Studio, but some Florentine and Neapolitan examples are also included. As for architects, Michelangelo, Borromini, and Bernini are the best represented, but much space is also dedicated to later generations, including Camillo Arcucci, Giovanni Antonio de’ Rossi, Matteo de’ Rossi, and Carlo Fontana. The plates, of excellent quality, were produced after drawings made by Alessandro Specchi, which were orthographic representations in line with the practice of the Accademia di San Luca. Engravers of the caliber of Specchi, Francesco Aquila, Vincenzo Franceschini, Antonio Barber, and Filippo Vasconi executed these plates. Yet this extraordinary work of art has so far received little attention; although an abundant literature is available on the engravers involved in its making, the Studio itself and the workshop of de’ Rossi have remained long ignored by historians.2

The volume edited by Aloisio Antinori is dedicated to the production of the Studio d’Architettura and to its reception in eighteenth-century Europe, and it is the final output of an international collaborative research project carried out since 2008, the first results of which were presented as conference papers in Parma in 2012 (“Libri, incisioni e immagini di architettura come fonti per il progetto in Italia, XV–XX secolo,” 17–18 September 2012). The volume contains a brief preface, eight essays, and an appendix section, followed by a generous bibliography and a helpful index including names of people and places. The texts are in Italian except for the three essays written in English by Christiane Salge, Martin Olin, and Terry Friedman. The volume is carefully edited and its abundant illustrations are, for the most part, of excellent quality (a few pictures are blurred and some of the color ones would have benefited from postproduction color editing). In the first essay, Antinori focuses on the production of the Studio d’Architettura, which the author contextualizes within the practice of the de’ Rossi family press as well as within the broader artistic and cultural milieu of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Rome. Antinori traces the history of the de’ Rossi workshop from its foundation by Giuseppe the Elder in 1629 to its establishment in the 1650s as one of the most successful presses of Rome under the direction of Giacomo’s son, Giovanni Giacomo, to its rise to dominance over the same market in the 1680s, and finally under the direction of Giovanni’s son, Domenico de’ Rossi, from 1691 to 1729.

While exploring the diversified output of the de’ Rossi shop over the span of a century in its technical and artistic aspects, the essay also emphasizes the commercial strategies that ensured its success, including the ability to secure the services of first-rate draftsmen and engravers such as Falda and Specchi; the choice of targeting a broad audience that included architecture professionals as well as amateurs and print collectors; the efforts to ingratiate important patrons, within the papacy in particular; and the sensitivity to the trends of the cultural market in its revivals of Michelangelesque and Borrominesque architecture as well as in its successive pro- and anti-French turns.

The second and third essays both deal with architecture books inspired by the Studio and produced shortly after its publication: Oronzo Brunetti focuses on Ferdinando Ruggieri’s Studio d’Architettura Civile (Florence, 1722–28) while Tommaso Manfredi analyzes Vasconi’s Studio d’Architettura Civile (Rome, n.d. [1724–30]) and Filippo Juvarra’s homonymous work, which remained in manuscript form (MS, Turin, Fondazione Antonio Maria e Mariella Marocco, 1725). Ruggieri spent two years in Rome from 1712 to 1714, and Brunetti highlights the architect-engraver’s connections with Fontana, Ludovico Sergardi, Juvarra, and the Accademia di San Luca, as well as the debt of his Florentine Studio toward de’ Rossi’s. But the author’s main focus is the previously neglected Florentine precedents to Ruggieri’s publication such as the albums of drawings by Giorgio Vasari the Younger and Giovanni Battista Nelli. He also examines the cultural and political significance of Ruggieri’s project, mostly dedicated to Michelangelesque
sixteenth-century buildings, within the context of the declining Medici dynasty and the related debates concerning the notion of florentinitas as a marker of identity. Manfredi’s essay follows the intellectual and professional development of Juvarra and Vasconi: their training, their relationships with Fontana’s workshop in Rome and with the Accademia di San Luca, and their later careers. The focus is on how de’ Rossi’s Studio, and the Accademia methods it illustrated and promoted, informed the architects-engravers’ work, not only with regard to their choice of subject for their books (Vasconi’s is a collection of Borrominesque creations and motives, Juvarra’s a collection of exemplary buildings based on his lecture plans at the Accademia), but also with regard to their understanding of the relation between print and built architecture.

Each of the remaining essays analyzes the impact of de’ Rossi’s Studio on the production of both print and built architecture in eighteenth-century Spain, Portugal, Germany and Austria, Sweden, and England. All the authors grapple with the complex issue of isolating the specific contribution of de’ Rossi’s volumes to artistic contexts in which, due to travels or training, both patrons and artists often were already under the spell of Roman architecture. Delfín Rodríguez. Ruiz explores the variety of channels through which the Studio became an “enormous influence” (115) in eighteenth-century Spain, including the illustrious patrons who acquired it for their libraries, such as Queen Isabella Farnese and King Philip V; the Italian architects who worked on royal projects such as the Granja de San Ildefonso Palace in Segovia; the local architects for whom the Studio substituted for a sojourn in Rome, such as Ventura Rodríguez; and the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando and the erudite circles that orbited around it. Giuseppina Raggi’s essay on Portugal focuses on the enthusiastic promotion of Roman architectural models during the reign of King John V (1706–50), who not only launched a “program of systematic acquisition” of architecture books, prints, and drawings available on the Roman market (143) but also hired architects trained in Rome, such as Juvarra, Johann Friedrich Ludwig, and Antonio Canevari, to work on the royal palaces in Lisbon and Mafra. The case of Mafra, in particular, shows the central role the Studio played in the transfer of architectural models across geographical boundaries and also from paper into built architecture. Similarly, Salge points out a number of instances in which the doors and windows illustrated in the Studio seem to have been directly translated into stone in eighteenth-century Germany and Austria. Salge underlines that this was partially due to the fact that they could be applied “without any great effort to existing façades and thus afford buildings a fresh look swiftly and cost effectively” (180); she also provides a compelling picture of how significant a model the Studio became for architectural books produced in the German-speaking world since the 1710s. Olin’s essay focuses on the impact the Studio had on the works of Nicodemus Tessin in Sweden, especially for the Royal Palace of Stockholm. While the palace has been traditionally considered a generic “undigested compendium of Roman architecture” (190), Olin shows that it was de’ Rossi’s Studio that informed much of its design. The author also explores the significance Tessin attributed to the publications of de’ Rossi—not only the Studio but also the Insignium Romæ Temporæ Prospectus (1683) and the Disegni di vari Altari e Cappelle (1688–89)—in the promotion of Roman baroque models that could counterbalance the dominance of the French Academy and the “normative publications it supported” such as François Blondel’s Cours d’Architecture (1675–83) (200). Friedman looks at the “climax of European Baroque in Great Britain” (225) that took place during the first three decades of the eighteenth century mainly through the works of Thomas Archer and William and Francis Smith and through the volumes of de’ Rossi’s Studio, which became the “most influential contemporary Italian architectural pattern book of the age” (213). Focusing on three case studies—Heythrop House, Oxfordshire (1707–10); Beningbrough Hall, near York (1710–16); and Sudbrook House at Peterham (1715–19)—Friedman shows that the Studio did not simply serve as a catalogue of interchangeable decorative motives but that English architects used it to “create an unequivocally holistic, blocky Roman Baroque palazzo form … which penetrated beyond mere façade-ism into a correspondingly sympathetic treatment of the interiors” (216).

The appendix to the volume consists of three essays dedicated to the most important architecture books published by the de’ Rossi shop: the Insignium Romæ Temporæ Prospectus, the Disegni di vari Altari e Cappelle, and the Studio d’Architettura itself. Written by Paola Piacentino (for the Prospectus and the Studio) and by Antinori (for the Disegni), the essays read like catalogue entries focused on these books’ content and the artists who participated in their production. Accompanying tables helpfully detail the existence and location of preparatory drawings and other drawings related to or derived from de’ Rossi’s volumes, as well as the reuse of certain plates from previous publications.

Antinori’s edited volume is an important and original contribution of excellent quality to the interwoven histories of architecture, architecture books, and prints. Its presentation of the most up-to-date research on the production and eighteenth-century European circulation and reception of architecture books by the de’ Rossi shop renders it an indispensable reference for scholars as well as anyone interested in the dissemination and cultural relevance of architecture books in the early modern era. It is curious, however, that the volume lacks an essay focused on the circulation of the Studio in France, particularly in view of the many connections and rivalries between the Parisian and Roman cultural, artistic, and academic milieus during the reign of Louis XIV. Hopefully this lacuna will help to stimulate similar research among historians of French art and architecture.

SARA GALLETTI
Duke University

Notes

John A. Pinto

**Speaking Ruins: Piranesi, Architects, and Antiquity in Eighteenth-Century Rome**


John Wilton-Ely

**Piranesi, Paestum & Soane**

Munich: Prestel, 2013, 120 pp., 58 color illus. $39.95 (cloth), ISBN 9783791348063

A letter of 1774 from William Chambers to a former student living in Rome draws attention to that city’s seminal importance in architectural education. “Converse much with Artists of All Countries particularly foreigners,” Chambers wrote. “Seek for those who have most reputation. . . . Amongst which forget not Piranesi, who you may See in my name, he is full of Matter, extravagant ‘tis true, often Absurd, but from his overflows You may gather much information. . . . Form if you can a style of Your own,” he urged, “in which endeavour to avoid the faults and bend the Perfections of all.” Thus Chambers advocated an eclectic design process for which the Rome of Giovanni Battista Piranesi furnished the crucible. Both books discussed in this review reinforce the wisdom of Chamber’s remarks and elucidate the role played by publications of new archaeological finds.

Prestel’s handsome second edition of *John Wilton-Ely’s Piranesi, Paestum & Soane* of 2002 definitely improves upon the original softbound version published by Azimuth Editions. Larger format, more durable binding, and higher quality color reproductions enhance the contents, notably the illustrations featured in the central section: Piranesi’s seventeen magnificent drawings of the three antique Doric temples at Paestum (Greek Poseidonia) in southern Italy. In most other respects, the editions are identical except that noted Piranesi specialist Wilton-Ely updates notes 48–74 and the bibliography to reflect advances in scholarship. Puzzlingly, nowhere except in the acknowledgments does any mention of the Azimuth first edition occur. And the dust jacket blurb describes Soane as Piranesi’s “contemporary, friend, and colleague,” belying the scant evidence of any such close personal relationship presented inside the covers. This caveat and bibliographic questions aside, the second edition makes an insightful and visually appealing contribution to the literature.

Wilton-Ely’s nine chapters start with one titled “Piranesi, Paestum & Soane,” in which the Chambers letter just quoted provides the keynote for the whole book. It happens that prior to his departure for Rome in March 1778, Soane received from Chambers a copy of the letter. Quick as always to follow up on any promising introduction to a possible mentor, the young Englishman heeded Chambers’s advice and approached the ailing Piranesi. It is a good thing that he did because their acquaintance was perforce brief. Soane arrived on 2 May and the Italian died on 9 November of that year (not 1777 as mistakenly printed on page 72). Yet in a typical act of Piranesi’s generosity to foreigners, he presented Soane with four of his prints of Rome, a kindness the grateful Soane never forgot.

The Chambers letter sets the stage for a masterful chapter that investigates Soane’s initial artistic debts to Piranesi. Wilton-Ely begins with Piranesi’s *Bridge of Magnificence* (1743), etched shortly after the artist’s arrival in Rome from Venice, which almost certainly influenced Soane even before he left England. Similarly, Soane admired the *Carceri d’Invenzione* prints (1745, revised 1761). Appropriately enough, they inspired George Dance’s Newgate Prison in London, a building on which Soane worked for his revered first master in the early 1770s. As Wilton-Ely points out, Dance had previously known Piranesi well in Rome.

Wilton-Ely skillfully interweaves two radically different careers: Soane’s with a string of notable buildings to his credit; Piranesi constantly thwarted in that regard except for his hidden-away jewel on Rome’s Aventine Hill, S. Maria del Priorato. Soane collected preparatory drawings of the design that show its “sophisticated linear collage of antique motifs” (17). I believe that the entrance façade of Soane’s own country house, Pitzhanger Manor, subtly adopted Piranesi’s collage approach. Beneath side windows, Soane imbedded a copy of the antique bas-relief of a spread eagle that Piranesi had etched on the title page of the second volume of his *Vasi, Canedelabri, Cippi . . .* (1778). Wilton-Ely’s highly informative notes remark that one of the sepulchral objects illustrated in this publication ended up in Soane’s possession. He envisoned it inside Pitzhanger, I would speculate, as yet another acknowledgment of his allegiance to Piranesi!

The next two chapters constitute the core of Wilton-Ely’s book, in which he sets out the history of Paestum, the circumstances of its mid-eighteenth-century rediscovery, and the shock this event caused in artistic circles. Three ancient temples of mid-fifth-century date, in as good a state of preservation as anything surviving from that period in Greece, sat side by side.