

# THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE



---

*Art Historians and Art Critics — vi: Alois Riegl*

OTTO PÄCHT

*A Domenichino Series at the National Gallery: the Frescoes  
from the Villa Aldobrandini*

LUIGI SALERNO

*Sir Bruce Ingram as a Collector of Drawings*

LUKE HERRMANN AND MICHAEL ROBINSON

---

MAY 1963

PRICE 7s 6d NET (U.S.A. \$1.50)

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION £5 (U.S.A. \$16)

(p.512) is distinctly misleading. In the first place you specify among 'the paintings criticized' less than a dozen works. But a full count of the pictures included in the exhibition that came to Mr Chrysler from the two New York sources that are under fire, the Hartert Galleries and Harry B. Yotnakparian, leads to a total of over seventy-five works.<sup>1</sup> Then again you say that 'Mrs Betcherman . . . discusses none of the disputed paintings', but she does in fact refer to several items which carry a provenance going back to the Hartert Galleries. These are, to be precise, paintings attributed to: Denis, Gleizes, Gris, Kandinsky, Marcoussis (two works), Nolde, Picasso (the oval *Cubist Composition*), and Rouault (*Christ and Disciples on the Road to Emmaus*, which is catalogued with a provenance said to go back beyond Hartert to Ambroise Vollard). The *Cubist Composition* attributed to Braque as a work of 1910, which Mrs Betcherman also mentions, is catalogued with the following provenance: 'The Artist, 1910-1912; Barcelona, Spain, 1912'. But, very curiously, no other record of intermediate ownership is provided.

It is precisely because of what the paintings look like to anyone who examines them with a skilled and experienced eye that we have drawn attention in this way to the question of provenance. On this basis it is our opinion that all of the above works, and indeed every single picture that came to Mr Chrysler from Hartert or Yotnakparian, should be regarded as suspect until such time as a reasonable account can be produced of its claim to authenticity. Further, since it is in Canada that these works have received a bona fide showing - one which could well be used at a later date as an extra embellishment to the pictures' pedigrees - we think that the British art world certainly needs to ascertain and assess the true dimensions and implications of what took place at the National Gallery of Ottawa.

FREDERICK B. DEKNATEL  
MARK ROSKILL

Fogg Art Museum  
Cambridge (Mass.)

<sup>1</sup> Our comments about provenance, here and subsequently, draw on the published catalogue of the exhibition (which was seen by us during its prior appearance at the Chrysler Art Museum of Provincetown, Mass.). This catalogue is entitled: 'The Controversial Century, 1850-1950; Paintings from the Collection of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr.'

## Delacroix in Canada

SIR, In his genial review (February 1963, pp.71 ff.) of the Delacroix exhibition which I helped to organize in Canada, Mr Mras contests my dating of the *Portrait of Paganini*. In his view, the image is too assured and concentrated in its sketchiness to qualify as a work of 1831. But surely the *Boissy d'Anglas at the Convention* (Bordeaux), which is dated 1831, is equally assured and complete in its sketchiness. Though Mras states that I compared the *Paganini* to the *Interior of a Dominican Convent*, he omits to mention that I also related it stylistically to the *Boissy d'Anglas*. In addition to suppressing part of my argument in this way, he adduces documentary evidence in support of his own opinion, stating that in his single reference to the portrait Delacroix speaks of 'mon souvenir de Paganini'. But it seems more than doubtful from the context in which this phrase appears that Delacroix was referring to his portrait, and not to his personal recollection of the violinist, either at concerts or in society. And even if he were referring to the portrait, 'souvenir' could simply mean that he did it from memory (not necessarily a distant one) rather than from sittings.

May I take this opportunity to correct two errors in my exhibition catalogue, and to record a change of opinion. In the entry for the sketch for the *Battle of Poitiers* (No.2) I stated that the

presence in his studio of a copy of Gros' *Battle of Nazareth* probably inspired Delacroix to undertake his *Battle of Poitiers* and *Battle of Nancy*. This may hold true for the former battle-piece, but not for the latter, which had been commissioned by the Minister of the Interior by 4th October 1828, several months before the copy of the Gros entered Delacroix's studio (see ALFRED DUPONT: *Eugène Delacroix, Lettres Intimes*, Paris [1954], 151-2).

I stated that Durand-Ruel had wrongly been listed in an earlier exhibition catalogue as one of the former owners of the *Othello and Desdemona* (No.14) now with E. V. Thaw, New York. A printed label on the stretcher indicates, however, that it was handled by Durand-Ruel, though no record of the transaction appears to have been preserved in their archives in Paris.

Without having seen the original, I listed the version of the *Interior of a Dominican Convent* (No.5) belonging to the Krannert Art Museum as a sketch for the larger version dated 1831. Having now had an opportunity to study the picture at the exhibition, I consider it too highly finished to be a preliminary sketch and believe it is a reduced version, unquestionably by Delacroix, of the picture of 1831. It seems very likely that it is the 'répétition' which, according to Amédée Cantaloube, belonged to Alfred Bruyas.

LEE JOHNSON

## Matthijs Maris and Edwin Austin Abbey

SIR, In connexion with two research projects, proceeding under the auspices of the Institute of Art History at Utrecht University and the Department of History of Art at Yale University, I am attempting to compile catalogues of the works of Matthijs Maris (1839-1917), Dutch landscape and romantic genre painter, and Edwin Austin Abbey, R.A. (1852-1911), American illustrator and mural painter. I would like to trace and record information about paintings, drawings, and prints by either of these artists which may be owned by museums and private collectors. In addition, I would be grateful to know of any documents, letters, etc., pertaining to these men, both of whom spent the greater portion of their later lives in England.

WILLIAM M. KANE

Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht  
Drift 25, Utrecht.

## The Literature of Art

### Pietro da Cortona

BY WALTER VITZTHUM

SINCE Milizia's indictment of Borromini, Bernini, and Pietro da Cortona as 'la peste del gusto', two - Bernini and Borromini - have fully succeeded in rubbing off this stigma. The case of the third culprit - Pietro da Cortona - is still being heard. The two most devoted advocates he has found in the past - Fabbrini in a monograph published in Cortona in 1896, and the organizers of an exhibition, again in Cortona, in 1956 - were guided by municipal patriotism. They left their public unimpressed. What other fame Pietro da Cortona enjoyed he owed to the specialists and it never went beyond their circle. No better example of an art historian's artist could be found.

If Giuliano Briganti with his excellent book on the painted work of Pietro da Cortona\* meant to remedy the situation, he adopted the right course. He realized that few, if anyone, will be attracted by Pietro da Cortona's paintings for their own sake,

\* *Pietro da Cortona o della pittura barocca*. By Giuliano Briganti. 357 pp. + 289 pl. + 16 col. pl. Florence (Sansoni, *Biblioteca di 'Proporzioni'*), 18,000 lire.

and even then at best only by the frescoes. An interest in Rome and the seventeenth century will, on the other hand, lead to their acceptance and to a recognition of the important position they hold. Rome and the Baroque are the true heroes of Briganti's book.

Apart from the superlative set of plates – they make Pietro da Cortona together with Caravaggio and Reni the best illustrated sixteenth century painter – Briganti's book consists of three parts. The first treats '*la Questione del Barocco*' – a perfect and lucid summary of the situation where the roots of the word, the changes of the concept, and its application in art history are traced. The second part is the true text of the book. Briganti establishes here Pietro da Cortona's development together with the successive stages of Roman painting, registering almost from year to year the experiences the artist received and provoked. The accent is rightly put on the years just before and after 1630, the crucial years for the formation of the baroque style. In clarity and breadth of vision nothing written on Roman painting in our generation can be compared to Briganti's text. The third part of the book offers four abundantly documented catalogues. First a list of biographical data which contains no particular surprises, then the very substantial *catalogue raisonné* of the paintings, and as additions, a list of lost and wrongly attributed works, and a *traccia per un catalogo dei disegni*.

A closer inspection of the catalogue of paintings yields a considerable number of new and acute observations together with some ten paintings which have for the first time been recognized as works of Cortona's. The following should be underlined: two frescoes in the Villa Muti at Frascati (Cat.1) painted c.1616, convincingly established as Cortona's earliest independent works; an early *Birth of the Virgin* (Cat.7), formerly in England and now in a private collection in Rome; the original of the Mattei *Adultera* (Cat.20), so far only known through a fragment of a replica in Munich; and the totally unexpected *Veduta of Castel Fusano* (Cat.26). Other works had been known to exist but, through difficulty of access or the absence of photographs, had never been investigated properly and are thus introduced for the first time to a wider public. This applies to the copy after Raphael's *Galatea* (Cat.2) which Briganti presents with an exemplary discussion of the history of the Sacchetti collection; the fresco of *St Philip Neri in Ecstasy* (Cat.51) in the saint's private chapel; the fresco of the *Deposition* (Cat.56) in Urban VIII's chapel in the Vatican; the fresco of *Leo X celebrating Mass* (Cat.98) painted for the younger Michelangelo Buonarroti; the *Allegory of Night* (Cat.152) in the former casino of Gian Carlo de' Medici, painted during Cortona's second Florentine period;<sup>1</sup> and it applies above all to the frescoes in the Villa Sacchetti at Castel Fusano which in the past had only been studied with Sacchi's contribution in mind.<sup>2</sup> These frescoes reveal for the first time the full extent of Cortona's interest in landscape painting during the period just prior to his engagement in the Barberini Palace. But even for Sacchi, Briganti supplies new evidence. He identifies a drawing of the *Sacrifice to Pan* in the Uffizi (Fig.28) as a sketch which Cortona had evidently drawn to guide Sacchi who had been allotted this particular scene in the gallery at Castel Fusano (p.180). No better document could be found to illustrate the period when baroque and classicist tendencies were still going hand in hand, and only one element should be added: Sacchi's final transformation of Cortona's sketch survives in a drawing at Darmstadt (Fig.30).

No one would have suspected the fascination landscape painting

had for Cortona at the time of the Castel Fusano commission and Briganti rightly emphasizes this new facet of the artist's work.<sup>3</sup> Cortona's exact position in the development of landscape painting in Rome – in its final stage not quite as unconnected with the classicizing camp as the author (p.172) would have it – will have to be established when the entire field comes up for remeasuring.<sup>4</sup> For the time being, Briganti's excellent discussion requires only one slight addendum and, at one point, a question-mark. The Roman provenance of what in the past had often been considered Cortona's only essay as a landscapist, the *Vocation of SS. Peter and Andrew* at Chatsworth (Cat.25), is revealed by Ridolfino Venuti who, writing in 1755, states that the picture had formerly belonged to Marchese Pallavicini.<sup>5</sup> The question-mark should be put behind the date which Briganti suggests for his list of Cortona's landscape drawings. Briganti rightly feels that Cortona showed an active interest in landscape only in the years immediately preceding 1630 and he consequently dates all available landscape drawings into this period (p.181). I suspect this to be an over-simplification. Granted, Cortona created his language as a landscape artist during the period indicated by Briganti and he admittedly never developed it any further. This, however, did not preclude him from using the same vocabulary also during later periods. A manifest case is Cortona's *Mount Athos*, designed during the reign of Alexander VII, where a fully developed landscape theme is treated according to the old formula, established thirty years earlier.<sup>6</sup> If it is a question of dating, stylistic criticism of Cortona's landscape drawings cannot, therefore, stop with the analysis of the compositional devices. On the contrary, it has to concentrate on the purely graphic evidence. And once this has been done a considerably later date for a number of Cortona's landscape drawings appears advisable. External considerations, too, should act as a warning: Ciro Ferri, Cortona's assistant only after 1647, appears to be fascinated by, and frequently copies, Cortona landscape drawings of a type which Briganti would date before 1630. In addition we have two letters by Cortona from which we know that in 1666 he executed *paesi a acquarello* for Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici.<sup>7</sup>

The question of Cortona's landscape style quite apart, Briganti introduces into the discussion of Castel Fusano another element of considerable interest: a small canvas reproducing exactly one of Cortona's frescoes in the chapel of the villa (Cat.24). If this picture is more than just a copy it would prove that the use of *bozzetti*, or at least of a *modello*, goes back to Cortona's very early years. One may feel disappointed that the author does not treat this question more fully. It should be underlined that there is at least one case – towards the end of Cortona's career – where there can be no doubt that Cortona made use of an oil-sketch. The Rospigliosi Collection contains Cortona's *bozzetto* for the altarpiece in S. Ivo which, together with two drawings at Holkham Hall and at the Uffizi, permits the complete reconstruction of the gradual development of this composition. Briganti's occasional impatience with all but the finished work – a Longhian characteristic – is shown here at its most typical: the Rospigliosi *bozzetto* – as authentic an oil-sketch as there ever was on canvas – is listed as a drawing.<sup>8</sup> On to the same debit sheet goes Briganti's omission

<sup>3</sup> The traditional view found expression in *Kunstchronik*, x [1957], p.95, where Cortona's landscape in the Pinacoteca Capitolina were described as without *Verbindungslinien* to his other works.

<sup>4</sup> The recent exhibition in Bologna signally failed to do this.

<sup>5</sup> R. VENUTI: *Risposta alle Reflessioni Critiche sopra le differenti Scuole di Pittura del Sig. Marchese d'Argens*, Lucca [1755], p.64.

<sup>6</sup> Repr. by BRIGANTI, pl.288, No.62.

<sup>7</sup> H. GEISENHEIMER: *Pietro da Cortona e gli affreschi nel Palazzo Pitti*, Florence [1909], p.38.

<sup>8</sup> An additional oversight should be corrected. Briganti includes *St Louis* (?), *St Gregory the Great* and *Charlemagne* among the figures surrounding Christ. This should be changed to SS. Leo the Great, Alexander, and Fortunato (cf. H. THELEN in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Hertzianae*, Munich [1961], p.290, n.21).

<sup>1</sup> The traditional attribution of this fresco to Cortona was first taken seriously by Mr Philip Pouncey. Briganti's assumption that the fresco belongs to the period 1640–2 can be substantiated with the help of a drawing in the Uffizi (No.7326 F). Clearly a preparatory drawing for the fresco, this drawing is dated 1642.

<sup>2</sup> G. INCISA DELLA ROCCHETTA in *L'Arte*, xxvii [1924], p.60ff and H. POSSE: *Der römische Maler Andrea Sacchi*, Leipzig [1925], p.27ff.

of the presumable *bozzetto* for the altar-piece in S. Carlo ai Catinari, recorded by Barnabita in 1861 as in the Colonna Palace.<sup>9</sup> This clue might still be worth following up, especially since the Colonna commissioned the altar.

One last complaint, and again of a minor nature. The *elenco delle opere di Pietro da Cortona o di lui credute non rintracciate, di quelle distrutte, e di quelle a lui erroneamente attribuite* is, as one might already suspect from the title, rather difficult to use since one is never too sure which of the three currents one is actually navigating in. The moment one manages to catch up with the author his guidance appears to be unfailing, e.g. the *Dream of Joseph* at Graz, given to Luca Giordano; the *Holy Family* from the Mauritshuis (now transferred to the Rijksmuseum), given to Luti; an altar-piece in the *réservé* at Strasbourg, given to Carlo Loth.<sup>10</sup> One picture, listed as lost (or misattributed?), should, however, be reclaimed for the living. This is a painting in the Harrach Collection which Briganti describes (p.284) as *L'Udienza papale del 1628 al Barone di Harrach*. The picture still exists – with a nonsensical attribution to Luca Giordano – and it is undoubtedly from Cortona's hand. Most important, the date is 1620, not 1628, and the picture represents thus one of Cortona's earliest extant works. Evidently of the same type and period must have been the lost painting listed by Briganti (p.281) as *L'Udienza concessa da Paolo V al principe Savelli ambasciatore di Ferdinando II*. We have here an entirely new aspect of Cortona's work who is seen to cultivate a *genre* usually associated with Tassi and Sacchi. But even during the early reign of Urban VIII Cortona was still producing these topical *vedute*: a drawing exists at Chatsworth which shows the pope carried through St Peter's with the *Baldacchino* completed according to Bernini's original project of 1624, abandoned c. 1630/31.

In the following a few individual problems will be investigated more closely.

Palazzo Mattei (Cat.5)  
Briganti gives a detailed account of Cortona's ceiling of the gallery in the Mattei Palace and accepts in all essentials the arguments set forth by Jakob Hess when he first introduced the fresco as the combined work of Pietro da Cortona and the Gobbo dei Carracci.<sup>11</sup> In addition Briganti supplies new material for the preparatory stages of the ceiling. On the one hand he draws attention to two drawings in the Uffizi which he divests rightly of their traditional attribution to Cortona in order to propose them as records of an earlier scheme for the same gallery by Gobbo; and on the other he records two drawings which served as composition studies for Cortona's *Sheba before Solomon* (at Haarlem and in the Scholz collection) indicating thus the earliest certain drawings from Cortona's hand. Briganti also speaks of a drawing at Duesseldorf, evidently done as a preparation for the Mattei ceiling, and published by Hess as the work of Tassi. This attribution rests on a garbled inscription on the drawing mentioning Tassi's name. However, one should recall that reliably attributed drawings by Tassi are available.<sup>12</sup> If they are compared to the drawing in Duesseldorf no stylistic connexion can be established and it would seem wisest to abandon the whole notion of Tassi's connexion with the Mattei Gallery, based, after all, only on the Duesseldorf inscription. The connexion of the Duesseldorf drawing with the Mattei ceiling is, however, a fact and it would indeed be tempting to see in it the work of Gobbo. Only a thorough study of the graphic work of this very elusive artist can furnish the answer.<sup>13</sup>

One element should be added to Briganti's discussion of Cortona's Mattei frescoes. It appears worth pointing out that Cortona derived the compositional arrangement of his *Sheba before Solomon* directly from the identical scene in the gallery of the Giustiniani Palace (Figs.29 and 31). The uncompromising adaptation of this late-Mannerist composition so as to fit the Polidoresque

idiom spoken by the early Cortona furnishes one of the best testimonies for the clarity and single-mindedness of his stylistic intentions.

S. Maria della Concezione (Cappuccini): *The Healing of Saul* (Cat.42)

This picture could in the past be dated with a certain laxity. As an extreme case Fabbrini put it after 1653, thus ignoring that the picture is already mentioned in Totti's guide-book of 1638. Since then Voss assigned it to the 'thirties, Waterhouse dated it between 1631 and 1636, and Blunt suggested the mid-'thirties. Briganti now argues very convincingly for 1631 as the most likely date, considering that the first mass in the church was said in September 1630 and that other altar-pieces in the same church are documented for the years 1630–2. Briganti's statement *non si ha nessun documento su questo dipinto di Pietro da Cortona* is correct. However, it could have been added that 1633 can nevertheless be postulated as a *terminus ante quem*. In fact, the earlier of the two Cortona *vite* in the Marciana manuscript of Mancini contains a postil which reads: *E sua compositione la Conversione di S. Paolo nella prima cappella della chiesa dei Padri Cappuccini nell'entrare a mano sinistra; et ultimamente ha dipinto nella volta della sacrestia della Chiesa Nuova con arte meravigliosa*.<sup>14</sup> Cortona's altar-piece for the Capuchins thus precedes the fresco in the sacristy of the Chiesa Nuova, and the date for the latter is documented: the payment for the completed fresco was made on 12th January 1634.

Palazzo Barberini: *Stanza di passaggio* (Cat.46–8)

Before discussing this room Briganti rightly rejects the attribution to Cortona of another ceiling in the Barberini Palace: the first room of the present Galleria Nazionale, i.e. the room in which the cartoons of the *Life of Urban VIII* are exhibited. The attribution of this ceiling to Cortona, suggested by Waterhouse, is indeed untenable.<sup>15</sup> Unfortunately Briganti quotes neither here nor in his list of lost works the references which are likely to have been the cause of this error. The notion of a room in the Barberini Palace, other than the Salone, decorated by Cortona may have been provoked by Passeri's statement that Cortona painted there *alcuni camerini e volticelle*, together with the record of a payment of 15th April 1633 where a *sala dipinta dal Sig. Pietro da Cortona* is mentioned.<sup>16</sup> If read carefully, however, it will be discovered that the room mentioned in the payment is described as a *salotto ovale*, and this excludes the one Waterhouse had in mind. The payment may refer to the room behind the Salone on the garden side, or to the corresponding room on the ground floor, later pierced by the present carriage road.

For the decoration of the *stanza di passaggio*, i.e. the corridor which at present ends the *enfilade* of the Galleria Nazionale, Briganti proposes the date 1636. He remarks rightly that one of the frescoes contains a reconstruction of Palestrina, a project supposed to have occupied Cortona in that year. Nevertheless, I feel that the decoration should be dated several years earlier. It must be remembered that the Barberini acquired the principality of Palestrina in 1630 and that the title connected with it was bestowed upon Taddeo Barberini who, from 1632 to 1634, lived in precisely this part of the palace. The style of the frescoes is far from developed and Briganti justly accords Romanelli a large share in their execution. However, closer observation reveals a discrepancy in style between the two principal scenes and, since Romanelli is known to have worked together with Giacinto Gimignani in the palace in 1632, I suggest that the scene of the *Founding of Palestrina* be assigned to Romanelli and the *Sacrifice to Juno*, clearly inferior, to Gimignani. Waterhouse (*loc. cit.*) had already dated the room 'before 1633' and the decoration of this corridor can indeed hardly be separated from the palace chapel, documented for 1632. According to Briganti, Blunt listed drawings at Oxford and Ottawa as preparatory studies for the corridor. In reality these drawings had been connected rightly with the decoration of the Salone.<sup>17</sup>

Barberini Palace: *Volta del salone* (Cat.45)

Briganti's account of the factual history of Pietro da Cortona's crucial commission as a painter is the result of the most careful reading to date of the documents published by Posse and Pollak and of an equally careful re-examination of the relevant literary references. Only slight details can be added to the evidence discussed in exemplary fashion by the author.

Thus, concerning the year 1635, Briganti writes (p.199): '*Per il 1635 c'è la notizia del Sandrart che da Roma, alla fine del suo viaggio, spera (condurre il Cortona) con se a Venezia, ma il Cortona non può seguirlo perché troppo asorbito dal lavoro di palazzo Barberini.*' This is a correct interpretation of Cortona's intentions as they transpire from Sandrart's text. However, Sandrart's most revealing reference to the ceiling – it appears only in the German edition – is left unheeded: '*... weil aber wegen damahlig eingefallener eilfaertiger Arbeit des Palasts Barberini er nicht abkommen koennen ...*' This can only mean that in 1635 a sizeable portion of the fresco or possibly of the ceiling had collapsed.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>9</sup> L. M. C. BARNABITA: *Memorie intorno alla chiesa de' SS. Biagio e Carlo a' Catinari*, Rome [1861], p.109, n.3.

<sup>10</sup> It could be added that the *bozzetto* for this picture is in the collection of M. Michel Laclotte in Paris.

<sup>11</sup> J. HESS: 'Tassi, Bonzi e Cortona a Palazzo Mattei', *Commentari*, v [1954], pp.303 ff.

<sup>12</sup> The best examples are illustrated in G. BRIGANTI: *Il palazzo del Quirinale*, Rome [1962], pp.29 and 35.

<sup>13</sup> It should be noted that a drawing in the Louvre (inv.3434), attributed by Mariette to Montano and reproduced without identification in H. PRUDENT: *Les Dessins d'architecture au Musée du Louvre. Ecole italienne*, Paris [s.d.], pl.14, ii, records another early stage of the Mattei ceiling. Coat of arms and proportions show this unmistakably.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. ed. MARUCCHI-SALERNO, I, p.343.

<sup>15</sup> E. WATERHOUSE: *Baroque Painting in Rome*, London [1937], p.59.

<sup>16</sup> PASSERI: *Le Vite* (ed. Hess), p.379, and O. POLLAK: *Die Kunsttaetigkeit unter Urban VIII*, I, Vienna [1927], p.923.

<sup>17</sup> A. BLUNT: 'The Palazzo Barberini etc.', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXI [1958], p.283, n.68.

<sup>18</sup> J. V. SANDRART: *Teutsche Academie etc.*, Nuremberg [1675], ed. Peltzer, Munich [1925], p.288.

Another minor point concerns Baldinucci's story of how Cortona's pupils Romanelli and Bottalla had attempted – during their master's absence from Rome in 1637 – to finish the ceiling according to their own designs and had as a result both been expelled from Cortona's atelier. Briganti rightly remarks (*loc. cit.*); '... non se ne trova traccia nelle lettere del Cortona datate dopo il suo ritorno a Roma.' One observation would, however, lend credence to Baldinucci's account: Cortona returned at the very end of 1637, and in 1638 Romanelli is reported in Naples a *rimettersi in salute*.<sup>19</sup> One might add that after his return, during the carnival of 1639 Romanelli was frequently seen at the theatre in the company of Bernini and, as everyone knew in Rome, between the latter and Cortona *era solito passare poca buona corrispondenza*.<sup>20</sup>

Briganti justly qualifies as tendentious Boschini's reference to a complete change of the Barberini ceiling after Cortona's return from Venice in 1637. As they stand Boschini's lines sound indeed exaggerated: 'subito zonto a Roma, el fè un bel trato; el rasse zo quel, che l'haveva fato da i Barberini in la famosa stantia. E po co'l vero venetian costume el fece maravegie.'<sup>21</sup> But would it not only be plausible to assume that, if Romanelli and Bottalla had deviated from Cortona's established plan, the master should not content himself with ridding himself of the disloyal pupils, but would above all destroy the unauthorized work done in his absence? Instead of discarding Boschini's passage entirely, as Briganti does, it could thus be interpreted as an echo of the Romanelli-Bottalla affair, distorted and magnified in order to serve better the Venetian point of view. Some grain of truth must after all be in Boschini's story: it was published during Cortona's lifetime and author and painter knew each other well. In this connexion a second, although much later, reference to a thorough-going change during the execution of the ceiling might have been worth mentioning: Mariette writes in his *Abécédario*: 'On dit aussi dans Rome que la voûte de la salle du palais Barberini a été peinte deux fois par P. de Cortone, et que celle qu'on admire aujourd'hui n'est pas la même qu'il avait peinte en premier lieu.'<sup>22</sup>

These remarks touch only on negligible points. However, one criticism of Briganti's discussion of the Barberini ceiling could be made which involves a serious shortcoming. This concerns the drawings. The evolution of Cortona's compositional ideas becomes fairly clear once the surviving preparatory studies for the Barberini ceiling have been examined and compared. But unfortunately this readily available source of information has been left out of account both in the text and in the catalogue. Only a very incomplete list of the connected drawings is given, and those drawings which are listed have not been discussed. Most strikingly, Briganti, no doubt deliberately, does not mention the drawing in Munich which Posse published in 1919 and which has since been reproduced on several occasions.<sup>23</sup> It will be granted that the drawing is extremely difficult to judge – and in the original more than in a reproduction – and it may well be no more than a studio record. Its existence, and its connexion with the Barberini ceiling, however, cannot be denied. Posse had used the drawing as evidence for the very plausible idea that Cortona originally planned a ceiling far less daring in concept, still essentially based on Carraccesque *quadro riportato* principles. The gradual change can be traced in Uffizi 11762 F where the *quadro riportato* scheme has been abandoned, but where the figures are still confined within the trapezoidal compartments of the ceiling. The final step is taken in two drawings, at Ottawa and Haarlem, where spatial unification is achieved through figures moving freely across the borders of the individual compartments.

Hôtel de la Vrillière (Cat.91, 92, and 104)

In the history of Italian influences in France during the seventeenth century the Hôtel de la Vrillière occupies a position of eminence. From the 1630's on Louis Phéliepeux de la Vrillière assembled here in the *Grande Galerie* a group of ten paintings which together constituted the most advanced representation of the Romano-Bolognese Grand Manner to be seen in Paris. To this Cortona contributed three paintings: *Caesar and Cleopatra* (now in the museum at Lyons), *Romulus and Remus* (Louvre), and *Augustus and the Sibyl* (Nancy).

Before treating Cortona's paintings individually Briganti rightly discusses them as part of the wider scheme of the gallery and, underlining the importance of the Hôtel de la Vrillière in the history of taste, begins with a general account of what is known of Louis Phéliepeux and the artists he commissioned to work for him. Here, on three points, where Briganti's arguments are based on assumptions, firmer ground can be reached once the description of the Hôtel de la Vrillière in Sauval's *Antiquités de Paris* has been added to the bibliography.<sup>24</sup> Thus, when Briganti writes that he is not certain of the original order of the ten paintings in the gallery, Sauval furnishes at least a specified list of the five paintings on the right-hand wall. Also, when Briganti lists one of the paintings as 'Guercino (?)': *Addio di Ettore a Priamo* (*Museo di Marsiglia*)' (p.230) Sauval

<sup>19</sup> L. PASCOLI: *Vite etc.*, Rome [1730], i, p.94 and WATERHOUSE, *op. cit.*, p.88.

<sup>20</sup> BALDINUCCI: *Notizie etc.* [ed. 1773], xviii, p.208, and PASSERI, *ed. cit.*, pp.389f.

<sup>21</sup> M. BOSCHINI: *Carta del navigar pitoresco*, Venice [1664], p.355.

<sup>22</sup> J. P. MARIETTE: *Abécédario* [ed. 1851–3], p.122.

<sup>23</sup> H. POSSE: 'Das Deckenfresko des Pietro da Cortona im Palazzo Barberini etc.', *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, xl [1919], p.168. The best reproduction, in colour, is in P. HALM-B. DEGENHART-W. WEGNER: *Hundert Meisterzeichnungen etc.*, Munich [1958], p.13.

<sup>24</sup> H. SAUVAL: *Histoire et recherches des antiquités de la ville de Paris*, Paris [1724], II pp.229–32.

could have been used to eliminate the question-mark and give the painting its correct title: *Addio di Catone*.<sup>25</sup> This last observation changes in turn two of Briganti's subsequent statements: the entries in Guercino's account-book listing a *Catone*, commissioned by Vrillière in 1635 and finished by 1637, do refer to the picture in the gallery, and Poussin's *Camillus and the Schoolmaster* of 1637 becomes thus the second, and not the first, of Vrillière's pictures after the acquisition of Reni's *Abduction of Helena*. This correction, marginal as it is, does nevertheless weaken Briganti's claim that 1643 is 'il periodo di maggior attività del La Vrillière nelle ordinazioni' (p.232), since the activity between 1635 and 1637 was at least as great. The intensity of Vrillière's commissions should consequently not be used as an argument when it is a question of dating Cortona's pictures to any specific year. The dates proposed by Briganti are: '1643 (?)' for both *Romulus and Remus* (Cat.91) and *Caesar and Cleopatra* (Cat.92), and '1645 c.' for *Augustus and the Sibyl* (Cat.104). '1645 c.' for *Augustus and the Sibyl* is certainly too early a date, and this can be established unequivocally with the help of Sauval. In fact, after listing the five pictures on the right-hand wall, Sauval states: 'L'autre côté de la Galerie n'est encore garni que de trois tableaux' and two spaces remain, therefore, still to be filled.<sup>26</sup> It should be noticed that the eight paintings described by Sauval include one which is documented for 1645: Guercino's *Romans and Sabines*, now in the Louvre.<sup>27</sup> Cortona's *Augustus and the Sibyl*, on the other hand, is not listed by Sauval and 1645 is thus established as an absolute *terminus post quem*. In order to come closer to the correct date of Cortona's picture three additional pieces of evidence have to be taken into consideration: first, Sauval completed his manuscript in approximately 1654 and it appears logical to assume that the two pictures not mentioned by him should have been painted after 1654, or in any case at a time when it was too late to amend the manuscript.<sup>28</sup> Second, the other picture not yet in the gallery at the time of Sauval's description is Maratta's *Peace of Augustus*. Briganti realizes, of course, that Maratta's picture, which is generally dated c.1660,<sup>29</sup> could never have been painted earlier than the 'fifties, when Maratta first established himself as an independent artist, and he states this quite clearly (p.226). However, when he proposes ten pages later the date '1645 c.' for Cortona's *Augustus and the Sibyl*, Briganti forgets what he had earlier said about Maratta's *Peace of Augustus* and writes: 'i quadri della Galleria furono commessi ai rispettivi pittori fra il 1635 e il 1645' (p.236). This oversight eliminates the useful hint which Maratta's picture might have given. Cortona's *Augustus and the Sibyl* and Maratta's *Peace of Augustus* have, after all, more in common than the fact that they had not yet been painted when Sauval described the gallery. They correspond so well in subject-matter that they can be considered as pendants and they may well have been commissioned at the same time.

There is a further external reason to suggest a late date for Cortona's picture. Chantelou, on the occasion of Bernini's visit to the Hôtel de la Vrillière in 1665, described Cortona's painting of *Augustus and the Sibyl* in the gallery as 'le dernier fait'.<sup>30</sup> Sauval and Chantelou combined make it, therefore, advisable to see in the picture a very late work, executed in approximately 1660. A stylistic analysis points in the same direction: the picture shows the vigorously simplified compositional scheme, the heavy, unlegant concept of the human figure, and the unified colour-scheme based on blue and white which are typical for the late Cortona. The altar-piece formerly in San Daniele in Venice, for which Briganti establishes the date 1663, would afford the closest parallel.<sup>31</sup>

Stylistic considerations make it also advisable to change the date '1643 (?)' proposed by the author for *Caesar and Cleopatra* to c.1637. The picture is closely connected with the classicizing tendencies which during the 'thirties show Cortona in striking affinity with Poussin. Hence 1637 – when with Cortona's journey to the north and the beginning of the last and decisive stage of the Barberini ceiling these tendencies come to an end – appears as the last possible date for this picture.

A word might be added on the ideas expressed in Briganti's introductory chapter. In twenty pages – and fifteen footnotes where the most valuable contributions will be found – the author discusses the phenomenon 'Baroque' and the interpretations it

<sup>25</sup> M. HOOG: 'Attributions anciennes à Valentin', *La Revue des Arts*, x [1960], pp.270–2.

<sup>26</sup> SAUVAL, *op. cit.*, II, p.231.

<sup>27</sup> For the date see J. A. CALVI: *Notizie . . . del Cavaliere Gioan Francesco Barbieri*, Bologna [1808], p.110.

<sup>28</sup> The date of publication, 1724, is very misleading. E. BONNAFFÉ (*Dictionnaire des amateurs français au xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris [1884], p.vi) writes: *Bien que la première édition porte la date de 1724, l'ouvrage était presque achevé en 1654, époque à laquelle l'auteur demanda et obtint un privilège pour l'imprimer*. Sauval died in 1676. J. THUILLIER dates the essential portion of Sauval's manuscript between 1652 and

1655 (*Colloque Poussin*, Paris [1959], II, p.147).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. A. MEZZETTI: 'Contributi a Carlo Maratti', *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte*, N.S. IV [1955], p.276 and p.328 (No.66).

<sup>30</sup> *Journal du Voyage du Cavalier Bernin en France*, ed. L. Lalanne, Paris [1885], p.226.

<sup>31</sup> The author may have had second thoughts himself. He feels quite rightly that the picture is *per ragioni stilistiche, alquanto più tardo degli altri due dipinti per la Galleria* (p.236) and he dates the replica of the picture at Hampton Court between 1650 and 1655.

has been subjected to in the past. Pietro da Cortona's name is hardly mentioned and Briganti fears, not without reason, that he could be accused of making the cart draw the horse since *dès le potage je m'exprime en termes abstraits*. But before judgement is rendered it must be recalled that the complete text of this chapter was originally published in the form of three articles in the first issues of *Paragone*, over twelve years ago. Read at that time, Briganti's arguments permitted two conclusions. For one, Briganti, starting with the first word of his superb title 'Baroque in Uniform', had set out to denounce mercilessly the Austro-Germano-Swiss wonder-drug *Stilgeschichte* and all the over-simplifications it had led to. So much was only to be expected from an admirer of Roberto Longhi. Longhi, after all, has devoted his life to peopling art history with artists rather than abstractions, *Geist*, and principles. But, to be fair to both Guelphs and Ghibellines, nearly everybody else had become aware of the limitations of the Woelfflinian treatment and of the dangers involved when it was prescribed exclusively. But since Woelfflin's exegetes were still giving birth to quite a number of monstrosities, Briganti had a point. A second aspect of Briganti's articles was more revealing. They implied no less than the defection from certain orthodox tenets of Longhi's circle. Splendid as the results of Longhi's method had been, the more brilliant among his disciples must at times have felt dissatisfied with the cult of the artistic personality as an exclusive object of study which was threatening to make of art history little more than a crossword puzzle of interacting visual stimuli, numbered according to artists who provoked them, and artists who absorbed them. The future historian of art history has only to remember the '*Indovinello*' which appeared in *Paragone* No. 1 – a collage of details from a dozen paintings which the reader was asked to identify – to catch the spirit, admittedly grotesquely distorted, of this school. In opposition to this narrow concept – as narrow as Woelfflin's had been before, since it simply reverses Woelfflin's 'history without names' to 'names without history' – Briganti demanded to see more, at least occasionally, than just a picture and a painter and how they influenced each other. And indeed Briganti's articles, together with his book on Mannerism or Zeri's *Scipione da Gaeta*, can only be explained as the result of a beneficial broadening in outlook of what everybody will readily acknowledge as Italy's *avant-garde* in art history.

This was twelve years ago. Whether it was wise to submit these pages to a renewed inspection may be doubted. Especially since what were originally quickly and brilliantly sketched essays have now to serve as a heavy first chapter which claims to settle the 'baroque question' once and for all. Even when Briganti's articles first appeared he was by no means continuously fighting in the front rank. Re-read now, with the problems having changed but the answers remaining the same, Briganti's position becomes at times even more difficult to justify. To give only one example Briganti indicates as his premise: '*Barocco*' vuol dire ormai *troppe cose e quindi . . . non vuol dir più nulla* (p. 14). Does this really apply, and is there really cause for alarm when the Eiffel Tower is being called baroque? Baroque, like Gothic and Renaissance, or any other wide stylistic category, has by now been in use for such a length of time that we are all sufficiently prepared to gather fairly soon a writer's intentions. And just as no one will fear that the use of 'Gothic' as an epithet for a novel could lead students of the cathedral of Chartres astray, so will it be clear to everyone that in the case of the Eiffel Tower 'baroque' has simply been used in its primitive, pre-art-historical meaning of *bizarre*.

Nor does it take long to gather what Briganti means by 'baroque'. He quite rightly uses the term to designate the stylistic language which originated in Rome between 1625 and 1630 and was eventually spoken as fluently in South America as it was in St Petersburg. One of Briganti's implied points being that the previous generation, Annibale and Caravaggio, should not be

styled 'baroque'. This is perfectly admissible, but was it really worth the effort of twenty pages? Sceptical of periodization and weary of re-periodization, a speaker at a recent meeting of art historians in New York liquidated the question in two sentences: 'The word Baroque taken in its wide sense, covers the whole art of the seventeenth century. Taken in its more limited sense it means the style created by Bernini, Borromini, Rubens, and Pietro da Cortona.' This was a mere aside, a statement of a fact taken for granted. Briganti, by comparison, leaves one with the impression of someone rushing fully armed to a battle that has already been won: '*Barocco all'italiana*'.

Nevertheless we should be grateful for being given once more a full tour of the ground covered since Milizia. On this very tortured terrain Briganti proves an intimately informed and often very entertaining guide. And even if some of his readers should occasionally be irritated, the author's deployment of strength in the second – essential – part of his book and in the catalogue is such that only admiration for an excellent work will remain as the final impression.

## The Art of Photography

BY AARON SCHARF

is photography an art? Is it true that in photographs the instinct, the sentiment, the taste and the love of the artist cannot be expressed? Can a mechanical procedure alone produce the marvellous effects to be found in photographs? Is the photographer only a hand that manipulates the machine?

One hundred years ago, these questions were asked in a case before the Imperial Court of France in an attempt to win for photography at least the legal distinction accorded to the art of painting. The brilliant case presented by the lawyer for the photographers Mayer and Pierson rested on the assumption that the aims of both photographers and painters coincided and that their results were not so dissimilar as to exclude photography from the sphere of art: 'Truth and beauty are the same for the photographer as they are for the painter and sculptor'.

Many artists were troubled by the decision of the Court which declared on 4th July 1862 that photography was an art. Ingres, foremost among them, headed the names on a petition to the Court asking that its judgement be reversed: since photography consists essentially of a series of manual operations, since its products do not stem from the intelligence or the study of art, we (the petitioners) protest against its being made into an art.

By that date 'artistic' photographs had already hung in a salon adjacent to that of painting and sculpture. Already, photographers were making elaborate claims for their pictures, comparing them with those of the best artists of the past and present. The photographer, it was declared, might attempt almost any subjects possible to the painter. Why not those of Salvator Rosa? Why not the kermesses of Rubens, the interiors of van Ostade and de Hoogh? Teniers, Chardin, Watteau, Diaz, and Ingres himself were suggested. Even Veronese was thought possible. Photographers delighted in the report of an 'indisputable authority' that in the R.A. exhibition of 1861, a 'coloured photograph' was inadvertently hung 'on the line'. That is significant. It hardly needs saying that the repugnance of painters for the 'new art' grew in direct proportion to the successful development of creative photography.

'Let it keep its place' stormed Ingres in a bitter denunciation of any 'industrial' techniques being applied to art. Ingres despised photography because he knew it would destroy his kind of art. The Temple of Apollo would be desecrated by painters in the classical style who would substitute realistic images of contemporaries posed *à l'antique* and rendered not in a linear manner, but like the photograph, tonally. The ravenous beast, photography, hungered after art and the antipathy of artists grew in