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FOREWORD

The National Gallery’s collection of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Italian paintings contains a number of important works by the painters of the baroque and its aftermath, notably Annibale and Lodovico Carracci, Orazio Gentileschi, Jusepe de Ribera, Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Canaletto, and Bellotto. Although in America in the first half of this century Italian baroque art was not held generally in the same regard as Renaissance art, the National Gallery has from its inception been one of the country’s major repositories of later Italian painting. The presence of so many fine examples in Washington is due greatly to the generosity of Samuel H. Kress, who sought to create at the National Gallery “as complete a representation as possible of the Italian School of painting and sculpture.”

The Samuel H. Kress Foundation has for more than a half-century played an integral role in the acquisition, care, and interpretation of our Italian paintings. Stephen Pichetto, William Suida, Mario Modestini, Guy Emerson, and Rush Kress were particularly involved in the creation of this collection of later Italian paintings; Fern Rusk Shapley catalogued it; and the Foundation, under the dedicated leadership of Franklin P. Murphy, sponsored research, publications, and exhibitions that stimulated appreciation of it.

This volume is the ninth published in the series of systematic catalogues of the National Gallery’s collections and the first devoted exclusively to our great collection of Italian paintings. Information on the later Italian paintings was previously available only in Mrs. Shapley’s catalogues of the Italian paintings in the Kress Collection and in the National Gallery. Since their publication in the 1970s, there has been an explosion of scholarship in the field of later Italian painting, with the result that we can grasp much more securely the authorship, dating, and meaning of these pictures. Equally significant in the preparation of this study were the sophisticated technical investigations conducted in the Gallery’s conservation and scientific research laboratories, enabling us to understand more fully than before the methods and techniques of their creators.

In recent years many of our most significant later Italian paintings have been conserved with splendid results, notably works by Panini, Canaletto, and Tiepolo, and a number have been rehung in appropriate frames of the period. Together with important recent additions to the collection, such as the great paintings by Jusepe de Ribera, The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, and Bernardo Bellotto, The Fortress of Königstein, the presentation of later Italian painting at the National Gallery has never been more successful. This catalogue complements our other efforts to foster greater understanding and appreciation of this area of our collections.

Earl A. Powell III
Director
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INTRODUCTION

The National Gallery’s collection of Italian baroque paintings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries exists largely as the result of the enthusiasm for Italian art on the part of Samuel H. Kress (1863–1955), and his younger brother, Rush (1877–1963). One may easily forget the prejudice prevailing in America against the art of the Catholic Counter-Reformation, which was not overcome until the 1950s and 1960s. Kress was alone among the early twentieth-century American collectors—Frick, Morgan, Mellon, Widener—to recognize the importance of Italian seventeenth- and eighteenth-century pictures. When Kress, a businessman who turned to art collecting late in life, acquired Tanzio da Varallo’s extraordinary Saint Sebastian in 1935, he really was a pioneer in an area of collecting that was still largely unfamiliar in this country. The collection he created—ranging from Cimabue to Tiepolo—is filled with the kind of Italian painting ignored by other collectors of his day.

Through the Italian art dealer Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi (1878–1955), Kress acquired his first painting in 1927. His earliest purchases were almost all Italian Renaissance works from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, but among them was The Interior of the Pantheon by Giovanni Paolo Panini, and within a few years he had acquired a group of eighteenth-century Venetian paintings that was to form the basis of the National Gallery’s collection of later Italian paintings. These included a pair of conversation pieces by Pietro Longhi, The Faint and A Game of Pentola; oil sketches by Sebastiano Ricci, A Miracle of Saint Francis of Paola and The Finding of the True Cross; Campo San Zanipolo by Francesco Guardi; a pair of fanciful female heads by Pietro Rotari; and a luminous oil sketch by Giovanni Battista Tiepolo.

In the 1930s most of these Venetian paintings hung in the dining room in Samuel Kress’ apartment at 1020 Fifth Avenue, New York, but as his collection of Italian art continued to grow, Kress began to consider the possibilities of sharing it with a wider audience. In 1938 he decided to donate his collection to the National Gallery of Art, and when it opened in 1941, 375 paintings and 18 sculptures from his gift were installed in the West Building. The Italian baroque was well represented in the galleries by Kress’ Venetian pictures, the touchstone of which was Giovanni Battista Tiepolo’s brilliant oil sketch for the ceiling fresco (Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III) in the throne room in the Royal Palace, Madrid.

Kress was assisted in his efforts by Stephen S. Pichetto (1888–1949), one of the most prominent American restorers of his generation, who from 1928 served as Kress’ principal restorer. In 1947 he was appointed curator of the Samuel H. Kress Collection at the National Gallery. Pichetto oversaw the expansion of the Kress Collection in the 1940s when Kress, then in his eighties, became ill. After 1946, when Kress was completely bedridden, responsibility for the collection passed to Rush, who played a significant role in its continued development.

Rush Kress transformed the collection in quality, focus, and scope, broadening the acquisitions to include French, Flemish, Spanish, Dutch, and German art as well as Italian paintings. He was particularly fond of baroque paintings, which he called “bucolic pictures,” and under his leadership the Kress Foundation acquired many of its finest later Italian paintings.

In 1947 William E. Suida (1877–1959) was appointed as the Kress Foundation’s librarian and research curator. An authority on Leonardo da Vinci, Titian, Raphael, Giorgione, and other Renaissance masters, the distinguished Austrian scholar and connoisseur also loved Italian painting of the baroque, and he greatly influenced the future growth and development of the Kress Collection at the National Gallery. His aim was to create “the most comprehensive and complete demonstration of Italian art, from 1200 to 1800, existing in the world.”

Suida envisioned adding two or three additional galleries of Kress Italian baroque paintings at the National Gallery, and his enthusiasm for works of the period was supported by Mario Modestini (b. 1907), the gifted Italian restorer and connoisseur who joined the staff of the Kress Foundation in 1951, two years after the death of Pichetto. Baroque paintings were out of vogue in 1950s America, and were thus cheap and plentiful. One of the Gallery’s
finest baroque pictures, for example, Lodovico Carracci’s *The Dream of Saint Catherine of Alexandria*, acquired from Contini in 1950, brought only £52 10s ($210) at the earl of Ellesmere sale at Christie’s, London, in 1946.

At the instance of Suida and Modestini, the Kress Foundation acquired dozens of Italian baroque paintings in the early 1950s, representing the work of many of the major figures of the Italian Seicento and Settecento. That only about forty of these works entered the Gallery’s collections provides a fascinating glimpse into the vicissitudes of taste for the old masters. From the moment of Samuel Kress’ initial gift to the National Gallery in 1939, the Kress Foundation endorsed the principle of exchanges to improve the quality of the collections on view in Washington. From the inauguration of the Kress galleries in 1941 until the final distribution of the collection to museums across the United States in 1961, paintings had been delivered to Washington, exhibited at the National Gallery, and either retained for its collection or returned for dispersal to one of the regional galleries.

John Walker (1906–1995), as chief curator from 1938 to 1956 and director from 1956 to 1969, was the final arbiter in the selection of the Kress paintings for the National Gallery. A disciple of Bernard Berenson, Walker was not an enthusiast of the baroque, and greatly preferred earlier Italian painting. His views frequently reflect Berenson’s position in *Italian Painters of the Renaissance*, which concluded with a chapter on painting of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries entitled “The Decline of Art.” Many of the later Italian pictures acquired by Suida and his colleagues for the collection were exhibited for years in the Kress galleries in Washington, but in the end were returned to the Kress Foundation, often in exchange for Renaissance paintings.

The Italian baroque paintings eventually selected for the Kress Collection at the National Gallery reveal a definite preference for bright, decorative, non-religious pictures, especially Venetian, epitomized by Giovanni Battista Tiepolo’s *Apollo Pursuing Daphne*. Landscapes, views, genre paintings, portraits, still lifes, and allegorical and mythological subjects predominate in the Kress Collection at the expense of the violent martyrdoms (excepting the Tanzio) and esoteric literary themes often found in Italian baroque painting. Among these are some of the most important baroque paintings in America: a Caravagesque still life of great historical significance, now ascribed to the so-called Pensionante del Saraceni; the only landscape by Annibale Carracci in the United States; the Lodovico Dream of Saint Catherine; a powerful history painting by Giuseppe Maria Crespi, *Tarquin and Lucretia*; one of the finest of the “Monuments” to the British worthies commissioned in the 1720s from Marco and Sebastiano Ricci by the eccentric Irish impresario, Owen McSwiny; and distinguished works by Guercino, Bernardo Strozzi, Domenico Fetti, Donato Creti, Sebastian Ricci, Magnusco, and Giambattista Tiepolo. The Kress Collection also includes several fine view paintings by the Venetians Canaletto, Bellotto, and Guardi.

Gifts and bequests other than Kress have enriched our collection of later Italian paintings, notably in the area of Venetian view painting, beginning with Peter A. B. Widener’s view of SS. Giovanni and Paolo, Venice, for years thought to be by Canaletto and now recognized as an early work by Bernardo Bellotto, and Francesco Guardi’s *Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge, Venice*, in 1942. Barbara Hutton, the Woolworth heiress, donated two important, signed views of Venice by Canaletto, formerly at Castle Howard, Yorkshire, in 1945. Howard Sturgis in 1956 presented the Gallery with a deftly painted little oil sketch by Tiepolo depicting *Saint Roch Carried to Heaven*. And in 1964 Paul Mellon rounded off this sequence of Venetian pictures with a pair of imaginary landscapes in beautiful condition painted by Canaletto in England shortly before his return to Venice in 1755.

Purchases of later Italian paintings by the National Gallery have been rare until relatively recently; the most notable is Orazio Gentileschi’s *Lute Player*, a painting that has been called his masterpiece, which was acquired from the Liechtenstein Collection in 1962. Shortly thereafter, the Gallery bought, also with the Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund, a pair of lyrical and poetic pictures from the Guardi circle illustrating episodes from Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata*, and in 1968 a fine version of one of Panini’s most popular compositions, the *Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome*. In the past decade a concerted effort has been made to fill the lacunae in the collection. Two paintings by Guercino and one by the Cavaliere d’Arpino were purchased in the mid-1980s. The Gallery’s first work from the school of Naples—a major painting by Jusepe de Ribera, *The Martyrdom...*
of Saint Bartholomew—was purchased in 1990 through the generosity of the 50th Anniversary Gift Committee. (A second, Diana and Endymion by Luca Giordano, was given by Joseph McCrindle, also in honor of the 50th Anniversary.) The Gallery’s commitment to strengthening its later Italian collections was affirmed in 1993 with the purchase of Bellotto’s Fortress of Königstein, a painting of sublime conception and technical execution. Commissioned for Augustus III, king of Poland and elector of Saxony, the artist’s most important patron in the first half of his career, and unique in this country for having been created for the royal collections in Dresden, the painting brings full circle the Gallery’s group of views by Venetian painters initiated by the Widener gift of the early Bellotto painting fifty years earlier.

Currently, the baroque collection consists of five Genoese paintings, ten Bolognese, and more than twenty by Venetian artists, but none from Florence and only one from Lombardy. Several Roman Caravagesque paintings are included, but none from the high baroque in Rome. We see the future as a further effort to add to the strength of the collection while continuing to search for masterpieces by artists, regions, and subjects not yet represented. The later Italian works in the Kress Collection were catalogued in 1973 by Fern Rusk Shapley (1890–1984), longtime curator of paintings at the Gallery, and again in 1979 in her publication of the entire collection of the Gallery’s Italian paintings. The present catalogue includes these works as well as those acquired subsequently. Several paintings catalogued by Shapley carry different attributions here, and others, catalogued by her as Italian, will be included in forthcoming volumes of other schools in the Gallery’s systematic catalogue. These changes are listed at the end of the present volume. Among the several changes of attribution recorded here is the discovery that the Saint Cecilia and an Angel, formerly attributed to Orazio Gentileschi, was begun by Gentileschi and completed by Giovanni Lanfranco. Several of the view paintings given to Francesco Guardi are now thought to have originated in his workshop or to be the work of followers, but the nine paintings by Giambattista Tiepolo (there are more works by him than by any other artist in the later Italian paintings collection) have withstood the challenge of scholarly investigation and are here published as autograph works by the master. Numerous changes in provenance, date, title, and interpretation, the result of extensive new art historical research as well as technical investigations in the gallery’s conservation and scientific research laboratories, will make this volume the most comprehensive and up-to-date source of information on the National Gallery’s collection of Italian baroque paintings.

NOTES TO THE READER

Entries in the volume are arranged alphabetically by artist. For each artist, there is a short biography and bibliography, followed by individual entries on paintings arranged according to date. Paintings assigned to an artist’s workshop, to followers, and to school are discussed after entries on an artist’s securely attributed paintings. A list of changes of attribution and of title is included at the end of the volume. In 1983 the National Gallery assigned new accession numbers by year of acquisition; these are followed by the old numbers in parentheses.

The following attribution terms have been used:

Attributed to: Probably by the named artist according to available evidence, although some degree of doubt exists.

Studio/Workshop of: Produced in the named artist’s studio/workshop by assistants, possibly with some participation of the named artist. It is important that the named artist was responsible for the creative concept and that the work was meant to leave the studio as his.

Follower of: An unknown artist working specifically in the style of the named artist, who may or may not have been trained by the named artist. Some chronological continuity is implied.

After: A copy of any date.

School: Indicates a geographical distinction, used only when it is impossible to identify a specific artist, his studio, or followers.

The following conventions are used for dates:

- 1603 Executed in 1603
- c. 1603 Executed sometime around 1603
- 1603-1614 Begun in 1603, finished in 1614
- 1603/1614 Executed sometime between 1603 and 1614
- c. 1603/1614 Executed sometime around the period 1603-1614

Dimensions are given in centimeters, height preceding width, followed by dimensions in inches in parentheses.

The Technical Notes summarize the contents of the examination reports prepared by members of the Gallery’s conservation department for the Systematic Catalogue. In writing the Technical Notes, the authors collaborated closely with the conservators responsible for preparing the reports, and they studied all the paintings jointly with the conservators. The notes describe the condition of the paintings as of February 1994.

Each painting was unframed and examined in visible light, front and back. The paintings were examined with a stereomicroscope and under ultraviolet light. X-radiographs were taken to answer specific questions about the painting’s construction or condition; for example when pentimenti suggested reworking of the original composition. All of the paintings were examined with infrared reflectography to reveal underdrawing and compositional changes. When useful information was discovered, reflectograms were prepared, although only those considered essential to the interpretation of the work are discussed in the Technical Notes. In response to specific questions about technique, the Scientific Research Department analyzed all of the paintings (for a description of the analytical methods, see below).

Most of the paintings in this volume are on coarse or medium-weight, plain-weave fabric supports, with a few of the paintings on finely woven fabrics (both Longhis and Panini’s Interior of the Pantheon), and a few others on twill-weave fabrics (the Lodovico Carracci; Crespi’s Tarquin and Lucretia; all three Guercinos; the Ribera; the Tinelli; and the original support of Gentileschi’s Lute Player, with a plain-weave piece added later during lining). The largest paintings (the Guardis, Tiepolo’s Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers, and the Tinelli) and several of the smaller paintings are on fabric supports that were pieced together prior to the ground application. All are presumed to be hemp or linen (fiber analysis has not been carried out), though the conventional term “canvas” is used in the heading. Four paintings are on wooden panel (Cesari’s Martyrdom of Saint Margaret, both Fettis, and the Follower of Guardi’s Rialto Bridge, Venice), and one is on a copper support (Crespi’s Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs). Michael Palmer of the Scientific Research department analyzed the wood type of the panel paintings in this catalogue.
The ground for the paintings in this volume is generally a reddish brown layer (twenty paintings), or a reddish brown imprimatura toning a white (seven paintings) or a red (two paintings) ground layer. However, there are variations in color from white (ten paintings) to gray (two paintings) to a yellowish brown (eleven paintings) to a pinkish brown (five paintings), and seven paintings have double-layered grounds consisting, in most instances, of a dark layer beneath a lighter one. Generally the ground layer is smooth, but the appearance in x-radiographs suggests that a stiff-bristled brush or a palette knife was used to apply the ground in several of these paintings.

The conditions of the paintings vary. The treatment records are available in the National Gallery conservation files. The dates of conservation treatments when known are cited here. The presence of a lining canvas is assumed unless noted. At times the files record that the painting was “relined” rather than lined. The Technical Notes repeat the phrases as found in the records, without determining whether this means a first or a later lining, since this phrase is probably a casual use of the term, without intending to indicate that an earlier lining was removed during the treatment. Unless specifically noted in the Technical Notes, the tacking margins of the original support can be assumed to have been removed. Cusping along the trimmed fabric edges is taken as a strong indication that the artist’s original dimensions have been retained. In treatments carried out prior to acquisition, original stretchers or strainers were routinely removed and discarded during treatment. With the exception of Cesari’s Martyrdom of Saint Margaret, the panel paintings were cradled. For these paintings, the process included thinning of the original panel, and marouflaging it to a backing board. All of the conservation treatments included removal of discolored varnish layers and old inpainting. Damages, such as tears or paint losses, should be assumed to have been repaired and retouched. All significant areas of inpainting are discussed in the Technical Notes. The varnishes are all later replacements and impart no information about the artist’s choice of finish.

Description of Equipment Used

X-radiography: X-radiography was carried out with equipment consisting of a Eureka Emerald 125 MT tube, a Continental 0–110 kV control panel, and a Duocon M collimator. Kodak X-OMAT film was used. The x-radiograph composites were prepared with photographs developed from the film and assembled into a mosaic. The composite of the Tiepolo Bacchus and Ariadne x-radiographs was prepared by scanning 35 mm slides of the film into a Macintosh Quadra desktop computer and assembling with Adobe Photoshop.

Infrared examination: A vidicon camera was used for the infrared examination, which consisted of a Hamamatsu C/1000–03 camera fitted with either an N2606–10 or N214 lead sulphide tube and a Nikon 55mm macro lens with a Kodak Wratten filter, a C/1000–03 camera controller and a Tektronics 634 monitor.

Air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF): Air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy, a nondestructive analytical technique, was carried out using a Kevex 0750A spectrophotometer equipped with a barium chloride target and a Si(Li) detector. The anode voltage was 60kV.

Optical microscopy: Small paint samples (c. 0.25 mm) were removed using a scalpel and mounted in polyester-type resin blocks. The samples were polished with silicon carbide papers and examined using optical microscopy. The samples were photographed using ultropak lenses on a Leitz orthoplan microscope.

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM): Small samples were examined with a JEOL 6300 scanning electron microscope.

Energy dispersive spectrometry (EDS): The samples were examined with energy dispersive spectrometry using a Link eXII analysis system with the Super ATW Si(Li) detector.

X-ray diffraction (XRD): The Philips x-ray generator XRG 3100 was used with a tube with a copper anode and nickel filter. The paint sample was mounted in a glass fiber in a Gandolfi camera. Data were collected on film and line spacings and intensities were estimated using a calibrated rule.

Provenance information has been stated as concisely as possible. Dealers’ names are given in parentheses to distinguish them from collectors. A semicolon indicates that the work passed directly from
one owner to the next. A period indicates either that we have been unable to establish whether it did so or that there is a break in the chain of ownership. The year in which a painting entered the National Gallery is recorded in the accession number. We checked provenance information from original sources in nearly all cases, and we have been able to modify existing knowledge of the provenance of several works. Endnotes indicate sources not obvious from context and provide additional information needed to supplement accounts of ownership.

The exhibition history is complete as far as is known. Information has been checked from the original catalogues of nearly all relevant exhibitions.

In the main text of the entries, related works have been discussed and are illustrated wherever relevant. Information that is not essential to the interpretation of the Gallery’s paintings is kept to a minimum.

All early references are given, even if they are trivial in nature. Otherwise, only the principal literature is included. Sales and exhibition catalogues cited in the provenance and exhibition sections are not repeated in the References list. References and exhibition histories are complete as of February 1994.
Giuseppe Angeli
1712 – 1798

Giuseppe Angeli was born in Venice and entered the shop of Giovanni Battista Piazzetta (q.v.) at an unknown date, probably before he was twenty years old. By 1741 he was officially registered as an independent painter, although he remained in Piazzetta’s workshop and eventually became its director. Of all the painters employed by Piazzetta, Angeli was the most adept at imitating the master’s style. He soon succeeded, however, in cultivating his own circle of influential patrons in Venice and its mainland territories. He is not known to have left the city for study or work.

Early in his career Angeli produced works of all the types turned out by Piazzetta’s shop, including genre paintings, half-length devotional images, decorative cycles, and the large religious paintings that would be the focus of his career. Although his style derived primarily from his teacher’s late manner, he was receptive to other contemporary developments, particularly the refined elegance and lighter palettes of Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (q.v.) and Jacopo Amigoni (1682–1752). His earliest works, of the 1730s and 1740s, are the most indebted to Piazzetta, yet they anticipate his later style. In these works he retained Piazzetta’s restricted, vaguely defined space, but with more simplified, symmetrical compositions in which he isolated heavy, blocklike figures. These figures derive principally from Piazzetta, but often recall Amigoni. Angeli’s palette, too, initially developed from the mature Piazzetta’s careful blend of warm, primarily brown, tones accented with cooler hues, but he later came to prefer a lighter, more silver tonality which avoided the reddish cast of his master’s paintings.

In the only extended consideration of Angeli’s career to date, Mollenhauer Hanstein has described his evolving, somewhat uneven style of the 1750s and 1760s as influenced by the neoclassical manner of such painters as Pier Antonio Novelli (1729–1804) and the new Enlightenment ideals among the Venetian ecclesiastics, who were his chief patrons. Angeli’s altarpieces of this period tend to increased simplicity and clarity of outline. Their pastel-like finish, derived from Amigoni, is quite unlike Angeli’s earlier, more vibrant paint surfaces. As he strove for a more straightforward presentation of subject, his religious paintings assumed an almost genre-like immediacy, the figures becoming less monumental. In many instances he drew directly upon fifteenth-century models, often appropriating their flat gold backgrounds or specific architectural details. These he used to give concrete definition to a space no longer determined solely by Piazzetta’s chiaroscuro effects, as in his own early works. His last church commissions of the 1770s, however, return to his first style.

In addition to large altarpieces, Angeli also executed decorative commissions in palaces and villas, where he was less innovative, simply reworking earlier treatments of historical and mythological scenes. For the Scuola di San Rocco he executed a number of ceiling paintings, restored works by Jacopo Tintoretto (1518–1594), and even repainted unrestorable compositions by Tintoretto and Pordenone (1483/1484–1539). In the 1770s he returned to painting small devotional images and portraits of his influential patrons, following the conventions of official portraiture as practiced by Alessandro Longhi (1733–1813).

Elected drawing master in 1756, Angeli was a leading member of the Venetian Academy until the later 1770s. In 1774 he was awarded a medal of honor from the Venetian government for his accomplishments in religious painting. Thereafter, however, demand for his art declined as a result of the religious and social transformations that preceded the fall of the Venetian Republic in 1797. He left no successful pupils and had no influence on the profoundly different course of Venetian art in the nineteenth century.
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**1952.5.70 (1149)**

**Elijah Taken Up in a Chariot of Fire**

**c. 1740/1755**

Oil on canvas, 174.6 x 264.8 (68 3/4 x 104 1/2)

Samuel H. Kress Collection

**Technical Notes:** The support is a rather coarse, plain-weave fabric with prominent nubby threads. It was prepared with a warm, pinkish tan ground, over which the opaque paint layer was freely applied with low to moderate impasto. There is little glazing or complex layering. X-radiographs show slight contour modification in the foreleg of the front horse, and reveal that Elijah's robe extends under the wheel. The reserve left in the flames for the wheel, however, suggests that only the section over the robe was painted as an afterthought, with an extension of the robe beyond the rim.

The corners of the support were once curved and have been filled with crudely painted strips of fabric to provide the present rectangular format. Cupping is evident along all the edges of the original support. The painting has numerous tears in the background: the most extensive are in an area of about 42 x 10 cm at the bottom of the wheel, with more tears around Elijah's right hand. Abrasion, especially in the background, has been heavily inpainted; the inpainting is slightly discolored. The present varnish is moderately yellowed. Discolored varnish was removed and the inpainting restored in 1948 by Mario Modestini.

**Provenance:** San Giorgio in Alga, Venice, until 1806 or 1807. 1. Pivan collection, Venice, by 1934. 2. (Count) Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence; purchased 1950 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.

**Evidence** that *Elijah Taken Up in a Chariot of Fire* is the work of Giuseppe Angeli was assembled only recently. The painting was first published by Pallucchini in 1934 with an attribution to Francesco Polazzo (1683–1753), a student of Giovanni Battista Piazzetta. 4 Suida’s 1951 attribution to Piazzetta was accepted by Pallucchini in his 1956 monograph 5 on the artist and also by later scholars, who continued to suggest at least the assistance of Polazzo. 6 Pigler’s suggestion of 1956 that the painting might be one of the two *Elijahs* by Angeli recorded in Antonio Maria Zanetti’s 1771 guide to Venice appears to have gone unnoticed. 7 In 1981 Jones observed that the painting was identical in size, shape, and style to Angeli’s *Madonna Presenting the Habit to Saint Simon Stock*, now in the church of the Maddalena in Venice, and assumed that the pair had been painted for that church. 8 Thirty years earlier, however, Pignatti had noted an inscription on the back of the Maddalena canvas reading “San Giorgio in Alga” and identified it as the painting of the same subject recorded by Zanetti in the church of San Giorgio in Alga. 9 In 1982 Mollenhauer Hanstein also noted the similarities between the two paintings and, turning to Zanetti’s text, found that Angeli had, in fact, executed a pair of paintings for San Giorgio in Alga: the Maddalena *Saint Simon Stock* and the Washington *Elijah Taken Up in a Chariot of Fire*. She suggested that the two had hung high on the walls of the choir of this church, 10 which was destroyed early in the nineteenth century. 11 This identification is now unanimously accepted.

Scholars do not concur on the dating, however, and have proposed a broad range of dates, from 1740 to 1755, for the San Giorgio pair. The dating of paintings from this period of Angeli’s career is complicated by the lack of documented works and by considerable variation in his style. Furthermore, from 1741 until Piazzetta’s death in 1754, Angeli was also active as the director of Piazzetta’s shop. Mariuz argued that the high quality of the San Giorgio paintings indicated the direct intervention of the master, and thus a date of 1745–1750. 12 Knox, on the other hand, suggested a date of 1750–1755 based on their high level of accomplishment as compared to dated works from the 1740s. 13 Mollenhauer Hanstein found their diagonal compositions more baroque than that of the Virgin with Saints Felix of Cantalice and Margaret of Cortona in Santo Spirito, Cortona, documented to 1744–1745, and thus proposed an earlier date of 1740–1743. 14

A date around 1745 seems most plausible, but cannot be firmly established without specific documentation or a more secure chronology of Angeli’s oeuvre. As Pignatti observed, the Virgin in the *Saint Simon Stock* is the same figure as in the Cortona altarpiece, and the Saint Simon is similar in pose to the Saint Felix in the same painting. 15 Like the figures in the *Elijah*, these are derived from Piazzetta but are conceived in Angeli’s own manner. Likewise, the smooth, fluid brushwork and light tonality are also characteristic of Angeli’s developing style, 16 while the restricted palette and the chiaroscuro effects derive from Piazzetta’s works of the late 1730s and 1740s. These strong echoes of the master’s style might seem to confirm the date suggested by comparison with the Cortona altarpiece of 1744–1745, yet Angeli’s style of the 1750s is not so consistently independent as to rule out the possibility that he returned, as on other occasions, to an earlier, more Pi-
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azzettesque manner, perhaps at the request of the patron. A date later than 1755 is quite unlikely, however, as Angeli’s style became increasingly independent after Piazzetta’s death, with clearer contours, a still lighter, more varied palette, and less monumental figures.

In the eighteenth century the church and monastery of San Giorgio in Alga belonged to the Discalced Carmelites, who reconstructed it following a devastating fire in 1716. The Carmelites considered the prophet Elijah to be the founder of their Order, and scenes from his life were often depicted in their churches. His ascension in the chariot of fire, taken from 2 Kings 2: 1-12, was the most popular of these scenes. Knowing that he was about to be called to heaven, the prophet Elijah went across the Jordan with his disciple Elisha. As they spoke, a chariot and horses of fire appeared and swept Elijah up to heaven in a fiery whirlwind, whereupon he cast down his cloak to Elisha, who later used it to part the waters of the Jordan. Combination of this subject with that of the Madonna presenting the Carmelite habit to Saint Simon Stock was also not unusual at that time. The original contract of 1740 for the ceiling of the Sala Capitulare in the Scuola Grande dei Carmine, Venice, called for Giovanni Battista Tiepolo to include the figures of Elijah and Elisha in a depiction of the presentation of the habit to Saint Simon Stock. The Virgin’s presentation of the habit to Saint Simon parallels Elijah’s giving of his mantle to Elisha, and together the two subjects show visible signs of the holy spirit cast upon the Carmelites.

In his Washington Elijah, Angeli followed the traditional depiction of the scene with Elijah borne aloft in a blaze of fire from which emerge a pair of horses and part of the chariot, in this case one wheel. Angeli departed from the more common iconography in that Elijah is not shown casting his mantle down to Elisha, but rather grasping it as if about to remove it. Angeli also reduced the landscape to a rocky hillock, with merely a strip of blue at the lower right to indicate the river Jordan. The resulting composition is typical of Angeli’s early style, with monumental figures in the manner of Piazzetta isolated within an indeterminate space defined principally by light effects. The composition may owe something to a painting in the Ateneum, Helsinki, now attributed to the workshop of Palma Giovane, in which a similar figure of Elisha, arms outstretched, looms in the left foreground. Another earlier Venetian model may have been Tintoretto’s small grisaille on the ceiling of the Sala Grande of the Scuola di San Rocco in Venice, which, however, is known only through Angeli’s copy of 1778.

Notes

1. Zanetti 1771, 477. The church and monastery were suppressed in 1806 and the works of art removed in 1807: Zorzi 1972, 2: 405-406.
2. According to Pallucchini 1934, 341.
6. Shawley 1973, 138, and 1979, 1: 366, found the painting “uninspired and academic with exaggerated gestures and flat brushwork suggesting especially the work of Polazzo.” She attributed it to “Piazzetta and Assistants” and noted the doubts of Fredericksen and Zeri 1972, 647 (as Piazzetta or Polazzo), and Zeri’s later oral rejection of the attribution to Piazzetta.
10. Mollenhauer Hanstein 1982, 148, no. 128, and 128, no. 70. This history is now also summarized in Knox 1992, 215.
15. Pigltni 1949, 169. Writing without the benefit of Mollenhauer Hanstein’s catalogue raisonné, Pigltni dated both the Saint Simon Stock and the Cortona altarpiece to the 1760s.
16. Jones, “Piazzetta,” 1981, 2: 238, called the smooth, opaque brushwork characteristic of Angeli. The light blue and apricot tints of the Eliahs are not so far from Piazzetta’s late palette as she suggested; Piazzetta’s Saganna at the Well of c. 1736 in the Brera, Milan, has much the same palette, but appears darker (comparison suggested by Mitchell Merling). Assuming that the painting was executed for the Maddalena, Jones dated the Elijah to the 1760s.
17. Mollenhauer Hanstein 1982, 46, remarked on the unevenness of Angeli’s stylistic development in the early 1750s. None of the documented works from the years 1750-1755 offers a useful comparison with the San Giorgio paintings. Angeli is known to have received independent commissions from Piazzetta’s patrons.
18. For Angeli’s style of the 1750s and 1760s, see biography and Mollenhauer Hanstein 1982, 44–82.
21. Barcham 1989, 154–155. In the original program for the Sala Capitolare, Barcham saw the habit, or scapular, as “standing for the spirit that descended from Elijah, to Elisha, and then on to the sons of Carmel.”
22. The smaller, more distant chariot faces the other direction and the landscape is much more defined. Ivanoff and Zampetti 1980, 599, no. 474; reproduced in Berenson 1980, pl. 98. The comparison was made by Shapley 1973, 138, and 1979, 1: 366.
23. The documents described the eight rhomboid fields, in which Tintoretto’s tempera grisailles had deteriorated beyond repair, as “rifatti di novo… cavati dalli vecchi” by Angeli. The San Rocco restorations are discussed in Rossi 1977, 265, Mollenhauer Hanstein 1982, 195, fig. 103, and Mariuz and Pallucchini 1982, 129, assumed that Angeli copied his own earlier composition in executing the grisaille at San Rocco.
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Bernardo Bellotto

1722 – 1780

Bernardo Bellotto is now believed to have been born in Venice on 20 May 1722 to Fiorenza Domenica Canal and Lorenzo Bellotto. His mother was the eldest of the three sisters of the Venetian vedutista Antonio Canaletto (q.v.), and around 1735 Bellotto entered his uncle’s studio to train as a view painter. During his apprenticeship, which lasted until the early 1740s, he so thoroughly assimilated Canaletto’s methods and style—a phenomenon remarked upon by contemporaries—that the problem of attributing works from this period to one painter or the other continues to the present day.

As early as 1738 Bellotto was enrolled in the register of the Fraglia dei Pittori, the Venetian painters’ guild, which suggests that by then he had developed into an independent painter. By 1740 he was capable of faultless perspective drawing, and he had produced several independent oil paintings of Venetian scenes. In 1740–1741 Bellotto accompanied his uncle on a visit to the neighboring mainland along the Brenta to Padua, and on this trip he attained his majority as an artist. For several months in 1742 Bellotto traveled in central Italy visiting Florence, Lucca, and Rome. The paintings produced during this time exhibit a high standard of execution, skillful handling, and precise linear framework, and the distribution of light, shade, and color anticipate his distinctive mature style and eventual divergence from the manner of Canaletto.

Bellotto probably returned to Venice before the end of 1742; he was certainly there in 1743. From 1744 onward, before his departure for Dresden in the summer of 1747, he spent months at a time in Lombardy, Piedmont, and Verona, where he executed many paintings of new subjects. During this period he began to take an interest in the surroundings of towns and in landscape, which had previously played a minor role in his work. The most important of Bellotto’s Italian works are considered to be two views of the village of Gazzada, near Varese (Brera, Milan), which in their contrast of light and shade, intense color, crystalline atmosphere, and evident feeling for rural landscape summarize the artist’s early maturity. In 1745 Bellotto executed two views
of Turin for Charles Emmanuel III, king of Sardinia and duke of Savoy. These were his first royal commissions, and he signed them with his given name and surname, as well as the byname “II Canaletto,” no doubt to draw attention to his relationship with his celebrated uncle.

Bellotto’s views of Milan, Turin, and Verona are the products of a mature style of view painting, but he also painted a number of vedute ideate and capriccios in his last Italian years, which reflect the same high quality and technical standards as his realistic views of the period. In July 1747, in response to a summons by the court of Dresden, he left Venice forever. From the moment of his arrival until the outbreak of the Seven Years’ War in 1756, Bellotto was engaged in the service of Augustus III, king of Poland and elector of Saxony, and of his powerful prime minister, Count Heinrich von Brühl. In 1748 the title of court painter was officially conferred on the artist, and his annual salary was the highest ever paid by Augustus III to a painter. Between 1747 and the first months of 1753, Bellotto painted fourteen large panoramic views of Dresden; between 1753 and 1756, eleven views of the village of Pirna; and between 1756 and 1758, five views of the fortress of Königstein. These thirty paintings are among the painter’s most significant works. In these paintings Bellotto developed a highly original style impossible to confuse with that of his uncle: darker in tonality and painted with a much thicker impasto, the figures with which they are animated are far more individualized than in Canaletto’s work. They conclude the stage of development initiated by the Italian views, and in their panoramic breadth, convincing depictions of deep space, and contrasts of shadow and sunlight stand among the greatest achievements of view painting in the eighteenth century.

A new phase was ushered in with Bellotto’s move to Vienna in the winter of 1758–1759, where he remained until early in 1761. The thirteen large paintings recording the principal attractions of Vienna, painted for Empress Maria Theresa and emphasizing her palaces and those constructed at her behest, constitute his second great series devoted to the portrayal of a single city and its immediate environment. Following his departure from Vienna in early 1761, Bellotto visited the court of Elector Maximilian III Joseph of Bavaria in Munich before returning to Dresden shortly before the end of the year.

Bellotto’s second period of residence in Dresden, 1761–1766, was marked by financial difficulties caused by the destruction of his home and the contents of his studio in Pirna during the Prussian bombardment of the city in July 1760, the deaths of Augustus III and Count Brühl within a few months of each other in 1763, and the Saxon court’s new preference for native artists. To eke out a living, Bellotto taught perspective drawing at the Dresden Academy of Fine Arts, established in 1764, and he made and sold prints. He also produced replicas of his earlier views of Pirna, Königstein, Vienna, and Munich, most of them in reduced formats. The high technical standard of some indicate that they were painted entirely by his own hand; many others were completed with the assistance of members of his studio, notably his son Lorenzo (1744–1770). Bellotto also produced two unusual views of war-torn Dresden, and large numbers of capriccios and vedute ideate.

In December 1766, Bellotto and his son left Dresden with the intention of traveling to Saint Petersburg and working for the empress of Russia, Catherine II. He arrived in Warsaw probably before the end of January 1767 and was immediately offered employment at the court of the last king of Poland, Stanislaus II August Poniatowski. He was appointed court painter in 1768 and spent the last fourteen years of his life working for the king in relative comfort and security. His most important work from this period is a series of twenty-six views of Warsaw, intended for the so-called Canaletto Hall in the Royal Castle. With their extraordinary topographical precision and scrupulous attention to detail, these views played an important role in the reconstruction of Warsaw following the Second World War. Bellotto also produced, together with his son, an extraordinary amount of work for the royal residences at Ujazdów and Lazienki on the outskirts of the city. He died in Warsaw on 17 November 1780.

Notes

1. Kowalczyk, “Documenti,” 1995, 70, 76, appendix, no. 6, cites the baptismal document in the Archivio della Curia Patriarcale, Venice, which records the painter’s given names as Bernardo Francesco Paolo Ernesto. The father’s name is not specified as Lorenzo, but circumstantial evidence suggests strongly that the infant in question is Bernardo Bellotto. The artist’s traditional birth date, 30 January 1721, is evidently that of his older brother, Michiel Bernardo Antonio Eugenio.
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The Campo di SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice
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Belotto entered the studio of Canaletto, his uncle, around 1735, and by 1740 was participating in the production of view paintings. The extent of his participation in Canaletto’s oil paintings may never be established precisely, and even the artists’ contemporaries experienced difficulty in distinguishing between their hands: Bellotto’s first biographer, Guarienti, asserted that “his scenes of Venice were so carefully and so realistically done that it was exceedingly difficult to distinguish his work from his uncle’s.” The problem of discerning Bellotto’s hand in paintings from the early 1740s and separating his work from Canaletto’s of the period is one of the knottier problems of connoisseurship in the field of later Italian painting.

That there is not a single painted view of Venice indisputably by Bellotto has resulted in much conjecture about the authorship of the Washington canvas. Constable in 1962 and all earlier authorities assigned the painting to Canaletto. Kozakiewicz, however, in his 1972 monograph on Bellotto, proposed the intervention of the artist in the handling of the figures and in the treatment of the water. The present author, in 1992, realized that the painting is not by Canaletto and attributed it to the young Bellotto. Succi has also more recently assigned the painting to Bellotto, citing the work as an example of his period of apprenticeship with Canaletto, around 1738-1739.

This view of the square of Santi Giovanni e Paolo can be attributed to Bellotto before he left Italy in 1747 for Dresden. Although, in the words of Kozakiewicz, “The history of art holds few instances indeed of an artist whose early work, for all its many individual characteristics, was so thoroughly permeated by the style of an older artist as in the case of Bellotto and Canale,” there are significant differences between their styles from the moment Bellotto began to develop his own artistic personality. The
National Gallery painting exemplifies the maturity of Bellotto’s early style, before he went to Dresden, especially in the treatment of space, light and shade, tone, color, and brushwork. Comparison of Bellotto’s Washington painting with Canaletto’s paintings of the early 1740s, such as the view of the Porta Portello at Padua in the National Gallery (1961.9.53) vividly reveals two distinct hands.

The differences are particularly evident in the description of architectural surfaces and textures, the handling of figures, and the treatment of water. Bellotto’s earliest works reveal greater contrasts of light and shade and a cooler tonality than those of Canaletto. His architecture is more precisely drawn and the description of surface texture is more carefully rendered than in Canaletto’s paintings. His palette is considerably bolder and his colors more intense. (One example is the russet used to describe the exposed brick beneath the stucco on the buildings at the left, a color peculiar to Bellotto, which he often used for painting clay pots and terracotta-tiled roofs.) A pertinent difference between Canaletto and Bellotto is in their approach to figures: from the beginning Bellotto’s figures have more weight and solidity than Canaletto’s, and his technique of describing them with a brush loaded with liquid paint and his liberal use of white anticipate the fully developed staffage that populate the large views of Dresden, Pirna, and Königstein (1993.8.1) a few years later.

Bellotto’s subject, the Campo Santi Giovanni e Paolo, is, after the Piazza San Marco, one of the grandest and most important squares in Venice. The site embraces one of the city’s six great philanthropic confraternities, the Scuola Grande di San Marco; its main Dominican church, the basilica of Santi Giovanni e Paolo; and one of the most beautiful equestrian statues in the world, Andrea Verrocchio’s (1435–1488) monument to the condottiere Bartolomeo Colleoni. Bellotto’s wide-angle view encompasses nearly the width of the square. On the left are the buildings on the west side of the Rio dei Mendicanti, the Ponte del Cavallo spanning the small canal, and a wooden footbridge beyond. In the center is the trompe l’œil marble facade of the Scuola di San Marco, one of the most harmonious and significant examples of Venetian Renaissance architecture. The composition is closed at the right by the shaded Gothic facade and sunlit south elevation of the church. Verrocchio’s bronze statue stands on a high marble pedestal in the foreground. Pedestrians stroll in the square, and in front of the scuola a makeshift canvas shelter has been erected beside a stone pillar.

The square was frequently represented by eighteenth-century Venetian artists. Early in his career Canaletto painted two important views of the site, which established the standard prospect and the source for almost all contemporary depictions.\(^9\)

The earlier and larger of these canvases, now in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, was acquired in 1725 by Augustus III, elector of Saxony and king of Poland.\(^11\) In December 1725, Stefano Conti, a silk and cloth merchant in Lucca, commissioned another view of the church and scuola, which was completed in May 1726.\(^12\)

Bellotto’s design for the National Gallery painting clearly derives from his uncle’s depictions of the scene, except that, typically of the younger artist, the viewpoint is farther from the buildings and the angle is wider, so that more of the square is shown, including a portion of the one-story building attached to the church (College of the Holy Name of Jesus, now Saint Thomas’ Hall). The first reference to Bellotto’s artistic activity and his earliest surviving depiction of the Campo San Zanipolo (as the square is known in Venetian dialect) is a drawing (fig. 1) in the Hessisches Landesmuseum, Darmstadt, inscribed 8 December 1740.\(^13\) The composition corresponds quite closely to the National Gallery view, although it includes more of the pavement in the foreground and the south facade of the church, with differences in the boats and the figures.

The similarities between the painting and the drawing have led to a number of explanations of the relationship between the two works. Constable, who attributed the Washington painting to Canaletto, suggested that the drawing represents either a lost sketch by Canaletto for the National Gallery painting or a record of the view made independently by Bellotto.\(^14\) Puppi believed that the drawing was derived from the National Gallery’s view and therefore served as a terminus ante quem for dating the painting.\(^15\) Pignatti hypothesized that Bellotto and Canaletto worked independently, as though they were drawing from adjoining windows, when they produced the Darmstadt drawing and an almost identical composition in the Royal Collection at Windsor, respectively.\(^16\) Kozakiewicz, however, is surely correct in identifying the Darmstadt drawing as a preliminary study for a painting by Bellotto now in the Museum of Fine Arts,
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Springfield (fig. 2). Except for minor changes in the position of the figures, the Springfield painting and Darmstadt drawing correspond nearly exactly.

The Springfield view of the Campo Santi Giovanni e Paolo is so different from the Washington painting in its style and handling that it must belong to an earlier phase in the painter’s development. In fact, the National Gallery painting shares many more of the characteristics of Bellotto’s works of a few years later, such as The Tiber with the Castel Sant’Angelo and The Tiber with the Church of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini (The Barbara Piasecka Johnson Collection, Princeton, N.J.), 1743–1746. The technique of these two Tiber views is particularly consistent with the treatment of the figures in the present work, with heavier impasto than that ever seen in autograph paintings by Canaletto, and in the use of liquid, calligraphic touches of white to define forms such as the garments of the woman in the right foreground (fig. 3). The view of the Campo
Fig. 3. Detail of 1942.9.7

Santi Giovanni e Paolo also shares many similarities, particularly in the treatment of the architecture and the handling of the lanky and awkward figures, tall and thin with small heads, with a pair of views of Verona in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden. The latter pair, painted either shortly before Bellotto left Italy for Saxony, or produced for the royal collections within the first year or so of his stay in Dresden, suggest an interim date of about 1743–1747 for the Washington painting.

The National Gallery’s painting was accompanied in the 1873 Constable–Maxwell sale by a companion view of the Piazza San Marco that has not been traced subsequently.

Notes

1. Described in the sale catalogue as “From the collections of Mr. Wakeman and Lord Exeter” and accompanied by lot 133. “The Piazza San Marco, Venice, with numerous figures—the companion.” The latter painting was purchased by Agnew’s, London, and sold later the same year to Kirkman Hodgson, M.P., and remains untraced.

2. Reitlinger 1961, 225, commented that the price paid for the painting by the earl of Dudley—£3,360—was enormous for the time.

3. The painting was purchased from Agnew’s by John G. Johnson, either buying for Widener or for himself and selling it to Widener shortly afterward (information from Agnew’s via Getty Provenance Index).


6. Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 449: “The treatment of the staffage and especially the working of the water with constricted, parallel strokes of the brush seem typical of Bellotto’s style, while Canale’s manner predominates in the architecture.” Camesasca concurred with Kozakiewicz that this was one of Canaletto’s paintings in which he was assisted by his nephew.


9. The square and surrounding architectural complex appear today nearly as Bellotto depicted the site, with the exception of alterations in the fenestration of the facade and flank of the basilica (Zava Boccazzi 1965, 17, frontispiece, figs. 5, 6). The bronze portal door inscribed 1739 appears to be that recorded in the National Gallery view.

10. For example, Michele Mariotti’s etching in his series of Venetian views published between 1741 and 1742, Magnificientes seletioresque Urbis Venetiarum Prospectus, records the scene from a viewpoint even farther from the buildings and with a much deeper vanishing point than Canaletto’s, but he clearly derives his composition from that of the older artist: Succi 1987, 60, no. 8, repro. 61.


12. Constable andLinks 1989, 1: pl. 58; 2: 338, no. 304. The painting is now in a private collection. For a third view, see Constable and Links 1989, 2: 339, no. 306, citing Matthiasen, London, as the last known owner. The caption on an undated color postcard in the National Gallery files, however, describes the painting as in a private collection, Turin.

13. Darmstadt, Hessisches Landesmuseum, Graphische Sammlung, AE 2218: Von Hadeln 1929, 5, 23; Fritzsche 1936, 132; and Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 25–26, no. 25, fig. 25. Kozakiewicz 1964, 241, proposed that around 1740 Bellotto served as a kind of topographer for Canaletto’s studio, making drawings of views that other members of the studio, as well as Canaletto himself, used as studies for paintings.


15. Puppi 1968, 100.

16. Pignatti 1967, 1. For the Windsor drawing see Parker 1948, 37, no. 40, fig. 21.
18. Marinelli in exh. cat. Verona 1990, 66–69, nos. 8, 9, repro. The paintings are later versions of a pair of Roman views dated 1742–1744 in the Detroit Institute of Arts and the Toledo Museum of Art, respectively. Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 48, 51, nos. 64, 65, figs. 64, 65.
19. Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 77–81, nos. 99, 102, repro. Bellotto reduced the human figure to a characteristic type that is quite different from that of Canaletto. Features become simple blotches: the eyes and mouths, black; noses and wigs, white. These faces can be seen in views of The Old Bridge over the Po (Pinacoteca Sabauda, Turin; Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 73, fig. 93) and a Lock on the Dolo (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden; Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 84, fig. 107).
20. For a pair of paintings from the early 1740s that have been plausibly attributed to Bellotto and which share several similarities to the Washington painting in the handling of the figures and architecture, The Piazzetta looking North and The Arsenal (The National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa), see Pignatti 1967, figs. 15, 16, 21, 22, 26, 29.
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1993.8.1

The Fortress of Königstein

1756–1758 Oil on canvas, 133 × 235.7 (52 1/2 × 92 3/4)

Patrons’ Permanent Fund

Technical Notes: The support is a fine plain-weave fabric of medium weight, prepared with a light red ground of medium thickness. The paint has been applied with fluent brushwork and the handling reveals considerable variety in touch and application. In many places in the landscape and fortress the paint has been applied with strong brushstrokes, employing fairly thick paint to vary thickness and texture. The deliberate use of a fairly dry brush to create texture is particularly evident in the fortress. The upper-right edge of the escarpment was originally placed 4 cm to the right of its present location; indications of this change are faintly visible. In contrast, the sky has been painted more loosely and rapidly, the broad, sweeping strokes imparting a sense of active weather, light, and movement. The thinner application of paint in the sky has permitted the red ground to show through, although in certain areas the aging of the paint, previous varnish removals, and abrasion have revealed more of the red ground than was originally intended. Aside from minor abrasion in the sky and trees in the lower-left foreground, the painting is in exceptional condition. It was treated in 1992 by Bruno Heimberg at the Doerner Institute, Munich, prior to acquisition. Additional conservation treatment, including varnish removal and inpainting, was carried out by David Bull in 1993.

Provenance: Commissioned by Frederick Augustus III, king of Poland and elector of Saxony [1696–1763],1 Henry Temple, 2d viscount Palmerston [1739–1802], London; Henry John Temple, 3d viscount Palmerston [1784–1865];2 who gave it, perhaps to pay a debt, to William Lygon, 1st earl Beauchamp [1747–1816], Madresfield Court, Worcestershire;3 thence by inheritance to Else, countess Beauchamp [1895–1989]; (sale, Sotheby’s, London, 11 December 1991, no. 18); (Bernheimer Fine Arts Ltd. and Meissner Fine Art Ltd., London).


The painting is one of five large views of an ancient fortress near Dresden commissioned from Bellotto by Augustus III, king of Poland and elector of Saxony. The panorama encompasses a broad expanse of the picturesque, craggy landscape known as Saxonian Switzerland, which Bellotto invested with a monumental quality rarely seen in eighteenth-century Italian painting. The great castle of Königstein sits atop a mountain that rises sharply from the Elbe River valley, hundreds of feet below. In the distance
Bernardo Bellotto, *The Fortress of Königstein, 1993.8.1*
on the left is the Lilienstein, one of the prominent sandstone formations scattered across the country.

Bellotto's boldly contrived design hinges upon the equilibrium between the fortress on its rock massif and the towering expanse of the sky on the left; the interplay between the broad, distant vista stretching to the horizon and the wealth of detail in the complex of fields and paths; and, at the extreme edges of the composition, the equipoise between the Lilienstein, a prominent rock formation, and, on the right, the curving road leading to the castle. The fortress occupies the apex of a bold triangle; cold, remote, and forbidding, it is set off by its sheer height and weight from the staffage in the foreground below.

The human figures and animals, representatives of everyday life, temper the heroic mood of the painting and create an idyllic and pastoral atmosphere. Their presence mitigates the dominance of the fortress, which appears to exist in a realm of eternal repose where time and change are unknown. Whether or not Bellotto intended these rustic figures to give the landscape allegorical or symbolic meaning, their importance is underscored by the fact that they are larger in scale and far more closely integrated into the landscape than in almost any of the artist's other vedute.

The oldest reference to the Königstein rock dates to 1241, when a medieval castle existed on the site, which with the surrounding lands was in the possession of Bohemia. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the castle fell under the rule of the Wettin dynasty, the margraves of Meissen and electors of Saxony, ancestors of the House of Windsor. In 1589 Christian I, elector of Saxony, ordered Königstein to be turned into a fortress. In time, troops were quartered there, the fortifications strengthened, and the castle transformed into a formidable redoubt. Over the centuries the fortress has served the Saxon kings and electors as a refuge in times of unrest; a stronghold for their archives, treasury, and art collections; and a prison. In World Wars I and II it was an officers' prisoner-of-war camp.

Bellotto depicted the fortress in the National Gallery’s painting from the northwest, on the site of a former inn, the Neue Schenke. The road from Dresden to the village of Königstein at the base of the mountain runs along the river through the wooded valley at the lower left. In the painting the slopes below the fortress are cleared of vegetation for military purposes, although today these areas are once again heavily wooded. On the right, the principal road to the fortress runs east and then ascends along the west face of the mountain toward the entrance portal, concealed behind defensive outworks. The main building on the left of the complex is the Georgenburg, part of the fortress called the “emperor's castle” in the Middle Ages, which was altered in 1619 to its present appearance. The attached buildings on the right date from 1589 and include the Streichwehr, built for raking the entrance area with gunfire; the gate house; and the commander's house. On the extreme left edge of the precipice, connected by a little stone bridge, is the Rösschen, a watchtower belonging to the medieval castle. Most of the buildings farther to the right are hidden behind the castle walls except for glimpses of their roofs. The watchtower in front of these roofs on the edge of the esplanade is the Seigerturm, built in 1601 on a salient of rock called the Horn; the promontory at the extreme right corner is known as Hempel's Corner. High on a slope below the fortress, Bellotto has shown the construction of the Flèche, surrounded by scaffolding, the first part of the lower defensive outworks built between 1755 and 1802 as a gun emplacement to defend the lower slopes during attack.

To provide a clearer understanding of the magnitude and complexity of the fortress, which covers nearly twenty-four acres, Bellotto also produced four other views for the king: two in the collection of the earl of Derby at Knowsley Hall, Lancashire, showing the exterior of the castle from the north and south; and two in the City Art Gallery, Manchester, from within the walls. Bellotto’s views of Königstein thus comprise an unusually complete pictorial record of one of Europe’s more dramatic examples of fortress architecture, with considerable iconographic and documentary information of value to historians.

Bellotto began working at Königstein, twenty-two miles southeast of Dresden, in the spring of 1756. He was issued a warrant from Augustus III addressed to Crusius, the bailiff (Amtmann) of Pirna, requiring him and other officials to assist the artist in his work in and around the castle. The five views of Königstein, executed on canvases of the same size and format, were obviously intended to complete the earlier views of Dresden and Pirna painted for the king and placed in the Stallgebäude, the wing of the royal palace that housed the paintings collection after about 1731. Bellotto’s progress at Königstein
was abruptly interrupted, however, when Frederick the Great of Prussia opened hostilities in the Seven Years’ War by invading Saxony in August 1756. Following the surrender on 10 October of 17,000 Saxon troops at the foot of the Lilienstein, Augustus III, who had been encamped with his sons at Königstein, left the castle on 20 October and fled to the safety of Warsaw. One can only speculate on the degree to which Bellotto was himself traumatized by these events. It is known that in 1758 when Dresden was occupied by the Prussians, he departed the capital for Vienna. Kozakiewicz summarized the situation created by these events as follows:

He must have been at Königstein, making the preliminary drawings for the paintings completed later, from the spring of 1756 to the early autumn; any later date is ruled out by the fighting and the Prussian occupation of the castle. The continuity of his work for the court must have been disturbed by the precarious position in which the royal family and the capital were placed. Whether the many calls on the treasury permitted the whole of his original, high salary to be paid to him is not certain, although there exists a receipt from him for the first quarter of 1758. The four [Kozakiewicz was unaware of the existence of the National Gallery painting at the time he was writing in 1972] large views of Königstein, which he must have painted in 1756 and 1757, never reached the royal collection.  

One reason is the disarray of the royal picture collection itself. On 7 September 1756 the picture galleries in the royal palace were locked and the key given to Queen Maria Josepha, who remained at Dresden. When the queen died in 1757, the crown prince took charge of the key. The galleries remained closed, and in September 1759 were largely emptied and their contents dispatched to the fortress of Königstein for safekeeping. For all practical purposes the Dresden picture galleries ceased to function, so it is not surprising that Bellotto found it difficult to complete his remaining obligations to the court. It may be assumed that during the period before he left Dresden for Vienna, Bellotto accepted a variety of nonroyal commissions and produced replicas and etchings of earlier paintings for ordinary paying customers, but precisely when and where he completed the Königstein canvases is unknown.

Efforts to establish the early history of the views of Königstein have not been successful. The pictures might have been seized by the Prussians during the siege of Dresden, Pirna, and Königstein. Alternatively, following the disarray of the Saxon court and the depletion of its treasury, Bellotto might have retained the canvases and sold them privately. Two of the paintings came to light twenty years later in England. The two views now in Manchester have been traced to a sale at Christie’s, London, 7 March 1778, lots 79 and 80, described as “Canaletto. A View of the fortress of Koningstein [sic] in Saxony, painted for the King of Poland. A ditto, its companion.” They passed to the collection of the marquess of Londonderry, Wynyard Park, Durham, and were acquired by the City Art Gallery, Manchester, in 1983.

The earliest reference to the National Gallery's painting occurs at the end of the eighteenth century when it belonged to Henry Temple, 2d viscount Palmerston. The Fortress at Königstein hung in Lord Palmerston’s London House in Hanover Square. He acquired the property in 1790, but alterations were still being made in 1796, when he moved in, so it is unlikely that the picture was there before that date. The painting is listed in an undated inventory (paper watermarked 1796), “Catalogue of Pictures belonging to Lord Palmerston in Hanover Square,” in the Dressing Room and described as a “View of Keenig-steen: Cannaletti” and valued at £250. The painting is recorded after Lord Palmerston’s death in an undated manuscript list (paper watermarked 1804) of “Pictures in Stanhope Street and Hanover Square” as “Cannaletti Koningstein £105.”

The other two exterior views of the fortress of Königstein in the collection of the earl of Derby, Knowsley Hall, were published in various nineteenth-century catalogues at Knowsley, without any indication of earlier provenance. However, a loose note, written by the 13th earl of Derby and inserted into an 1846 catalogue of pictures at Knowsley, reads: “Königstein Castle 2 Canaletti (Palmerston) £200.” Since the National Gallery’s painting and the Knowsley paintings were once identically framed, it is reasonable to believe that the 2d lord Palmerston had owned at least three of the Königstein views. Thus he may have been responsible for bringing them to England in the later eighteenth century.

Included among the reproductive etchings Bellotto made of his views of Dresden, Pirna, and Königstein is the National Gallery’s painting. The print is a large folio and is captioned in French, with the coat of arms of the elector of Saxony in the lower margin. Bellotto probably produced the print be-
tween 1763 and 1766, and made several minor changes of detail: the castle rock appears higher than in the painting, the scaffolding on the lower slope has been removed, and the tree in the foreground has denser foliage.17

A reduced replica of the painting, evidently autograph, was in the Galerie Liechtenstein, Vienna, until about 1945 and then in a private collection in Zürich until at least 1965. A nineteenth-century copy is in Hradec Castle, Opávy, Czechoslovakia.18

Notes
1. See discussion in text.
2. See discussion in text.
3. This family tradition is recounted in Sotheby’s 1991, 37.
13. Connell 1957, 208–209, 259–260, 346. When the house was being done up by Henry Holland, Palmerston settled upon an extensive period of residence abroad, from July 1792 until October 1794, during which he continued to make acquisitions of art. Russell 1982, 226, notes that some 166 pictures hung in nine rooms at Hanover Square.
16. Sotheby’s 1991, 36. The two views from Lord Derby’s collection were fully catalogued by Scharf 1875, nos. 17 and 27. In Scharf’s notebook dated 31 August 1866, “Earl of Derby’s London pictures & some at Knowsley,” there is the notation: “Bought at Lord Palmerston’s for £200.”
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Bernardo Bellotto and Workshop

1961.9.63 (1615)

Nymphenburg Palace, Munich

c. 1761
Oil on canvas, 68.4×119.8 (26 7/8×47 3/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a rather coarse, open-weave fabric of medium weight and plain weave. The ground appears to be a warm, gray-brown layer that was smoothly applied. Two imprimatura layers appear under the paint surface, although their extent could not be determined: a reddish brown layer beneath the trees and a lighter brown tone under the water. A black underdrawing was used to outline the windows. The oil paint is granular with large pigment particles, although less so than the companion painting. The paint was applied wet-over-dry in thick, opaque layers. The handling is extremely fluid in the figures and some outlines of the architecture. Incised lines appear randomly in the ground and paint layers, particularly in the architecture; no general perspective lines appear, although they presumably were used. A line was incised into the top layer of paint to place the horse and carriage near the wall at the lower right.

The tacking margins have been removed, but rather strong cusping is visible along the left and right sides. The varnish is moderately discolored and there are yellowed varnish residues in the interstices of the paint. The sky has been heavily inpainted, presumably to compensate for severe abrasion. The painting was lined by William Suhr in 1951. Examination under ultraviolet light suggests that the
painting has been inpainted during the course of at least two other treatments.

Provenance: Art market, 1936. Dr. Gustav Mez, Switzerland; (Rosenberg & Stiebel, New York); purchased 1951 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


1961.9.64 (1616)

View of Munich

C. 1761
Oil on canvas, 69.2 x 119.8 (27 3/8 x 47 11/16)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is an open, plain-weave fabric of medium to coarse weight. The ground appears to be a warm, gray-brown layer with large pigment particles. It was apparently applied with brushes or tools that left arc-shaped or parallel strokes in the ground layer. A brown imprimatura layer appears beneath the paint in the lower part of the painting, but not in the sky. The oil paint is granular with large pigment particles and was applied relatively thickly with the topmost layers exhibiting a rather high impasto and rich body. Black underdrawing is visible with a stereomicroscope in some areas, such as small windows, where it was not covered by the paint. Incised lines were used occasionally to define the outlines of the buildings. These lines are very random and do not seem to have been used for a full-scale laying in of the perspective or forms.

The painting was lined during a treatment by William Suh in 1951. The tacking margins have been removed, but rather strong cusions along the left and right sides suggests that the painting has not been reduced in width. X-radiographs reveal an extensive loss at the lower-left side, suggesting that the child and dog seen in the original version in Munich were once present in this work, but were removed early in its history. The sky has been heavily inpainted, presumably to compensate for heavy abrasion. The varnish is moderately yellowed. Examination under ultraviolet light suggests that the painting has been inpainted at least twice.

Provenance: Private collection, Saxony. (Karl Haberstock, Berlin); purchased 1929 by Dr. Gustav Mez, Switzerland; (Rosenberg & Stiebel, New York); purchased 1951 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


Little documentary evidence exists regarding Bellotto’s visit to Munich in 1761. Empress Maria Theresa commended the artist to Princess Maria Antonia of Saxony in a letter of 4 January 1761, and he left Vienna for Munich shortly thereafter, arriving on 14 January. The princess and her husband, Prince Frederick Christian, the eldest son of Augustus III, Bellotto’s Dresden patron, were staying in Munich at the court of her brother, Elector Maximilian III Joseph of Bavaria. Bellotto would have known the royal couple from his years in Dresden, but it is uncertain whether he went to the Bavarian court in response to an invitation or of his own accord, hoping to obtain commissions from the elector upon the recommendation of the princess.

During Bellotto’s brief visit to Munich—he presumably returned to Dresden shortly before the end of 1761 or before January 1762—he produced three large, carefully executed views of Munich and Nymphenburg for Elector Maximilian III Joseph for one of the rooms in the electoral palace, the Residenz. The subjects were a panorama of Munich from the village of Haidhausen, and two views of the elector’s favorite summer residence, Nymphenburg, one from the approach from the city, the other from the garden side. Shortly after the elector’s succession in 1745, a suite of living rooms was constructed for the new ruler and his wife, Maria Anna, on the upper floors of the Residenz. In 1760–1763 the rooms were redecorated by François de Cuvilliés (1695–1768), and the three canvases commissioned from Bellotto in 1761 were installed in the second anteroom, which served as one of the elector’s dining rooms. The view of Munich was placed on the central wall, opposite a window; the views of Nymphenburg Palace were placed on a corresponding side wall, their steep perspectives converging on the painting in the center and unifying the three views.

Kozakiewicz has noted the importance of the three views as the first examples of architectural painting in the grand style produced in Munich, and their influence upon the local tradition of topographical painting. The two views of Nymphenburg, in particular, mark a new phase in Bellotto’s approach to the representation of palaces and gardens in a wider landscape background. Even more than in his earlier views of Dresden and Vienna, Bellotto created a powerful impression of space in the park landscape and in the expanses of sky. He achieved this by conceiving the views from an imag-
inary high viewpoint, which in reality could not have been reached by any spectator, and through an artificially constructed perspective. For this reason the Nymphenburg views represent a radical departure from all of Bellotto’s earlier views of topographical subjects employing an actual vantage point. Nonetheless, his description of the park and buildings of Nymphenburg was so meticulous that when the exterior of the palace was being restored, his paintings were consulted as guides to the original coloring.20

The Washington paintings are repetitions in reduced format of two of the three Munich views. (The third replica, Nymphenburg Palace observed from the city, was on the Vienna art market in 1937.21) The view of Munich across the Isar River is taken from the southeast from the village of Haidhausen. On the near bank in the foreground is the Aufer Tor (demolished in 1860), tollhouse, and related buildings, and a gate at the head of the Isarbrücke, which was begun in 1759, two years before the painting. The long, narrow island in the middle of the river almost entirely conceals the water beyond it. On the far bank is the tollhouse and Isartor at the end of the bridge and, beyond, the Rote Türm. The city of Munich, dominated by the towers and domes of its principal buildings, stretches from the center of the painting to the right edge. The skyline is dominated at the right of center by the Frauenkirche, with its familiar twin towers crowned with round caps, and the towers of the old Rathaus, the Heiliggeistkirche, and the Peterskirche; farther to the right is the spire of the Salvatorkirche, the dome and the twin towers of the Theatinerkirche, and the little spire of the Residenz.

The view of the west face of Nymphenburg Palace, as Kozakiewicz has written, is “taken from an imaginary, high vantage point, somewhat to the north of the axis of symmetry, so that there is a very slight degree of foreshortening. The main building, flanked by the galleries that join it to the pavilions, rises in the deeper middle ground, just left of center; further wings and minor buildings are visible on either side, partly concealed by the dense trees in the park.”22 The formal gardens are laid out in front of the palace in a pattern of parterres and walks; the fountain with a Flora group by Wilhelm de Groff (c. 1680–1742) is in the center. The gaily decorated boats and gondolas on the pool in the foreground, with attendants dressed in blue and white, the Bavarian national colors, may record the festivities organized by the elector in September 1761 to honor the visit of his cousin, Elector Karl Theodor of the Palatinate, both of whom are visible at the lower right.23 The towers of the Theatinerkirche and Frauenkirche above the Munich skyline are visible in the distance at the right, and in the distance farther to the right snowcapped mountains may be seen.

Each of the National Gallery’s versions records the composition of its original in Munich almost exactly except for the omission of minor figures. In the view of Munich, these omissions include the child fleeing a dog in the left foreground (although the evidence from X-radiographs suggests that they may have originally been present), two men on the riverbank seen between the pillars of the bridgehead, and three figures in the right foreground. In the middle distance on the near side of the island several figures have been eliminated as well as the genre detail of laundry hung out to dry. Similar minor changes have been made in the staffage of the view of Nymphenburg.

Despite these minor departures from the originals, the quality and handling of the Washington version of the view of Munich suggests that it is substantially the work of Bellotto himself. The handling of the view of Nymphenburg, however, reveals the more active presence of another hand; more schematic and reductive in its description of detail, the painting generally lacks the vivacity and fluency characteristic of Bellotto’s best works. Kozakiewicz, who knew the paintings only by photograph, characterized these replicas of the Munich views (and three repetitions in reduced format of Bellotto’s views of Vienna) as showing “occasionally clumsy brushwork and a general absence of the nobility of conception and the sovereign assurance of the application of the colour that distinguish the work of Bellotto’s own hand.”24 In his opinion, the two Washington paintings and the now-missing companion view of Nymphenburg Palace all show clear signs of collaboration by members of Bellotto’s studio, possibly including his son Lorenzo. Lorenzo Bellotto was born in 1744, however, and he only became a painter, both independently and in collaboration with his father, during Bernardo’s second Dresden period, 1761–1766, and the first three years of the Warsaw period, 1766–1769. If Lorenzo were responsible for the three Munich replicas, he would by necessity have had to have painted them in Munich in
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Bernardo Bellotto and Workshop, View of Munich, 1961.9.64
1761, at the age of seventeen, or at a later date, in which case he would not have had access to the originals, which were installed in the Residenz in 1761. Meticulous topographical depictions such as the National Gallery’s paintings require either the presence of an actual view or an original in oils, and it appears much more likely that Bellotto produced the reduced replicas in Munich at the request of a local patron following the completion of the original canvases for the elector.

In 1766 Franz Xaver Jungwirth (1720–1790) produced engravings in imperial folio format of Bellotto’s views of Munich and of Nymphenburg from the park, which were later reproduced in other formats. In both prints the disposition of the figures corresponds closely to those in the Washington paintings, suggesting the possibility that the engravings were made after the present replicas rather than from the originals in the Residenz.

Notes
1. Fritzsche 1936, 116, no. V.120. More probably the provenance is the same as the companion as stated by Kozakiewicz 1972, 2: 234, no. 295.
2. According to Saemy Rosenberg (letter of 7 December 1955 in NGA files), the painting was acquired by Mez from a Dresden collection during World War II. A photograph of the painting in the Witt Library, London, is inscribed on the reverse with the information that the painting was once in the collection of Augustus III, elector of Saxony. It appears more likely that both paintings were acquired by Gustav Mez in 1929, when the third of the three replicas of the originals in the Residenz was sold (see note 9).
4. See exh. cat. Verona 1990, 156, for the suggestion that the three Munich views by Bellotto were gifts from the Saxony court to their Bavarian hosts.
6. The room was an intimate petit souper, limited to a few persons, which functioned also as a waiting room during the day. The three paintings remained in their original setting until World War II; in recent years they have been returned to this location, now part of the Residenzmuseum.
9. William L. Barcham (letter of 24 June 1993, NGA curatorial files) has observed Bellotto’s manipulation of the site of Nymphenburg and the gardens in order to formalize and monumentalize the appearance of the palace buildings.

In comparison with the view of Munich, both views of Nymphenburg are much more rigidly controlled. In the view of the palace from the gardens, even though the central allée is shown off axis and the parterre gardens recede to the left, the facade of the central building is shown entirely frontal with the result that its formal entrance now bears an iconic relationship to the scene before it. Indeed, Bellotto has emphasized this adjustment by placing the central fountain’s enormously high jet of water exactly where the effect of perspective and recession would be prominent and by diminishing the deep shadow on the wing extending to the right.
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Giovanni Antonio Canal was born in Venice on 17 or 18 October 1697 to a family of well-defined class in Venetian society (cittadini originari), ranking just below patrician nobility. His father, Bernardo Canal (1674–1744), was a painter of theatrical scenery, and Canaletto appears to have assisted him at an early stage in the role of theater designer. In 1719–1720 he accompanied his father to Rome to execute scenes for two operas by Alessandro Scarlatti, performed there during the Carnival of 1720. While in Rome, according to Anton Maria Zanetti, one of the artist’s earliest biographers, he abandoned the theater and began to draw and paint architectural views. Canaletto’s name was inscribed for the first time in the register of the Venetian artists’ guild in 1720, which suggests a date for the beginning of his career as pittor di vedute, or view painter. He adopted the diminutive “Canaletto” (the little Canal) by the mid-1720s, presumably to distinguish his work from that of his father.

Canaletto’s earliest surviving works are of the 1720s and are characterized by a subdued palette, loose brushwork, deep shadows, and dramatic lighting that are different in every respect from the detailed, carefully delineated, sun-drenched views of the 1730s and 1740s. The first firm date in Canaletto’s career is 1725, when Alessandro Marchesini (1664–1738), a Veronese painter living in Venice, opened negotiations for a pair of large views for Stefano Conti of Lucca. Owen McSwiny, a bankrupt impresario living in Italy and acting as agent for various English noblemen in the commissioning of pictures, first introduced Canaletto to an English client, the duke of Richmond, and in the late 1720s encouraged the artist to paint small topographical views of Venice for tourists and foreign visitors to the city. The years 1727–1730 were crucial to Canaletto’s artistic development, witnessing the decisive change from his early theatrical views to a cooler appraisal of the familiar sights of Venice.

Sometime before 1728 Canaletto began his association with Joseph Smith, an English businessman and collector living in Venice, who was to become the artist’s principal agent and patron. Smith eventually acquired nearly fifty paintings, one hundred and fifty drawings, and fifteen rare etchings from Canaletto, the largest and finest single group of the artist’s works, which he sold to King George III in 1763. The publication in 1735 of Antonio Visentini’s (1688–1782) engravings after twelve views of the Grand Canal (Prospectus Magni Canalis Venetiarum), which Smith had commissioned from Canaletto around 1730, did much to arouse enthusiasm for the artist among the English, and during the next decade a large number of Canaletto’s paintings entered English collections under Smith’s auspices. The period between 1730 and 1742 was the most productive of Canaletto’s career; it was in these years that almost all of the paintings of Venice, for which he is best known, were completed and during which he produced much of his best work. In this, the second period of his career, Canaletto aimed to present an accurate and detailed record of a particular scene, and he captured the light, the life, the buildings, and the expanse of Venice with a perception and luminosity that established his reputation as one of the greatest topographical painters of all time.

The outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession in 1741 significantly disrupted the flow of foreign visitors to Venice, and the demand for Canaletto’s work on the part of the English declined considerably. Smith may have encouraged the artist to devote more time to drawing and to take up etching, which formed a small but significant part of his artistic activity. After Smith’s appointment as British consul in Venice in 1744, a volume of Canaletto’s etchings was published as Vedute altre prese da i luoghi altre ideate. In 1740 and 1741 Canaletto left Venice on a tour of the Brenta and the mainland and made a number of drawings on the spot, which served as the source for paintings and etchings that he produced in the studio upon his return. He was accompanied on this trip by Bernardo Bellotto (q.v.), the son of his sister Fiorenza, who had been in his studio since about 1735 and must have played an increasing role in the production of his paintings.

In 1746 Canaletto departed Venice for England, where he worked for the next decade. A number of Venetian artists of the preceding generation had found success there, and Canaletto’s name and work were widely known in the country, especially in aristocratic circles. The paintings of Canaletto’s English
period are as fresh and vivid as his Venetian views, and for many their delicate luminosity (less blinding sun) and color (lighter blues and greens and earth tones) are equally appealing. No absolutely precise dates have been established for his stay in England. Canaletto returned briefly to Venice once during his English sojourn in 1750–1751, and he appears to have left permanently sometime after 1755. Canaletto’s influence on English landscape and topographical painters lasted well into the next century.

In contrast to Canaletto’s evident success with the English and other foreign patrons, his standing with contemporary Venetians is more difficult to measure: few of his patrons were Venetian, and he was not elected to the Venetian academy until 1763, following an earlier refusal. This, however, may be more a reflection of the traditional attitudes on the part of formal groups to the hierarchy of subject matter than an indifference to or rejection of his art. In the traditional view, Canaletto’s paintings after 1756 seldom display the imagination and technical skill, the freshness and vitality of his earlier work. In fact, he produced pictures of high quality in his last years, like the architectural capriccio of the interior of a palace courtyard (Galleria dell’ Academia, Venice), a brilliant exercise in perspective that he gave the academy in 1765 as his reception piece. In August 1767 he attended a meeting of the academy. Eight months later, on 19 April 1768, Canaletto died of inflammation of the bladder and was buried in Venice.

1945.15.3 (876)

The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice

1742–1744
Oil on canvas, 114.6 x 153 (45 ⅞ x 60 ⅜)
Gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton

Inscriptions
At lower left: A•C•F•

Technical Notes: The support is a plain, loosely woven fabric of medium weight with irregular threads. The ground is a thick, reddish brown layer that strongly influences the hue of the overlying paint layer, particularly in the sky. The paint was applied in layers of varying thickness with a direct and vigorous wet-in-wet technique. The main compositional elements were blocked in with fairly thin layers. The sky was painted before the buildings and the areas for these were held in reserve to be painted later, although the textured paint of the clouds and sky extends slightly under the buildings. The upper-right corner of the Doges’ Palace was extended over previously painted passages of sky. A thin dark paint was employed for some of the details, and thin layers of semitranslucent dark paint were used throughout to outline and delineate forms and details of the buildings and figures. This dark paint was applied over or around sections of more thickly applied opaque paint that had already dried somewhat, as in the filigree on the facade of San Marco and the features of the small figures. Highlights on the faces were created with dabs of pink or yellow paint. The figures were applied directly over the white linear designs in the pavement, but before the thin black lines indicating the individual paving blocks.

The tacking margins have been removed, but moderate cusping is evident along all four sides. There is a single vertical area of discrete loss at the center of the painting, corresponding to a similar loss in the companion painting; the two paintings were evidently stored face to face when the damage occurred. This damage is most severe at the left of the central flagpole on the facade of the Palazzo Ducale. Another area of damage that existed below the base of the central flagpole was heavily overpainted. The thinly painted sky (which is significantly thinner than in the pendant) is badly abraded. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting restored by Catherine Metzger in 1993.
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Entrance to the Grand Canal from the Molo, Venice

1742/1744
Oil on canvas, 114.5 x 153.5 (45 3/4 x 60 1/4)
Gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton

Inscriptions
On the cartellino on the stone wall at lower left: A•C•F•
Inscribed on the reverse of the lining canvas and thus presumably recording an earlier inscription: “Bought of Lord Carlisle/ 1825 Gower.”

Technical Notes: The support is a coarse, loosely woven plain-weave fabric with some irregular threads. The ground is a moderately thick orange-yellow layer. No incised lines or compass holes are discernible. The sky (visible beneath the dome of Santa Maria della Salute) preceded the architecture, which in turn was painted before the figures and details such as the foreground pilings and the boats. The paint was applied smoothly in a paste consistency, with texture evident mainly in the whites and light colors. The final linear elements of brickwork were made with fluid paint drawn with a very fine brush over the completed underlying forms. X-radiographs and surface texture reveal several changes of contour: these include a shift of the dome of the Redentore to the right; a reduction in size of the second, smaller dome of Santa Maria della Salute; and a reduction in the size of its belfry. Minor changes were also made in the roofline and chimney of the Seminario Patriarchale to the right of the Dogana.

The original tacking margins are intact. There is a large vertical loss at the center of the painting extending through the cupola of the Dogana to the ornamental wood extension of the masonry wall in the foreground. The area of damage corresponds to a similar loss in the companion painting; the paintings were face to face when the damage occurred. (Confirmation is provided by the fact that traces of the flagpole in the companion picture were discovered adhering to the surface of the present painting.) There is generally heavy abrasion in the paint layer throughout the upper half of the sky. Faint indications of the statue of Fortune atop the Dogana were strengthened to reconstruct the statue during inpainting. The painting was treated by Michael Swicklik in 1993.

Provenance: Same as 1945.15.3.


For Canaletto, as for Luca Carlevaris (1663–1730), Michele Marieschi (1710–1743), Francesco Guardi (q.v.), and other eighteenth-century Venetian vedutisti, the Piazza San Marco was the quintessential view of the city, and he painted the square dozens of times from a variety of vantage points. The piazza may well have been the subject of both Canaletto’s first view of Venice, around 1720–1721, before the gray and white stone pavement was relaid by Andrea Tirali in 1723, and his last, in 1763. In the National Gallery’s painting, Canaletto focused his attention on the extreme eastern portion of the square looking southeast from one of the upper windows of the east end of the Procuratie Vecchie. The result is unique in the artist’s repertory of views of Saint Mark’s square and its environs, because although he focused on the facades of San Marco and the Palazzo Ducale from similar oblique angles in other canvases, these views are from the Torre dell’Orologio and place a greater emphasis on the Piazzetta and the Molo.

The main facade of the church of San Marco, its mosaics gleaming softly in the afternoon sunshine, is shown slightly in perspective, with the Doges’ Palace beyond on the right. In the foreground are the three flagstaffs rising upon their elaborate bronze pedestals cast by Alessandro Leopardi (1465–1522/1523) in 1505, with the large shade umbrellas of the cloth merchants set up beside the outermost. The north end of the Loggetta is visible at the right together with the edge of the campanile, a wooden booth at its base. In the Piazzetta a temporary pulpit has been erected from which a Dominican friar is preaching. Between the Ducal Palace and the Loggetta the Column of Saint Mark is visible, behind which lies the Bacino di San Marco, upon which two three-masted vessels are moored. The fascination with daily life in so many of Canaletto’s pictures is evident here. The swag or wreath hung over the central doorway of Saint Mark’s temporizes the scene, suggesting the preparations for a feast. Figures from all walks of life—monks, magistrates in full wigs and gowns, fashionable women, gentlemen in the typical costume of cape and three-cornered hat, laborers, and vendors—wander about the square and under the arches of the Ducal Palace. Canaletto, who had a sharp eye for the particulars of the scene before him, has noted a beam with a pulley wheel projecting from the last bay of the first story of the palace,
Canaletto, *The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice*, 1945.15.3
Canaletto, *Entrance to the Grand Canal from the Molo, Venice*, 1945.15.4
a detail which he first recorded around 1726 in a
drawing at Windsor.\(^7\)

The painting must date after 1742 when Antonio
Gai’s (1686–1769) bronze gates (commissioned 1735–
1737) to the Loggetta were erected.\(^5\) A probable date
for the work and its pendant view of the entrance to
the Grand Canal (1945.15.4) is about 1742–1744, a pe-
riod when Canaletto frequently signed his best
paintings, among which these are to be included.\(^9\)
Conservation in 1993 has confirmed the quality and
subtlety of each; for example, in the pavement of
the piazza Canaletto has brushed a cool gray pigment
over green browns in certain areas, and in other pas-
sages, such as the center of the composition, he has
employed warmer earth tones that subtly shift to
cool grays in the extreme foreground. Constable ob-
served the prevailing blond tonality, the brilliance of
the mosaics on the facade of San Marco, accentuat-
ed rose color of the facade of the Ducal Palace, chin-
a-blue sky touched with pink, and sharp accents of
the figures which, together with the crisply handled
paint and impasto in the lights, further point to a
date in the early 1740s.\(^10\) The figures are large and
painted with a full and liquid brush, and this solid
handling of the human form is comparable to a
painting at Windsor signed and dated 1743
and 1744.\(^11\)

A pen-and-ink drawing by Canaletto that corre-
sponds closely to the National Gallery’s view of the
Basilica and the Doges’ Palace, although from a lower
elevation and from a position a little farther west
with the result that the perspective of the buildings
is somewhat less pronounced, and with differences in
the figures, is at Windsor.\(^12\) What may be a pre-
liminary pen-and-ink sketch for the composition,
with the lower part of San Marco and the palace cut
off, was formerly in the collection of Itálico Brass,
Venice.\(^13\)

The view in the companion painting is southwest
toward the entrance to the Grand Canal along the
quay of the Molo extending to the Fonteghetto del-
la Farina at the extreme right. The building, now oc-
cupied by the Direzione Marittima e Capitaneria di
Porto (port authorities), was constructed at the end
of the fifteenth century and originally served as the
offices of the Magistrato della Farina, which con-
trolled the wheat supply of Venice.\(^14\) The foreground
is the area in front of the state granaries, demolished
in Napoleonic times for the gardens of the former
Royal Palace. In 1756 the building became the seat of
the Venetian Academy of Painting and Sculpture,
newly founded under the leadership of Giovanni
Battista Tiepolo (q.v.), and served as such until 1807.
The arch remains, although blocked in, and the
bridge across the Rio della Luna has been replaced
by another to the left of the one shown. The view of
the Fonteghetto from the Molo is presently obscured
by Lorenzo Santi’s (1783–1839) graceful neoclassical
building of about 1815 on the near side of the canal.

The Punta della Dogana, across the Grand Canal,
is the site of the customhouse where goods arriving
by sea were traditionally unloaded and taxed. The
massive Dogana del Mar was built in the late seven-
teenth century by Giuseppe Benoni (1618–1684). On
the sturdy cupola built on massive piers, two bronze
Atlases hold aloft a golden sphere on which stands a
figure of Fortune designed by Bernardo Falcone
(1659–1694). In the National Gallery’s painting the
statue was missing because of damage to the paint
film and subsequent repainting. Conservation treat-
ment in 1993 revealed indications of the original out-
lines of the form, and these have been strengthened
to restore the statue to an approximation of its orig-
inal appearance. Farther to the right of the Dogana
is the Basilica of the Santa Maria della Salute, built in
1631–1681 by Baldassare Longhena (1598–1682). In
the background at the left is the island of the
Giudecca with Palladio’s church of the Redentore,
and, at the left and right, respectively, the churches
and campaniles (each now pulled down) of San Gio-
vanni Battista and San Giacomo. Among the vessels
on the Bacino di San Marco in the middle distance is
a three-masted ship prominently flying the Union
Jack of England and Scotland.\(^15\)

Canaletto represented the entrance to the Grand
Canal from several points of view on the Molo, but
the vantage point in the National Gallery’s painting
is unique. The small harbor formed by two mason-
ry walls and a row of piles extending from the quay
into the Bacino is represented in a painting from the
mid-1730s at Windsor, but from a point closer to the
balustraded enclosure on the quay and omitting
much of the Fonteghetto. From the evidence of this
painting and similar views of the scene, it is appar-
ten that during the eighteenth century the various
wooden shelters and temporary structures—like the
wooden booth or stall beside the Fonteghetto—were
periodically erected and taken down, and that
changes were also made to the more permanent
walls and balustrades along the quay in this area of
the Molo. This area of the quay was for centuries the site of a fish market, which explains the presence of a number of eel vendors among the figures in the foreground.

Both paintings came from Castle Howard, Yorkshire, the home of the earls of Carlisle. The early history of the Canalettos at Castle Howard has occasioned considerable speculation. It appears probable that the National Gallery’s paintings were acquired with other works of the artist by Henry Howard, 4th earl of Carlisle, who visited Venice in the fall of 1738, and presumably continued to acquire works by the artist following his return to England. The paintings have therefore been thought to have been among the “several views of Venice by Canaletto lately put up there,” which Lady Oxford recorded seeing in the drawing room in 1745. After the “Canaletto Room” was rearranged in the present century, the views of the Piazza San Marco and the Molo were paired with other views of Venice of the same size: a view of the Molo looking west, with the Ducal Palace and the prison, and a view of the Piazzetta below looking west from the Campo San Basso. Whether originally there was an integral relationship between these canvases and the Washington pair will never be established, because the paintings were destroyed by fire in 1940. The pair was known in photographs to Constable, who considered them hard and mechanical, each “at best a studio piece.” Both of the present paintings bear contemporary carved and gilded frames in the style of William Kent that were placed on several of the Canalettos at Castle Howard.

Notes
1. The date of acquisition of the group of paintings by Canaletto at Castle Howard is uncertain. Although the greatest part of the picture collection appears to have been brought together by Frederick, 5th earl of Carlisle (1748–1825), who traveled in Italy in 1768, it is almost certain that the Canalettos were acquired by his father, the 4th earl. Some of these were certainly at Castle Howard by 1745, where they were seen by Lady Oxford in an account of her visit to Venice in November 1738 (Halsband 1965–1967, 1: 127, 148–149). The family tradition is that the paintings were acquired from Canaletto himself by the 4th earl of Carlisle (undated letter in NGA curatorial files from the 12th and present earl of Carlisle, Naworth Castle, Brampton, Cumbria). According to Browning (1905, 340) there were, in 1905, four large and nine smaller views by Canaletto in the “Canaletto Room” at Castle Howard, as well as eleven smaller works by Marieschi. Three more “hanging in the music-room and one in Lady Carlisle’s drawing-room” were evidently large pictures by Canaletto. A curious note on the early provenance of the National Gallery’s paintings is provided by the inscription (“Bought of Lord Carlisle/1825 Gower”) on the reverse of the lining canvas of 1945.15.4, suggesting that the painting was sold by the 5th earl in 1825.

2. Information from the archival house lists of the collection for the 5th earl of Carlisle, involved with the importation of the Italian pictures from the Orléans collection in France in 1797–1798). The 5th earl died in 1825, so it may be that his son George, 6th earl of Carlisle (1773–1848), sold the painting after his father’s death to assist with the usual financial problems connected with probate. As Eeyan Hartley points out (letter of 7 December 1993), “This leaves the puzzle as to when the painting was returned to the Castle Howard collection.” Constable and Links 1989, 2: nos. 40, 50, 85 [b], 154, 131, 171, 236, 334) discuss eight of the Castle Howard paintings as by Canaletto or his studio. Links 1982, 33–84, noting the uneven quality of the Castle Howard Canalettos, most of which were sold in the late 1930s or destroyed by fire in 1940, suggested that the 4th earl of Carlisle may have employed an agent other than Joseph Smith for his acquisition of paintings by the artist. “Such an agent may well have had his own sources for view paintings, but he or Lord Carlisle must have gone to Canaletto for three pictures of the collection”: the Washington paintings, signed with the artist’s initials, an unheard of practice before the 1740s, and the Boston view of the Bacino di San Marco from the Dogana, one of the artist’s masterpieces.

3. Information from the archival house lists of the collections, Castle Howard. For a resume of the paintings formerly at Castle Howard, see Constable and Links 1989, 2: 203, and note 1. The Bacino di San Marco (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) was acquired in 1939 from Castle Howard.
through the intermediation of Captain J. Spink, London, who may also have been involved with the sale of the other paintings (information from the Museum of Fine Arts curatorial files).

3. See note 1.

4. Canaletto’s earliest view of the Piazza San Marco is a canvas sold at Sotheby’s, New York, 31 May 1991, lot 75, as by Michele Marieschi and now generally accepted as an autograph painting by Canaletto. He painted the square around 1723 as one of a group of four paintings originally in the Liechtenstein collection and now in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid (Baetjer and Links 1989, no. 1). For the 1765 view, see Constable and Links 1989, 1: pl. 188; 2: 210, no. 54.


6. The curious red-and-white portable structure before the wooden building at the base of the Campanile is evidently a shop sign, and appears in other views of Saint Mark’s square by Canaletto: Constable and Links 1989, 1: pl. 20, 2: no. 53. No satisfactory explanation has been advanced for this device, but its proximity to the structure of a tooth suggests that it may have served as an advertisement for a dentist’s premises. The motif of an arm and fist holding a miniature version of the same device is repeated on the sign on the building and on other views of the square: Constable and Links 1989, 1: pls. 15, 20; 2: 195–196, 208–209, nos. 23, 52, 53.

7. Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, 7446: Parker 1948, 29–30, no. 4, fig. 8. The beam and pulley wheel are depicted in a painted view of the Piazzetta looking south in a private collection, Switzerland: Constable and Links 1989, 1: pl. 22; 2: 213, no. 57.

8. Lorenzetti 1910, 108–133. The presence of the gates in the National Gallery’s painting was first observed by Dario Succi (letter of 10 February 1993, NGA curatorial files).

9. Constable’s (Constable and Links 1989, 1: 113) characterization of the quality of the painting and its companion is puzzling: “The Piazzetta S. Marco and the Entrance to the Grand Canal from the Molo cannot be rated so highly. Colour, massing of light and shade, and treatment of the architecture and of the figures, all relate them to the Harvey pictures [see 2: 277, no.188]; but the handling is lifeless and mechanized to the extent of suggesting that it is the application of an over-matured recipe . . . .”

10. Constable and Links 1989, 1: 113, and Shapley 1979, 1: 102, date the painting and its pendant to the middle 1730s. Moschini 1954, 30, suggested a connection between the Castle Howard paintings and those in a series formerly owned by the Trustees of Sir Robert Harvey, now dispersed (Constable and Links 1989, 2: 277, 188) and dated them in the early 1740s. Viola Pemberton-Pigott (oral communication, 8 July 1992) has suggested a date around 1740, observing the similarities in handling between the Washington views and Canaletto’s signed and dated 1742 views of Rome at Windsor: Levey 1991, 13–17, nos. 368–372, pls. 15–19.

11. Levey 1991, 40–42, nos. 403–405, pls. 49–51. Constable and Links (1989, 1: 113, n. 1), interestingly, noted the resemblance of the figures to those in The Doge at the Scuola di San Rocco in the National Gallery, London, which has been dated 1735 or earlier. Without the presence of Gai’s Loggetta gates, the Washington paintings could quite reasonably be dated around 1740, and in fact as Sir Michael Levey observes (letter of 30 August 1993, NGA curatorial files), the handling of 1945.15.3 reveals indications of Canaletto’s bold painterliness of the 1730s.


14. The Fonteghetto is thought to have been built in 1493, redesigned in 1584, and again in 1717: Tassini 1885, 38–39. Thereafter, it appears to have been altered several times in the eighteenth century, and painted and drawn by Canaletto showing various arrangements of the fenestration, unfortunately without the sequences of these changes being clear. According to Parker 1948, 38–39, the building is topographically exact in three drawings at Windsor, nos. 48–50, pls. 34–35, the principal difference in its appearance between these and the present painting is in the placement of the inscribed plaque on the upper story. The fenestration is shown variously in Canaletto’s paintings; see Constable and Links 1989, 1: pl. 28, 192; 2: 234–235, nos. 99, 100.


18. See note 1.

19. Constable and Links 1989, 1: pls. 40, 191; 2: 203, no. 40, 225–226, no. 85(b). For the Canaletto Room (originally the anteroom to the 3d earl’s apartment and used by the 4th earl as a dining room), see Tipping, “Castle Howard,” 1927, 955, fig. 16, and “Pictures,” 1945, fig. 6, and Cornforth 1992, 76, fig. 9.

20. Shapley 1979, 1: 102, n. 7. The frames are illustrated in views of the “Canaletto Room” after its rearrangement early in this century during which the views of the Piazza San Marco and the Molo were paired with other views of Venice: Tipping, “Castle Howard,” 1927, 955, fig. 16, and “Pictures,” 1945, fig. 6.
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The Porta Portello, Padua

C. 1741/1742
Oil on canvas, 62 x 109 (24 7/8 x 42 15/16)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave fabric of medium-fine weight. The tacking margins were removed during relining. The ground is light gray and is visible in small areas in the middle foreground. The ground beneath the sky, however, is a light pink-brown color and is visible through the paint surface where the overlying paint layer is thinly applied. This colored ground influences the overall hue of the lighter sky, although it is not clear whether the gray layer is applied over the entire support beneath the pink-brown layer, which is not discernible in the lower half of the painting. The paint is applied fluidly and the handling is characteristic of the artist at this date. Low impasto is found in some of the highlights and details; the sky is painted more rapidly and thinly with delicate brushstrokes that reveal the underlying ground through striations in the surface layer. The paint is applied primarily wet-into-wet, although details such as the ripples of the water and the figures have been applied with liquid strokes over the dry underlying surface paint. The tile roofs of the buildings are textured with small drops of paint. The reflections of the buildings in the water are painted wet-in-wet. X-radiographs indicate that the left edge of the Porta Portello in the center of the composition has been shifted slightly.

There is an area of considerable loss in the center of the composition measuring approximately 15.2 x 15.2 cm. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting restored by David Bull in 1991.

Provenance: L. T. N. Gould, Suffolk; sold 1943 to (P & D Colnaghi & Co., London); sold later that year to Francis E. Madan, London [as Bellotto]; (his sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 15 July 1955, no. 88, as Canaletto); purchased by H. Ceva; (David M. Koetser, New York); purchased 1957 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


In 1740 or 1741, Canaletto made a trip to the mainland, traveling along the Brenta Canal and probably going no farther than Padua. The route was presumably by way of Fusina to Dolo and onward, and may also have included stops at Marghera and Mestre. It is possible that he had made a brief excursion to the mainland ten years earlier, but the 1740s tour was more fruitful, and a number of drawings and etchings, in particular, resulted from the journey. Canaletto made thirty or so drawings from nature that extended his range of subject and provided material for the capriccios he was to produce throughout his career. Most of the etchings were published as a series dedicated to Joseph Smith, Canaletto’s patron and agent in the 1730s and early 1740s, and as Links has suggested, it was possibly Smith who encouraged the artist to undertake the change of scene. Certainly the soft luminous atmosphere, limited use of local col-
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or, and palette of earth tones and greens is new in Canaletto's work and looks ahead to many aspects of the work of his English period in the next decade.

The painting has always been said to represent a view along the Brenta Canal, but the Porta Portello is actually on the south bank of the Piovego, a tributary of the Bacchiglione River that leads to the waterway between Venice and Padua. The site is on the eastern outskirts of Padua, and the view is northwest toward the city, its skyline dominated by the church and campanile of Santa Maria del Carmine and the belltower of what is possibly Santa Giustina. Although much of what Canaletto saw in the course of his tour of the Brenta has changed with industrial development, the Porta Portello (now Porta Venezia) in the center of the composition remains largely unchanged. One of the gates to the seven traditional entrances to the city, the Porta Ognissanti, as it was originally known, was constructed in the style of a Roman triumphal arch in 1518–1519 on the designs of Guglielmo Grigi d’Alzano, called Il Bergamasco (died c. 1550). In the eighteenth century, much of the traffic to Venice and the east passed through the Porta Portello. Contemporary guidebooks praised the building as the most ornate portal to the city, but Canaletto has chosen to represent the relatively unadorned south flank, providing only a glimpse of the columns on the principal facade and the tower and lead-roofed cupola to suggest the elegance of Bergamasco’s architecture.

The building with a colonnade at the right has disappeared, and the Ponte Portello shown by Canalet-
Canaletto, The Porta Portello, Padua, 1961.9.53
to was replaced in 1784.\(^8\) A pen-and-ink drawing at Windsor (fig. 1), which has the appearance of a preliminary sketch made on the spot, represents the scene at closer range from an imagined viewpoint above the canal and farther to the right.\(^9\) The representation of the bridge with three piers instead of the two in the painting, the reduction of the landing stage on the far bank, and the substitution of a grassy slope and a cluster of trees for the paved piazza and the buildings suggest that Canaletto has taken liberties with the actual topography of the site. The painting in all likelihood was produced on the basis of drawings in the artist’s studio in Venice upon his return from the mainland. At probably the same time Canaletto also made a highly finished ricordo drawing (fig. 2) of the painting with elaborate pictorial effects, probably intended for a collector, that is now in the Albertina, Vienna.\(^10\)

Canaletto’s nephew, Bernardo Bellotto, appears to have accompanied his uncle on his journey to the mainland. Bellotto’s apprenticeship was now almost over and he was assuming an identifiable role as an independent artist; the authorship of many works from the early 1740s has been disputed between the two artists. The National Gallery’s painting has at times in its history been considered an early work by Bellotto,\(^11\) but the drawing of the architecture and the handling of the figures are entirely characteristic of Canaletto at this moment, leaving no doubt that the painting is autograph. The recent cleaning has revealed vividly the assurance of Canaletto’s handling of the brush, in particular his consummate description of the various textures and colors of the materials in the scene before him—stone, stucco, grass, wood—that constitute such a significant part of the painting’s beauty.

Canaletto painted a second version of the view that corresponds closely to the present work except for minor topographical details, the placement of the figures, and the character and position of the boats.\(^12\)

Notes
2. Christie’s annotated sale catalogue lists the purchaser as “H. Cevat.”
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**English Landscape Capriccio with a Column**

c. 1754

Oil on canvas, 134 x 108.4 (52 3/4 x 41 3/4)
Paul Mellon Collection

**Technical Notes:**

The support is a plain-weave, medium-weight fabric. The thread count differs slightly from the support of the pendant (1964.2.2) and confirms that different rolls of fabric were used for each. A thin white ground is visible at the edges of the paint surface. The paint was applied wet-over-dry with only a few small passages painted wet-into-wet. The composition was built up from the middle ground, with each compositional detail completed before the addition of subsequent pictorial elements above. The column as well as the figures were painted over the fully developed landscape. The figures were sketched quickly with a dark wash that was allowed to dry before color was added over it using a thicker, opaque paint, with a lighter hue for the highlighted areas and a darker tone of the same color for the shadows. The highlights were applied more thickly.

Some red pigment was added to create a warmer tonality in the sky. X-radiographs reveal successive minor changes to the gabled top of the small architectural element at the base of the column.

The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping along the vertical edges suggests that the painting retains its original dimensions. Small losses are located in the upper-left corner, and slight abrasion is evident in the thinly painted areas of the distant landscape. The varnish is slightly yellowed. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition.

**Provenance:**

Probably commissioned by Thomas, 5th baron King [1712–1779], London and Ockham Park, Surrey; by descent at Ockham Park to Peter Malcolm, 4th earl of Lovelace [1905–1964]; [his sale, Sotheby’s, London, 13 July 1937, no. 135]; purchased by (M. Knoedler & Co., London); purchased 1938 by Philip Hill; Mrs. Philip Hill [later Mrs. Warwick Bryant] until 1959; [Rosenberg & Stiebel, New York]; purchased December 1960 by Paul Mellon, Upperperville, Virginia.

**Exhibited:**


---

**1964.2.2 (1910)**

**English Landscape Capriccio with a Palace**

c. 1754

Oil on canvas, 134 x 108.8 (52 3/4 x 42 7/8)
Paul Mellon Collection

**Technical Notes:**

The support is a plain-weave, medium-weight fabric. The thread count differs slightly from the support of the pendant (1964.2.1) and confirms that different rolls of fabric were used for each. A thin white ground was employed and is visible at the edges of the paint surface. The paint was applied wet-over-dry with only a few small passages painted wet-into-wet. The composition was built up from the middle ground, with each compositional detail completed before the addition of subsequent pictorial elements above; completed architecture or landscape can often be detected under the figures or other foreground details. The figures were sketched quickly with a dark wash that was allowed to dry before color was added over it using a thicker, opaque paint, with a lighter hue for the highlighted areas and a darker tone of the same color for the shadows. The highlights were applied more thickly. Some red pigment was added to create a warmer tonality in the sky. X-radiographs reveal no compositional changes.

The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping along the vertical edges suggests that the painting retains its original dimensions. There are small losses in the lower-right corner. Slight abrasion is evident in the thinly painted areas of the distant landscape. The varnish is slightly yellowed. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition.

**Provenance:**

Same as 1964.2.1.

**Exhibited:**


---

The traditional explanation for Canaletto’s journey to England in 1746, in the absence of documentary evidence, is the diminishing number of visitors to Venice and the increasing scarcity of local commissions. The outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession in 1741, spreading to Italy in the following year, no doubt encouraged Canaletto to consider establishing his practice in London. His friend Jacopo Amigoni (1682–1752) had spent ten successful years there, returning to Venice in 1739, and a number of Venetian artists of the preceding generation had worked there as scene painters, country-house decorators, history painters, and portraitists, includ-
Canaletto, *English Landscape Capriccio with a Column*, 1964.2.1
Canaletto, *English Landscape Capriccio with a Palace*, 1964.2.2
ing Marco and Sebastiano Ricci (q.v.), Giovanni Antonio Pellegrini (1675–1741), and Antonio Bellucci (1654–1727). Moreover, the majority of Canaletto’s earlier patrons, such as the dukes of Richmond and Bedford, were English, and it has therefore been assumed that Joseph Smith, Canaletto’s patron and agent, suggested, if not actually financially supported, the move.

Canaletto’s success in London was immediate, and his views of the Thames, Westminster Bridge, Whitehall, Westminster Abbey, Northumberland House, and other buildings and monuments of the city are among his most successful and memorable paintings. He also produced views in the environs of London, such as Greenwich Hospital, and received commissions, which correspond to a traditional category of topographical subject, the “country house portrait” or estate view, for more distant sites such as Badminton House, Warwick Castle, and Windsor Castle. During the end of his stay in England, Canaletto painted a number of vedute ideate, or imaginary views, of which the English Landscape Capriccio with Column and its companion are exceptional. The paintings are part of a series of six—one of which is signed and dated 1754—believed to have been commissioned by Thomas, 5th baron King, to decorate the walls of a room at his house in London or Ockham Park, Surrey. This ensemble, which constitutes both a significant example of Canaletto’s work during his last years in England and a point of reference for the capriccios he painted following his return to Venice, was consigned to Sotheby’s for sale in 1937 by the 4th earl of Lovelace, a descendant of Lord King.

The Lovelace capriccios, as the series has come to be known, consist of three pairs of paintings varying significantly in size and subject: the “English” landscapes in the National Gallery; a pair of fantasy views incorporating a combination of Venetian, Paduan, and Roman buildings and monuments, including the Colosseum, Andrea Verrocchio’s (1435–1488) equestrian bronze of the condottiere Bartolomeo Colleoni, and a variety of antique architectural elements; and two smaller, horizontal river landscapes with reminiscences of Eton College, and a view of the island of San Michele, with Venice in the distance. The last-named pair conceivably served as overdoors within the room in question.

The National Gallery’s capriccios have been described as “among the most exceptionally improbable, and successful, pictures of this type that Canaletto ever painted.” Appropriate to their decorative function, they are conceived in a lighter key than most of his paintings, full of agreeable color and handled with considerable virtuosity. Both paintings combine reminiscences of the Surrey countryside in which the King house was situated, and it seems likely that Canaletto painted the pair on the spot, so vivid is the character of the landscape around Ockham Park. Links described the paintings as giving the impression that the artist was invited to show the neighborhood of Box Hill as it might have looked had some Italian architects been building there.

The Capriccio with Column contains a number of Italian architectural motifs varying dramatically as to period and style, the most prominent being the column reminiscent of the Saint Theodore in the Piazzetta in Venice and the Roman triumphal arch. A number of architectural elements appear to have been drawn from scenes and details of Padua that Canaletto collected fifteen years earlier during his tour of the Brenta. The domed campanile at left center seems to have been inspired by several which the artist saw during his trip, and the distant skyline at right contains a number of silhouettes suggesting Paduan buildings like the Palazzo della Ragione. The landscape is populated with a variety of rural types, lively if a little coarsely painted, such as the poulterer and the man and woman catching eels in the foreground.

The background of the Capriccio with Palace is filled by a wooded hill with ascending chalk paths, a vivid reminiscence of Box Hill, near Ockham. The composition is balanced between an English cathedral on the left and an imaginary Italian villa on the right. The buildings on the hill include a church with a slate steeple that has been compared by Finberg to one at Great Bookham in Surrey, a farm, and another Roman arch. A river, possibly the Mole, flows under a bridge on the right. On it is an elaborately decorated gondola in which one of the passengers holds a parasol said to represent the Chinese fashions prevalent in England in the early 1750s.

Each of these picturesque capriccios is set in a brilliant landscape with English trees painted with extraordinary freedom. (Surprisingly, there are no associated drawings of the English countryside by Canaletto of the sort that he made on the Italian mainland, the River Brenta, and Padua.) Finberg, noting that in Venice Canaletto had little opportuni-
ty for painting foliage from nature, suggested that in these paintings are to be found "the beginnings of the English school of landscape painting." Certainly when Canaletto left England in 1755 or 1756 he left more behind than his paintings and drawings. He influenced profoundly a number of English topographers and landscape painters such as Samuel Scott (c. 1702–1772), Paul (1721–1798) and Thomas Sandby (1721–1798), and William Marlow (1740–1813), who began their careers as imitators of Canaletto. His work had always appealed to the English, and partly for this reason and partly because of the rise of the topographical watercolorists from the 1760s onward, his influence was far greater in England than it was in Italy after his death.12

Notes
1. Russell 1993, 64, has corrected the traditional provenance of the Lovelace capriccios: “That the most prominently placed of the series—the overmantel—which alone is signed and dated 1754, is dominated by a reminiscence of the chapel at Eton leaves little doubt that the patron was neither the 3rd Lord King, nor his successor the 4th Lord, but their brother Thomas, later the 5th Lord King (1712–79). He married an heiress and their son was sent to Eton. The original setting of the canvases was thus presumably in their London house, rather than at the family seat at Ockham ....” Constable and Links 1989, 1:146–147, reported the family tradition that the paintings were acquired with money brought into the family through the marriage in 1734 of Catherine Troye of Brabant to the 5th baron King, great-grandfather of the 8th baron King, 1st earl of Lovelace. The paintings are said to have been commissioned by the 5th baron and his wife, but since one is dated 1754, they may conceivably have been bought by either Peter, 3rd baron King, who died in that year, or his brother William, 4th baron King, who lived until 1767. See also Finberg 1938, 69, n.1.
2. APC, n.s. 16 (1936–1937), 192, no. 6548.
4. Typed notations from Mellon records by David M. Robb, 14 July 1964, NGA curatorial files.
6. Russell 1993, 64. For the entire series, see Constable and Links 1989, 2: nos. 367, 473–475, 478, 504, and Baetjer and Links 1989, nos. 75–80. The paintings were discovered by Tancred Borenius at Ockham Park in the 1930s (Finberg 1938, 69).
9. Katharine Baetjer (in Baetjer and Links 1989, 256) observed that many of the architectural motifs, Roman and perhaps also Paduan or Vicentine, appear in various vedute ideate.
10. Finberg 1938, 70.
11. Finberg 1938, 70.
12. Finberg 1938, 70.
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Simone Cantarini
1612 – 1648

Simone Cantarini was born in Pesaro, in the Marches, a region that was a crossroads for artists from many parts of Italy. Cantarini probably began his artistic training as a young man of between twelve and fourteen in the studio of Giovanni Giacomo Pandolfi (?i57O-i640?), a painter of religious works who combined the local naturalism with the mannerist style of the late sixteenth century. After a brief trip to Venice, Cantarini moved to the shop of Claudio Ridolfi (?i570-i644), a student of Paolo Veronese (1528-1588). From Ridolfi he received training in the Venetian manner and a deep appreciation for the art of Federico Barocci (1535-1612), with whom Ridolfi had worked in Urbino. In about 1629 Ridolfi left Pesaro, forcing Cantarini to continue his studies on his own. In addition to prints by the Carracci (q.v.), the young artist turned his attention increasingly to Barocci and also to the Caravagggesque, yet very personal, art of Orazio Gentileschi (q.v.), who executed several works in the Marches during the 1610s, and of Giovan Francesco Guerrieri (1589-1657) from nearby Fossombrone.

As Malvasia recounts, the most significant event of Cantarini’s youth was the arrival, probably in 1632, of Guido Reni’s (1575-1642) Madonna and Child with Saints Thomas and Jerome in Pesaro Cathedral (now Pinacoteca Vaticana). Not content to study Reni’s style from this work alone, Cantarini went to the church of San Pietro in Valle in nearby Fano to copy and draw after his Giving of the Keys to Peter (now Louvre, Paris), completed 1626, and Annunciation of 1620-1621. The young artist quickly assimilated Reni’s style and soon received important commissions, including the Saint Peter Curing a Lame Man for San Pietro in Valle. Malvasia writes that while visitors might mistake this for a work of Reni, Cantarini himself felt that it lacked a “certain Renian grandeur and nobility.” Cantarini’s desire to go to Bologna to study in Reni’s studio was given additional impetus by an attempt on his life resulting from amorous exploits, which, Malvasia intimates, were inspired by a too careful study of the lascivious prints by the Carracci.

Upon his arrival in Bologna, probably in 1634 or 1635, Cantarini presented himself in Reni’s studio as a painter of little training. His abilities soon became evident. Although Reni recognized that Cantarini was already a fully formed painter, he made the young man his most trusted pupil and secured him many commissions. Eventually, however, Cantarini’s pride and unbridled tongue alienated the master and the entire studio. One point of friction was Cantarini’s refusal to use his considerable talents as an etcher to propagate Reni’s designs, claiming that his own were equally worthy of publication. The decisive break came in 1637 when Cantarini publicly repudiated Reni’s relatively minor criticism of his Transfiguration for the Barberini church at Fortezza Urbana (now Brera, Milan). From this point on, Cantarini’s relations with his patrons also deteriorated rapidly, to the point where his commissions fell off almost entirely.

In 1639 Cantarini is documented at his sister’s wedding in Pesaro. It must have been shortly thereafter, in 1640 or 1641, that he made a brief trip to Rome. Following Reni’s death in 1642, Cantarini returned to Bologna, where he maintained a successful studio until his death in 1648, following a stay in Mantua. His behavior and criticisms of the Gonzaga collection created a scandal, and it is suspected that he had been poisoned there by an angry rival.

The lack of dated or securely documented works makes it difficult to plot a chronology of Cantarini’s brief but rapid and complex stylistic development. Both a successful imitator of Reni’s style and the most individual of his pupils, he never lost the naturalist tendencies of his Marchigian origins. In Rome he studied the works of Raphael (1483-1520) and classical sculpture, and came into contact with the neo-Venetianism of Pier Francesco Mola (1612-1666), Pietro Testa (1607/1611-1650), and Andrea Sacchi (1599-1661). As Ferretti Colombo has observed, Sacchi’s classicism seems to have offered Cantarini a viable alternative in the 1640s as he turned increasingly from Guido’s Bolognese classicism. Among the students in Cantarini’s last Bolognese studio, the most successful was Lorenzo Pasinelli (1629-1700), through whom the styles of both Guido and Cantarini were transmitted to Domenico Creti (q.v.).

40 ITALIAN PAINTINGS
Saint Matthew and the Angel

c. 1645/1648
Oil on canvas, 116.8 x 90.8 (46 x 35 3/4)
Gift of James Belden in memory of Evelyn Berry Belden

Technical Notes: The support consists of two pieces of fabric joined by a vertical seam about 22 cm from the left edge. The red-brown ground is extremely thin. The composition was laid out with broad strokes of black and white paint that are more evident in infrared photographs than to the naked eye. The stroke of white visible in the saint’s right sleeve is one of these initial strokes and was covered over by the now abraded red of the sleeve. Other such strokes are visible in the saint’s shoulders and elsewhere. The image was finished with fluid paint rich with medium and blended on the surface, often without brushmarks. The pigments are coarse and granular.

The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is present along all sides. The paint is badly abraded throughout and the surface texture has been altered through excessive heat and pressure in a past lining. Inpainting is concentrated along the seam, at the edges, and around the heads and shoulders of the figures. The varnish is considerably discolored. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition.


When in the Hagström collection in the 1930s, this painting carried an attribution to Guercino (q.v.), which was supported by Ragghianti in 1980. Except for Schaar, who advanced the name of Guido Reni, 2 all other scholars have followed Mahon’s attribution of Saint Matthew and the Angel to Simone Cantarini, 3 one of Reni’s closest imitators. Although the highlights on Saint Matthew’s face and hands and the rich accents of light on the angel’s sleeves and wings recall works by Guercino, and the composition and morphology of forms are reminiscent of Guido Reni, there is little doubt that this painting is by Cantarini. The saint’s face resembles those of his old men in both paintings and prints, 4 and the volumetric simplicity and naturalism as well as the braided hair of the angel recur in the figure seen from behind in the artist’s late Chiaroscuro (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna). 5 According to Malvasia, Cantarini made reliefs of heads as models for his effigies of “Saints Joseph, Lots, and the like,” which would account for the repetition of certain forms in various paintings. 6

Despite the individuality of elements suggestive of Cantarini’s hand, the conception of the subject relies generically on representations by Guercino and Reni. Guercino’s painting of Saint Matthew in a series of the apoteses in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, 7 portrays the half-length figure of the saint writing in a book held by the angel, who turns toward the viewer. Reni’s similar Saint Matthew (Pinacoteca Vaticana) 8 is in lively communication with the angel and holds his own book as he transcribes the divine inspiration communicated by the heavenly messenger. An earlier Saint Matthew and the Angel by Cantarini (Palazzo Venezia, Rome) 9 also relies heavily on Reni; the saint holds the book to show the small angel-child what he has written. Cantarini breaks with this tradition in the National Gallery painting. The angel is distinctly feminine in appearance, seen almost fully from behind, and is older than Reni’s baby angels. It holds an inkwell for the evangelist as he reads what he has already written. In addition, Saint Matthew, although partly hidden behind his writing table, is a three-quarter-length, not a half-length, figure. What further sets this portrayal apart from the familiar representations of the saint 10 is Matthew’s intense concentration on his gospel and the mysterious quality of the young female angel, whose face is hidden from view.

Borea, followed by Ferretti Colombo, connected this work with two half-length paintings of saints Andrew and Isidoro by Cantarini in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence. 11 Notwithstanding the similar penchant for volumetric and naturalistic depiction of form in the three portrayals, few other affinities exist. The dry brushstrokes and unfinished appearance of Saint Matthew are not evident in the other two paintings. All three works fit among the “molte altre mezzane figure” in Cantarini’s oeuvre noted by Malvasia. 12 Whether Saint Matthew and the Angel belonged to a series of the four evangelists, as did paintings by Guercino and Reni, is unknown; no other evangelist portrayed by the artist accords in style, composition, or size with this one.

Scholars have dated Saint Matthew and the Angel to
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the period following Cantarini’s visit to Rome, where he probably worked c. 1640/1641–1642. They point out a neo-Venetianism, popular in the papal city, which the artist would have adopted from Andrea Sacchi and Pietro Testa, among others. Most of Cantarini’s oeuvre is undocumented, but his works after Guido Reni’s death tend to combine the “non-finito” manner of the Bolognese artist’s late works with a down-to-earth naturalism inherited from his early years in the Marches. Saint Matthew and the Angel fits into this manner and is close to paintings that gel the period following Cantarini’s visit to Rome, where he probably worked c. 1640/1641–1642. They point out a neo-Venetianism, popular in the papal city, which the artist would have adopted from Andrea Sacchi and Pietro Testa, among others. Most of Cantarini’s oeuvre is undocumented, but his works after Guido Reni’s death tend to combine the “non-finito” manner of the Bolognese artist’s late works with a down-to-earth naturalism inherited from his early years in the Marches. Saint Matthew and the Angel fits into this manner and is close to paintings that date to Cantarini’s very last years, such as the Adoration of the Magi (Credito Romagnolo, Bologna) and the Chariot of Apollo (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna), the latter certainly an unfinished painting, and the former likely unfinished. Several other paintings were left unfinished at the artist’s death. The drapery of Saint Matthew and most of the angel and the book have been blocked in and then painted with a thicker impasto than elsewhere, while the saint’s left arm, his left hand, the area around his neck and beard, and portions of the angel’s back and wings are merely sketched in. The slash of white paint above the angel’s right wing has no relation to the rest of the painting but was probably painted over, and is now made more prominent by abrasion. Unlike Lot and His Daughters (private collection, Bologna), which logically becomes sketchier as forms recede in depth in a deliberate emulation of Reni’s style, the rough portions of Saint Matthew and the Angel appear incomplete. The abrasion and alteration of the surface texture make it difficult to determine whether this unfinished appearance is due to the poor condition rather than to the artist’s intention. If the painting is an unfinished composition, it is possible that it can be dated very late in his career, near his death. Without further particulars about Cantarini’s working methods or knowledge of why this painting might have been left unfinished, a broader date of c. 1645–1648 appears justified.

Notes
1. According to Shapley 1979, i: 110.
4. Compare, for example, Lot in Lot and His Daughters (private collection, Bologna; Age of Correggio and the Carracci 1986, no. 133, repro.) and Joseph and the old Magus in the Adoration of the Magi (Credito Romagnolo, Bologna; Mancigotti 1975, pl. 22). In prints, see Joseph in the Rest on the Flight into Egypt and Argus in Mercury and Argus (Mancigotti 1975, figs. 105 and 132).
5. Mancigotti 1975, pl. 25.
9. Mancigotti 1975, pl. 17, probably datable in the mid-to late 1630s.
10. On Saint Matthew and his representation see Pietro Cannata in BiblSS 9: 125–146. As an apostle and evangelist his effigy had been popular since the early Christian period. Numerous were the depictions of the saint in the act of writing the gospel. In these images Matthew is almost always represented at an advanced age with his book and an angel. In the seventeenth century, his calling by Christ and his martyrdom were depicted often. On the various images and meanings of Saint Matthew writing the gospel see Lavin 1974, 59–81.
13. Cantarini left Reni’s studio in 1637. Malvasia said that he went to Rome to work but gave no dates. He was documented in Pesaro in 1639 and returned to Bologna probably after Reni’s death in 1642, remaining there until 1648 when he was called to Mantua. He died in Verona in the same year. See Mancigotti 1975 for chronology and documents.
15. On the Chariot see Mancigotti 1975, 165, color pl. 25, who stated that the painting was unfinished at the artist’s death. Several of the figures are merely blocked out. The eighteenth-century chronicler Marcello Oretti noted that the Adoration of the Magi in the Fava collection was not finished: “Non è terminate il vecchio in ginocchio ed il piede della Madonna,” quoted in exh. cat. Frankfurt 1988, 518, no. D-7, repro.; Mancigotti 1975, 159, fig. 94. The painting is generally dated c. 1648, the year of Cantarini’s death.
17. See note 4, above.
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Simone Cantarini, *Saint Matthew and the Angel*, 1972.44.1
Annibale Carracci
1560 – 1609

Born in Bologna to a family of Cremonese origin, Annibale Carracci learned the craft of painting from his cousin Lodovico (q.v.) and that of printmaking from his brother Agostino (1557–1602). Some of his early undated portraits and genre subjects suggest that he may have trained also with Bartolomeo Passarotti (1529–1592). His earliest dated paintings of the Crucifixion (1583, Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna) and the Baptism (1585, San Gregorio, Bologna) indicate that his formative years were spent studying other north and central Italian masters as well. In the late 1570s and early 1580s Annibale must have set forth on the study trip (studioso corso) mentioned by his biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia. Letters of 1580, disputed but apparently authentic, show that in this year he was in Parma copying frescoes by Correggio (1489/1494–1534) in the cupola of the Duomo. The influence from his Parmese trip appears in the fresco cycles of 1584, the Story of Jason and the Aeneid, in the Palazzo Fava, Bologna, painted in collaboration with his brother and cousin. He must have traveled also to Tuscany, possibly the Marches, and to Venice, because influences of Federico Barocci (1535–1612) and the Venetians elide with those of Correggio in the early dated works.

Around 1582 the Carracci formed an academy, the Accademia degli Incamminati, to teach their innovative artistic theories. In their art they rebelled against the mannered styles of their contemporaries and took as their program a thorough study of nature combined with a study of earlier artists. They believed that this regimen would renew art and form a universal style. Based on these theories, the three Carracci achieved a common style in those years. When asked who painted the masterpiece of the Story of the Founding of Rome in the Palazzo Magnani, Bologna (1592), they replied, “It is by us all, the Carracci.” In fact, their individual hands in the early years are often difficult to distinguish.

In the late 1580s Annibale’s paintings, with their deep, rich, saturated colors and naturalistic forms in asymmetric compositions, reflected an overwhelming attraction to Venetian art. These were at odds with contemporary mannerists’ static compositions and stylized figures dressed in acid, unnaturally colored garments. By the early 1590s the Carracci had earned a reputation for originality. Aspiring painters chose to study in their academy rather than with the Bolognese mannerist painters. Masterpieces in the Palazzo Fava and the Palazzo Magnani brought them numerous commissions and praise. Their work came to the attention of the powerful Farnese family, and Annibale left for Rome permanently in 1595 to work for Cardinal Odoardo Farnese.

From 1595 to 1597 Annibale painted the ceiling of the Camerino in the Palazzo Farnese, Rome. These frescoes pointed to a new direction in his art that incorporated Correggesque morphology and sfumato with the sculpture of ancient Rome and the art of the Renaissance in central Italy, especially that of Raphael (1483–1520). The trompe l’oeil effects of the grisaille reliefs recall Correggio’s work in Parma, while the central painting of Hercules at the Crossroads has roots in the classical idealism of form and balanced compositions of his Renaissance predecessors.

Annibale’s success in the Camerino was followed by the commission for the gallery of the Palazzo Farnese, on which he worked with the aid of Agostino from 1597 until 1600. Taking as its starting point Michelangelo’s (1475–1564) Sistine Chapel ceiling, Annibale’s fresco combines trompe l’oeil with the highly idealized forms of classical sculpture and Renaissance painting. Feigned oil paintings (quadri ripartiti) overlap as painted fictive medals and sculpture hold them in place. The walls of the room were finished c. 1603/1604 on Annibale’s designs by his students Domenichino (1581–1641), Lanfranco (q.v.), and Badalocchio (1585–after c. 1620). The gallery, which became the most influential ceiling painting of the seventeenth century, was a required stop for sophisticated travelers, art lovers, and artists visiting Rome for the next two hundred years.

Annibale’s so-called hyperidealized style reached its apex in the early years of the seventeenth century. His Assumption of 1600–1601 for the Cerasi Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo contrasts with the dramatic naturalism of the Caravaggio paintings flanking it. The compositional rationalism of his
landscape lunettes for the chapel of the Aldobrandini palace (c. 1604) differs markedly from his own earlier naturalistic style.

Of a melancholic nature, Annibale suffered a decline in health around 1605, caused in part by his poor treatment at the hands of Cardinal Farnese, his patron, who paid him miserably for his years of service. However, he was still able to produce designs for the Herrera Chapel (1604–1606), which were executed by his students, and to complete several important etchings.

Annibale’s death brought an end to a brilliant career, which spanned the three most revolutionary decades of Italian painting since the High Renaissance. Annibale’s naturalistic style of the 1580s became the basis for one of the major trends of seventeenth-century art. He also elevated both genre and landscape subjects to a new, independent status in art. So, too, the intellectual rationalism of Domenichino, Poussin (1594–1665), and the French classicists had its origins in Annibale’s Roman style. Nor could the ideal classical landscapes of Claude Lorrain (1582–1666) have existed without his innovations. Moreover, the loose and unfettered execution of seventeenth-century etchings depends more on Annibale’s forays into the medium than on any other artist. Even Rembrandt (1606–1669) admired and copied his prints.

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Italy, France, and England, Annibale Carracci’s works were avidly collected. Only in the nineteenth century did the trend toward romanticism overshadow his contributions to seventeenth-century painting. Not until the mid-twentieth century did Annibale Carracci and his Bolognese and Roman counterparts once again enjoy the admiration of collectors and scholars.
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River Landscape

C. 1590
Oil on canvas, 88.3×148.1 (34 3/16×58 1/16)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The original support is a loosely woven, plain-weave fabric of medium weight. The ground is a single red layer. It functions as a warm middle tone under the transparent darker layers and lighter colors thinly scumbled over it, as at the center left where the mass of reeds is indicated by a thin greenish yellow layer over the ground tone, with a sketchy definition of individual stalks. The large forms of the dark trees and earth in the foreground were applied first, followed by the sky and the distant landscape, with details, such as the smaller trees, the reeds, the figures, and the final definition of larger forms painted over the landscape and sky. Extensive pentimenti are visible, primarily in the trees.

The fabric has widely spaced cusping along all four edges. There are scattered losses throughout, with the sky and background exhibiting considerable abrasion and numerous small losses. Losses are also concentrated in and around the central tree. The painting was relined, discolored varnish removed, and the painting restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1948. Discolored varnish was removed and new inpainting was carried out by Teresa Longyear in 1985–1986 to reduce the confusing patterns created where the red ground showed through the abraded greens in the foliage and in the sky and water.

Provenance: John Rushout, 2d baron Northwick [1770–1859], Thirlestane House, Cheltenham; (Thirlestane House sale, 26 July–16 August 1859, no. 412, as by Velázquez); to Mrs. García, London.1 William Heathcote, London, by 1881.2 (sale, Sotheby’s, London, 24 June 1931, no. 31, as Velázquez); to Malcolm.3 (Durlacher Brothers, New York); purchased 21 May 1948 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.4


Few landscape paintings can be attributed with certainty to Annibale Carracci. The loss of many of these works, the impossibility of recognizing paintings identified generically as “landscape” in inventories, and the profusion of later landscapes based on Annibale’s work make it extremely difficult to determine the authenticity of paintings in this genre.
In addition, recent scholarship has shown that paintings once considered Annibale’s may instead be by his brother Agostino. The River Landscape is among the few paintings to have withstood the modern winnowing of Annibale’s landscape oeuvre, but this work, like the others, can be attributed to the artist solely on stylistic evidence.

The River Landscape carried an attribution to Velázquez (1599–1660) when it appeared in Lord Northwick’s sale in 1859, but was ascribed to Annibale in his Bolognese period by Suida in 1951, an attribution accepted by all subsequent authorities. Posner recognized its connection with the frescoed landscape of Romulus and Remus Nursed by the She-Wolf in the Palazzo Magnani, Bologna, which must date before 1592 and was likely executed several years earlier. Taking into account the difference between fresco and oil, there are basic similarities between the two paintings in the generalized rendering of the foliage in dabs of light green pigment, the sketchy depiction of the reeds and bushes on the river banks, the delicate white highlights to indicate gentle waves, and the quickly painted figures that dot the compositions. These are aspects also of Annibale’s somewhat earlier Hunting and Fishing in the Louvre, Paris, to which the River Landscape has other affinities. The repoussoir device of the dark foreground plane defined by trees enframes the scenes, which then recede in depth by means of diminishing tonal gradations in zigzag patterns: brown and yellow-green earth tones in the foreground subside to lighter blues and whites for the distant hills and plains. The woman in the boat to the left in the Washington picture repeats a similar figure in the left middle ground of the Louvre Fishing.

Annibale’s Landscape with Bathing Women and Landscape with River Scene in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, are composed in the same manner with a framed repoussoir foreground and slow progression into depth; they have been dated by Whitfield to c. 1590, but could well be a few years later. Their tonality is bluer and the contrast among the various planes more pronounced, while the foliage and its pentimenti as well as the figures are strikingly similar to those in the River Landscape. Moreover, the background landscapes and distant towns are sketched in the same bold horizontal strokes, made somewhat ethereal by the addition of a great deal of lead white. An autograph peculiarity in all the landscapes is the presence of tiny enlivening accent strokes of red or sometimes blue pigment throughout the composition. In the Washington picture Annibale emphasized the foreground landscape and trees, while in the Munich pair he concentrated on the coordination of human activity within the landscape setting. The greater compositional complication and balance of the Munich landscapes suggest that they postdate the Washington painting.

Whitfield observed that in Bolognese palaces of the late sixteenth century landscapes appear as decorative elements placed high on the walls; Posner has since suggested that the River Landscape was intended as an overdoor. Early inventories mention landscapes but do not record their placement within rooms. Contemporary writers offer little evidence for the placement of landscapes high on the wall. Armenini, however, suggested that friezes placed just below the ceiling simulate easel paintings with viewpoints at eye level to avoid becoming views of nothing but clouds. This device is employed in the clerestory frieze of the Palazzo Magnani; these compositions have the same high viewpoint and lack of foreshortening as the River Landscape. In addition, some paintings mentioned in inventories as soprapparte have the same viewpoint.

That the National Gallery landscape may have been conceived as one of a pair is suggested by the existence of the Louvre and Munich pairs of landscapes, each of which contrasts two related outdoor activities; by the mention in inventories of pairs and even groups of landscape paintings by a single artist; and by the fact that the landscape painter Giovanni Battista Viola (1576–1622), a disciple of Annibale, normally paired his landscapes. A landscape such as the one formerly in the Platky collection, for which no dimensions are recorded, may have complemented the River Landscape. Such a pair may have flanked a window opening in which the light source struck the Washington picture from the left and its companion from the right, suggesting two complementary river views as subjects rather than a continuous landscape.

Faberio, and later Malvasia, indicated that the Carracci drew landscapes outdoors, yet few landscape drawings can be connected with the landscape paintings. A drawing of a river landscape by Agostino in the National Gallery of Art that has been linked with this picture, is, in fact, a distinct and unrelated work. Similar drawings that Annibale made directly from nature would have been the ba-
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sis for the composition of this landscape, which then would have been worked up in the studio. In addition, Annibale’s painting fits into the tradition of Venetian and Flemish landscape compositions in which a broad view of the scene spreads across the canvas. The spontaneity of the brushstrokes and the inherent naturalism of this woodland scene, however, suggest that an actual site may have inspired the artist.

Annibale’s landscapes are among the first of the genre to stand on their own as primary subjects of paintings; the figures languidly boating in the River Landscape seem to be included as little more than devices to indicate scale or imply relaxation in the calm of the outdoors. Rather than depicting an allegorical subject, as has been suggested, the River Landscape appears to portray simply a pleasurable activity similar to those shown in the Louvre and Munich pairs.

Notes
1. Thirlstane House 1859, 42. Also published with the following title: Catalogue of the late Lord Northwick’s Extensive and Magnificent Collection of Ancient and Modern Pictures . . . , which also lists the auctioneer as Mr. Phillips.

2. The Knoedler microfiche copy of the Northwick sale catalogue includes a marginal notation that the painting was subsequently purchased by Heathcote; a note at the beginning of the catalogue indicates that these corrections were taken from a “priced and named list” in the possession of the auctioneer, Mr. Phillips. Curtis 1883, 29, repeats this information.

3. The Sotheby’s catalogue lists the purchaser as Malcolm, about whom nothing is known.

4. Kress Foundation records, NGA curatorial files.

5. The Fête Champêtre in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Marseilles (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 16a), the Vision of Saint Eustace in the Pinacoteca Nazionale, Naples (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 27), the Landscape with the Rest on the Flight into Egypt in the Winter collection, London (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 91), and the Landscape with Saint John the Baptist in the collection of Sir Denis Mahon, London (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 88), all reattributed by Whitfield (1988, 73–98) to Agostino. This author agrees with the reattribution of the first three paintings to Agostino, but, knowing the Landscape with Saint John the Baptist in a photograph only, is not wholly convinced that it is by the same hand.

6. Currently only six “independent” landscape paintings (without a specific biblical or mythological narrative) are attributed by all scholars to Annibale. These include, in addition to the National Gallery painting, the Louvre Hunting and Fishing (Posner 1971, 2: pls. 43, 44a), a pair of landscapes in Munich (Whitfield 1980, color pls. 1–2), and the Landscape with a River Scene in Berlin (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 74). The River Landscape with Boats in the collection of Sir Denis Mahon, considered by Nicolson 1960, 79, fig. 40, and Shapley 1973, 72, and 1979, 1: 120, as by Annibale, was reattributed to Domenichino by Cavalli 1962, 85–87, no. 13. It was subsequently attributed to Giovanni Battista Viola by Spear 1980, 302, 305, and again to Domenichino by Whitfield 1987, 90. A painting formerly in the Plattky collection, Leipzig, and the Hausmann collection, Berlin, was attributed to Annibale by Voss 1924, 490, and accepted by Posner (who knew it only from an old photograph) due to its similarity in composition to the River Landscape (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 51). The work has been impossible to trace, and the attribution cannot be securely accepted or rejected on the basis of the poor photographic reproductions available.

7. Only National Gallery catalogues of the 1960s propose a later date of c. 1600: NGA 1965, 23.


9. The date 1592 on the stuccoed chimneypiece indicates the terminus ante quem for the room, but Malvasia, in his manuscript notes to the Felsina Pittrice, reported a date of 1590 for the frieze (Scritti originali del Conte Carlo Cesare Malvasia spettanti alla sua Felsina Pittrice, Biblioteca Communale dell’Archiginnasio, Bologna, Ms. B 116, f. 171v, cited by Ostrow 1965, 129, n. 15). The landscape in Romulus and Remus Nursed by the She-Wolf is accepted as Annibale’s by the majority of scholars, but there is some dissent on the attribution of the animal and figures. Only Brogi 1985, 242–246, suggested Lodovico as the author of the landscape as well. He failed to take into account the evident similarities between this landscape and the landscapes in oil attributed to Annibale. For a review of the attributions of the Magnani frescoes see Brogi 1985; Ottani Cavina 1988, 19–38; and Stanzani 1989, 177–178.

10. Posner 1971, 2: pls. 43 and 44. They are dated to c. 1555 based on similarities of the figures with Annibale’s early genre pictures, such as the Butcher Shop at Christ Church, Oxford (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 4), and the Bean Eater in the Galleria Colonna, Rome (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 8). The dating of these early works is based solely on stylistic criteria.

11. Whitfield 1980, passim. Much the same foliage, color scheme, and compositional recession occur also in the background of the almost contemporaneous Christ and the Samaritan Woman in the Brera, Milan (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 77a).


13. Many seventeenth-century inventories, however, do mention landscapes as soprapporte. For a discussion of landscape paintings in the seventeenth century see Eskridge 1979, especially chapter IV. Richard Spear kindly brought this study to the writer’s attention.

14. Armenini 1587, 187. Landscape paintings, their function, and general location in houses are also mentioned, for example, by Lomazzo 1584, 408–411; by Gabriele Paleotti, Discorso interno alle imagini sacre e profane, 1582 (reprinted in Barocci 1960–1962, 2: 354, 356); and by Mancini c. 1617–1621, 114–115, 143. For this and further information on the importance and placement of landscapes, the present writer is indebted to Giovanna Perini (letter of 17 April 1990, NGA curatorial files).

15. For example, Annibale’s Venus Adorned by the Graces (1661.9.9) was a soprapporta in the Casa Tanari, Bologna, when noted in a 1640 inventory, although it is not known whether it was painted as a soprapporta.

16. In the Ludovisi inventories, for example, landscape
paintings by Domenichino, Viola, and others are mentioned in pairs. See Garas 1967, 340, ms. nos. 14, 64, 65, and 101.

17. See Spear 1980, 301.
19. Light strikes from opposite directions in the paired Munich landscapes.
20. Faberio's funeral oration for Agostino Carracci of 1603, published in Malvasia 1841, I: 308: "Alla villa si disegnavano colli, campagne, laghi, fiumi e quanto di bello e di notabile s'apprendeva alla lor vista." See also Malvasia 1841, I: 277 (discussing Agostino): "...e quando finalmente per istanchezza o per l'ora tarda partivansi a far quattro passi per la città o fuori di una delle porte di essa a prender aria di tant'acqua, o per torna tarda partivansi a far quattro passi..."
21. Louvre 7126 is a study for Agostino's Fête Champêtre in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Marseilles (Posner 1971, 2: figs. 16c and 16a), but this is more a genre scene with a landscape background than a landscape. A drawing by Annibale in the Louvre, acc. no. 8063, may be connected with the Louvre Landscape with a Fishing Scene (Posner 1971, 2: figs. 44a and 44b).
23. Landscape with Jacob Sleeping (Metropolitan Museum, New York, acc. no. 19.76.14) exhibits a similar conception of foliage and recession of space, and was probably drawn about the same time as the Washington River Landscape: Bean 1979, 68-69, repro.
24. It has been suggested, in "Painting of the Week" texts in the NGA curatorial files, that the reclining female figure in the boat carries a mirror and is an allegorical allusion to Vanity. Ripa 1992, 352-353, described "Vanità" without a mirror and as undirected activity, whereas "Lascivia" is described (245) with a mirror. Annibale's rapid execution and the condition of the painting preclude an identification of the object held by the woman, but if it is indeed a mirror, Eric Garberson suggests that the reference is to an amorous, self, which also corresponds to Ripa's description (245) of "Lassitudine o Languidezza estiva."
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1961.9.9 (1666)

Venus Adorned by the Graces

1900/1995
Oil, transferred from wood to canvas, 133 x 170.5 (52 7/8 x 67 1/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The original support was a wood panel, probably consisting of two members with a horizontal join about 54 cm from the bottom of the composition. The ground is a dark layer overall and shows through in thinly painted areas. The paint layer was fluidly applied and, in general, is of medium thickness, with greatest buildup in the highlights of the figures and drapery. Venus' left arm was initially slightly higher, as indicated by pentimenti. Similar changes occurred in the left leg of the foreground Grace, whose left arm was also closer to her body.

Already in 1828 James Irvine noted that large losses had occurred in the figure of Venus and in the Grace behind her, and that the middle hues had sunken into what he called the brown ground. The transfer was probably carried out in the early twentieth century (according to Mario Modestini) and was poorly executed. Damage incurred during the transfer process has resulted in a very uneven paint surface. Severe abrasion throughout also contributes to the generally poor condition, and particularly to the loss of modeling in the figures. The thinly applied middle tones, particularly those of the curtain, floor rug, and landscape, have become transparent and sunken into the dark ground, greatly reducing the painting's tonal contrasts. Mario Modestini removed discolored varnish and restored the picture in 1954-1955. He adjusted the inpainting in 1959. The inpainting was adjusted again in 1986 by Jia-sun Tsang.

Provenance: Alessandro Tanari [1548-1639], Bologna, by 1638; purchased 1828 from the Casa Tanari, Bologna, by (James Irvine) for Sir William Forbes, 7th Bt of Pitsligo [1759-1828]; by descent to his son Sir John Forbes, 8th Bt [1804-1866]; (sale of his father's pictures at Mr. Rainey's, London, 1 June 1842, no. 291); Hugh Andrew Johnstone Munro, of Novar, by 1854; (his sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 1 June 1878, no. 10); purchased 1878 by Sir J. Charles Robinson for Sir Francis Cook, 1st Bt, Richmond, Surrey; by descent to Sir Francis Ferdinand Maurice Cook, 4th Bt. (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); purchased 1949 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


Venus Adorned by the Graces is certainly the painting in the Tanari collection ascribed to Annibale Carracci by Malvasia in 1678: "In Casa Tanari Diana con le sue Vergini, che le accostano il capo presso ad una fontana, ed diversi Amorini." Malvasia's attri-
bution has been accepted in the succeeding scholarly literature and the painting dated to Annibale’s late Bolognese period, c. 1593–1595, just before the artist’s departure for Rome. The classicizing aspect and more idealized figural types reminiscent of Raphael and ancient sculpture seen in Annibale’s Roman works are not yet apparent. The geometrization of the composition reflects other paintings belonging to the early 1590s. The extremely poor condition of the figures at the left makes it difficult to understand Annibale’s handling of paint in this part of the picture. The right side, however, in better condition, shows the influence both of the Venetians, in the rich impasto of the landscape, and of Correggio, in the figures of the cupids and the statue of Bacchus. The softened contours of the forms, the sweetened expressions, and the enlivened movement of the sculpture and reliefs depend on the earlier Emilian artist’s example. These Correggesque elements and the active and dramatic landscape again suggest a date prior to 1595.

Annibale borrowed specific figures from various sources. As noted first by Waagen, the Grace at left is a variant of Correggio’s Venus in the School of Love, now in the National Gallery in London, but which Annibale would have seen in Mantua in the Gonzaga collection. Posture, stance, and placement of arms are identical. As noted above, Bacchus and the cupid kneeling at Venus’ side by her jewel box are also generically Correggesque in conception, reflecting similar morphological traits and a passion for trompe l’œil sculpture. Bacchus’ pose, however, is based, as noted by Posner, on Cellini’s (1500–1571) Perseus in the Loggia dei Lanzi, Florence. Although in reverse, the bent leg, the raised arm holding the grapes, the slightly twisted contrapposto pose, and the arm holding the staff all mimic Cellini. Shapley suggested that the figure of Bacchus derived from Michelangelo’s sculpture of the same subject, now in the Museo Bargello, Florence. Annibale would also have seen this work, which had been in Florence since its purchase by Francesco de’ Medici in 1571–1572. Annibale’s Bacchus could be a conflation of the two statues, but Cellini’s much more elegant Perseus, dependent also on Michelangelo’s Bacchus, seems to be the direct prototype. Shapley indicated that the gesture of Venus staring at her mirror was based loosely on Titian’s (c. 1488–1576) Venus with a Mirror, also in the National Gallery, Washington. The subject of Venus with a mirror at her toilet, however, was depicted by many sixteenth-century painters. Venetian fashion is evident in Venus’ coiffure of tight curls in the front with a long braid to be coiled at the back; this coiffure appears in Venetian depictions of Venus and in portraits of women assumed to be courtesans. This hairstyle is seen in other paintings by Annibale made after his Venetian interlude.

Like some earlier sixteenth-century depictions of “Venus Adorned by the Graces,” Annibale’s painting depends primarily upon one classical source, Claudian’s “Epithalamium for Honorius and Maria.” Additional elements in the painting, however, can be understood with reference to Vincenzo Cartari’s Gli Imagini degli Dei of 1571. The Three Graces, Venus’ constant companions charged with her adornment, attend her almost as in Claudian’s poem: as the goddess surveys her loveliness in a mirror, one Grace combs her hair, the second checks the clarity of a pearl she will wear, and the third readies her gracefully flowing locks to be braided. Besides Cupid, who is probably the one holding the mirror for his mother, other cupids, born of the nymphs, surround the goddess. One enters from the right carrying a perfume vase, perhaps to anoint Venus with honey-sweetened water from one of the two springs on the mountainous island of Cyprus. The marble floor, sumptuous pillows, red curtains, and surrounding grove indicate that the action takes place in Venus’ elegant palace on the island, as described by Claudian, forever in springtime bloom for her pleasure. Bacchus, the god of banquets and possibly the father of the Graces by Venus, squeezes wine from grapes into a fountain situated in a rose arbor.

A seventeenth-century edition of Cartari noted that paintings of Venus (who was considered a goddess of marriage and of procreation and generation) in the company of the Graces and cupids were given as gifts or commissioned on the occasion of a marriage to express good wishes for the fruitfulness of the union. Recent research on similar depictions of Venus and Cupid in the sixteenth century has shown that such pictures were painted for weddings and that the wishes expressed generally concern the fecundity of the union, following the standard conventions of marriage poems or epithalamia. Annibale’s inclusion of Mars and Vulcan in the background is perhaps meant as a reference to the heat of passion necessary for procreation, a generative heat denoted, according to Cartari, by de-
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picting Venus together with either of these gods. Annibale’s *Venus Adorned by the Graces,* therefore, was likely painted in honor of a wedding.

The picture was in the Tanari collection before 1640, but whether it was commissioned by the family as an epitalalium is disputable, since it has not been possible to identify Tanari marriages of the period. It is not even known whether this work was painted for the Tanari or purchased by them at a later date. The inventory made after Alessandro Tanari’s death in 1639 lists three overdoors by Agostino, Lodovico, and Annibale Carracci, the latter identifiable with the Washington *Venus.* The other paintings, Agostino’s *Venus and Vulcan* and Lodovico’s *Alexander the Great Leaving his Wife,* have not been identified with extant works, making it impossible to determine whether the three were made as a series or commissioned by the Tanari. Alessandro Tanari, a painting collector of some note, could have purchased works by the Carracci after their deaths. However, Tanari owned several paintings by Lodovico Carracci depicting his namesake, Alexander the Great, which were certainly commissioned directly from the artist. Since the three Carracci paintings are listed together as overdoors with similar frames (and each with a curtain of red silk), one assumes they were of similar sizes. Yet, if they were commissioned by the Tanari they could not have been made for the “sala grande” of the 1640 inventory, because the palace was not occupied by the family until c. 1612. The paintings could, however, have formed a group in a similar room in an earlier palace and could possibly have been an epitalalamic series relating to a Tanari marriage. The misidentification and confusion of the subjects in the inventories and sources make such a reading conjectural.

Annibale repeated the figure of Venus as a more classical Circe in one of the frescoes in the Camerino in the Palazzo Farnese, Rome, painted between 1595 and 1597. His interpretation of Venus in the *Toilet of Venus* also provided the prototype for Francesco Albani’s (1578–1660) many representations of the same subject. Other seventeenth-century depictions of the toilet of Venus, by Guercino (q.v.) and Simon Vouet (1590–1649), appear also to have been inspired by this painting.

### Notes


2. Inventory of May 1640 by Vicenzo Pisani (Archivio di Stato di Bologna), published by Giammotti 1985, 204, 215. Pisani described the painting thus: “L’altro d’Annibale Carracci nel quale è dipinta Diana con le sue Vergini che gli acconciavano la testa a bon’hora,” and “Diana con altre figure che si fa conciare la testa ad un fonte di mano d’Annibale Carracci.” Malvasia 1841, 1: 357, also misread the subject as “Di ana con le sue Vergini, che le acconciavano il capo presso ad una fontana, e diversi amorini,” as did Marcello Oretti at the end of the eighteenth century: in Oretti 1984, 90. Thomas Martyn, who had visited Italy in 1787, referred to the painting as “Venus attired by the Graces” (Martyn 1791, 110).


4. The painting was probably sold through the efforts of William Buchanan, who was called in to dispose of the pictures remaining from the unsuccessful 1842 auction of Sir William’s collection (Briggs 1982, 30).


7. Borenius, *Catalogue, 1913, 100, no. 85; Collection of Sir Herbert Cook 1932, 68, no. 85. A Toilet of Venus by Annibale Carracci, 31 x 64 1/2 inches, was in the sale of “N. N.” in 1886 according to Redford 1888, 223. Martha Hepworth of the Getty Provenance Index has suggested that this is one of the many mistakes in Redford (letter of 26 April 1990).

8. Sir Francis began to dissolve the collection after the death of his father in 1930. Most of the paintings were sold privately through dealers in unrecorded transactions (Hepworth in letter cited in previous note).


10. For the early confusion as to the subject, see note 2 above. Shapley 1979, 1: 121, discussed the problem of the picture’s iconography at length, concluding with most others before her that Annibale represented Venus, not Diana. Longhi 1957, 41, maintained that the subject represents Diana served by her nymphs.

11. Voss 1924, 503, first suggested the date at the end of Annibale’s Bolognese period, which was accepted by Longhi 1957, 41. All subsequent scholars have agreed with a date at the end of the Bolognese period (i.e., c. 1593–1595), except Pepper 1972, 267, who placed the painting c. 1587–1589 without giving the reasons for this earlier dating.

12. See, for example, the *Madonna and Child Enthroned with Saints* (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna) and the Resurrection of Christ (Louvre, Paris), both dated 1593, as well as the earlier prints of The Holy Family with Saint John the Baptist and Susanna and the Elders of c. 1590 (Posner 1971, 2: pls. 72–73 and 56–57, respectively).

13. The landscape background is comparable to Annibale’s few authentic landscapes datable to his Bolognese period. The Roman landscapes are more ordered and less ruled by natural forces. (See the entry for 1952.5.50.)
14. Waagen 1854, 2: 135. The painting was first recorded in a Gonzaga inventory only in 1627, but may have been painted for the Gonzaga. For its provenance, see Gould 1976, 214–215, figs. 173–176.

15. Posner in exh. cat. Bologna 1886, 281. Reproduced in Barbaglia 1981, pls. 53–55. This immensely famous statue may have been known to Annibale in copies, but it is likely that he had seen it on a visit to Florence in the 1580s. Annibale’s earlier painting of Bacchus, now in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples (Posner 1971, 2: pl. 59), is much closer in figure type to Michelangelo’s statue. On a proposed Florentine trip see Arcangeli 1956, 17–48.


17. Shapley 1979, 1: 121. For Titian’s painting (1937.1.34) and its other versions, see Shapley 1979, 1: 476–480, nos. 34, and 2: pl. 341.

18. Annibale’s madonnas and female saints are never portrayed with this type of coiffure but rather with long, uncurlcd or naturally curled hair. On hairstyles in Italy in the sixteenth century, with numerous examples, see Rodocanachi 1907, 111–113; Molmenti 1928, 2: 305; Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 2: 87; and most recently Lawner 1987, who illustrates many representations of courtesans. The accoutrements of Venus’ toilet were common to sixteenth-century aristocratic households and appear in many of the portraits reproduced by the authors cited above. Jeweled boxes were used to store and transport such accoutrements as well as jewelry. The needlelike object held by the cupid at left is in fact an implement for separating and, when heated, curling hair; it ends in a three-sided handle, not a flat end with an eye, as it appears in photographs. A similar, larger implement is being used as a curling iron by the third Grace; cf. Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 2: caption to pl. 63. See also the depiction of a courtesan having her hair curled in a similar manner from Franco 1610, reproduced in Rodocanachi 1907, following p. 112; and in Lawner 1987, 198.


20. See, for example, Lorenzo Lotto’s c. 1480–1556 work of c. 1530 in a private collection, Milan, discussed by Zampetti 1957, 75–81, repro. See also Vasari’s (1511–1574) painting in the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, reproduced in “Staatsgalerie Stuttgart” 1968, 202, pl. 3. An earlier example may be found in Giulio Bonasone’s print of Venus Attended by the Graces, perhaps after Raphael, reproduced in Illustrated Bartsch 29 (1982), no. 167. In all three, Venus, surveying herself in a mirror, receives an elaborate coiffure similar to that in Annibale’s painting.

21. Cartari 1571, 539, 557, 561 on their stances. Mark Zuckerberg (draft catalogue entry of 1967, NGA curatorial files) noticed that the Graces are depicted here as they are when portrayed alone, that is, two facing the viewer and the central Grace with her back toward the viewer. Annibale appears to have been the first to incorporate the standard poses of the Graces into a toilet of Venus, unlike the earlier depictions of Lotto and Vasari (see note 20).

22. Claudian, “Epithalamium for Honorius and Maria,” lines 50–116 (Claudian 1: 240–251). According to Claudian, one of the Graces uses the ivory comb, seen here in the box, another braids her hair, leaving a portion unkempt, while a third pours nectar over her head. The pearls that are adorned by the Grace and by the cupid at her side probably refer to Venus’ birth from the sea, and are a standard attribute of Venus for this reason. Likewise, Venus’ blue wrap refers to her marine origins (Cartari 1571, 538).


25. Roses were sacred to Venus (Cartari 1571, 531, 536).


27. Cartari 1615, 475, included an illustration of the Three Graces holding an image of Venus and Cupid accompanied by the Hours and amorini. This edition, which postdates Annibale’s painting by some twenty-five years, is the one consulted by Posner 1971, 2: 35. Claudian, in “The Magnet,” lines 28–30 (Claudian 2: 236; cited by Christiansen 1986, 173, no. 34), noted that “cloth of scarlet dye,” like that in Annibale’s painting, is appropriate to a marriage chamber.

28. On Giorgione’s Vénus see Anderson 1980, 340; for the fertility symbolism of Lorenzo Lotto’s Venus and Cupid in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, see Christiansen 1986, especially 169–170. Significantly, Lotto’s Toilet of Venus in Milan (see note 20) contains a urinating cupid, a motif that Christiansen identified as an overt fertility symbol in the New York painting.

29. Cartari 1571, 394–395. Posner 1971, 2: 35, referred to this passage in Cartari, but suggested also that the painting depicts the moment in the Odyssey after Venus and Mars have been released from Vulcan’s trap: Venus promptly returned to Cyprus, where the Graces “bathed her, and anointed her with immortal oil...and clothed her in lovely raiment.” It is unlikely that Annibale showed Mars and Vulcan discussing the “adulterer’s fec” owed by Mars, as Posner suggested, since Poseidon had agreed to pay this fee to Vulcan, should Mars flee without paying, as in fact he did (Odyssey, VIII, 325 ff).

30. The most complete study of the Tanari family is that of Dolfi 1670, 700–702; however, it lacks a family tree and marriages. See also Guidicini 1868–1873, 2: 170, n. 1. See also Carrati n.d., 1: 24, 34, 47, 84, 188, 341, for some Tanari marriage contracts of the period.

31. For the inventory and subsequent mentions of the paintings in Casa Tanari, see note 2 above. The esteem for the Carracci around 1640 was evidently much below that for the recently deceased Guido Reni. In the inventory, paintings by the Carracci were evaluated at 500 ducatoni, whereas those of Guido were estimated at 1,000 ducatoni.

32. This painting is identified by Malvasia as Venus asleep with a satyr and by Oretti simply as Venus and a satyr. Several drawings by Agostino may have been connected with such a painting: Venus, Vulcan, and Cupid in the Royal Library, Windsor Castle (in which Venus is reclining, but not asleep), and Venus and a Satyr in the Albertina, Vienna (with Venus asleep); both are reproduced in De Grazia and Bohlin 1979, 341, fig. 210b, and 451, fig. 17a. The drawing in Windsor appears to date from the late 1590s; the Albertina drawing probably dates from the early 1590s. A painting (oil on canvas, transferred from panel[?]), attributed to Agostino, of Venus (not asleep) with Cupid and a satyr is in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, discussed by Ostrow 1966, 428–431, no. 236; fig. 115. It is of similar dimensions (129 × 184 cm) to the Toilet of Venus but does not exactly match the description in either the 1640 inventory or Malvasia. Ostrow suggested that it might be one of the paint-
ings listed in a Farnese inventory of 1692; the inventories published by Bertini 1987, 154, no. 212, are more detailed and demonstrate that it is not the painting owned by the Farnese.

37. A painting attributed to Annibale in the Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna, is probably instead one of Albani’s first depictions of the subject. See Emiliani 1971, 48–50, no. 15, repro.
38. For Guercino’s Toilet of Venus of c. 1623 in the Goethe Academy, Renaissance, California, see Salerno 1988, 177, no. 93. This painting was inspired by Titian’s Venus in the Garden of Love, also in the Ludovisi collection, as recorded by Garas 1967, 343, no. 30. For the painting attributed to Vou-
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Lodovico Carracci
1555 – 1619

Born in Bologna, the son of a butcher, Lodovico Carracci grew up with his cousins Agostino (1557–1602) and Annibale (q.v.), who became his closest collaborators. Probably while in his teens Lodovico became a pupil of the prominent Bolognese painter Prospero Fontana (1512–1597). Lodovico’s biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia, the richest source for information on the artist, noted he was slow to demonstrate his talent. Malvasia also reported that Lodovico furthered his education by traveling to Florence, Venice, Mantua, and Parma to study the art of those cities. In 1578 Lodovico was inscribed as a master in the Compagnia dei pittori e bombasari (“Corporation of Painters and Makers of Cotton Cloth”), and in 1582 he was named to the council of the corporation.

Lodovico’s first known works date from the early 1580s when he was struggling to establish his position in Bologna. By the late 1580s, he and his cousins were much in demand by local patrons and gaining reputations outside the city. He began a steady production of altarpieces, devotional pictures, and a smaller number of secular subjects for private patrons that would continue unabated until his death. By the mid-1590s the Carracci were Bologna’s preeminent painters and had attracted the region’s best pupils, among them Guido Reni (1575–1642), Domenichino (1581–1641), and Francesco Albani (1578–1660).

Around 1582 Lodovico, Agostino, and Annibale founded an academy that emphasized drawing from life and offered an opportunity to study optics, anatomy, and other subjects considered important to painters. The three artists collaborated on several fresco cycles in private palaces, the most important of which were a cycle of Jason and the Argonauts in the Palazzo Fava, completed in 1584, and a frieze depicting the founding of Rome in the Palazzo Magnani, c. 1590. They worked together so closely in their early years that in many cases scholars have found it difficult to distinguish their hands. A conscious experimentation with style was a hallmark of the early Carracci academy, as the Carracci attempted to reform the chilly, abstruse elegance of the prevailing late mannerist style with an infusion of nature, comprehensibility, warmth, and authentic expression. Lodovico’s paintings of the 1580s exhibit a marked variety of manners ranging from a sweet, demure style that owed much to Correggio (1489/1494–1534), to a dynamic and expressive rhetoric partly inspired by Tintoretto (1518–1594). He deliberately searched out and tested different manners, assimilating what
he had seen on his travels to the tradition in which he had been trained. In works of the early 1590s Lodovico explored the sensuous properties of oil paint, contrasting thick, creamy textures with thin translucent layers that allow his favored reddish brown ground and the weave of the canvas to show through. He experimented with the jewel-toned palette of Venice and the sensational lighting techniques of Veronese (1528–1588) and Tintoretto. From the outset Lodovico’s works had demonstrated a fascination with light, but now he devised a bold chiaroscuro with strong shadows that break up solid forms and highlights that mimic the behavior of light leaping across the surface of forms. Lodovico’s “meteorological chiaroscuro” harnessed the impressions of atmosphere—light, air, temperature, wind—to enhance and dramatize his subjects. Night scenes, often with turbulent, cloudswept skies, became a trademark.

After the departure of his cousins for Rome in the mid-1590s, Lodovico remained in Bologna to head the Carracci academy and thriving studio. He traveled little and reluctantly. In 1602 he was briefly in Rome to visit Annibale and attend to business of the Compagnia dei pittori, of which he was a leading member. The imprint on Lodovico’s art of his Roman experiences was fleeting as well, in contrast to his cousin Annibale, who remade his painting style in response to the art of Roman High Renaissance painting and antique sculpture.

The decoration in 1604–1605 of the octagonal cloister in the Bolognese monastery of San Michele in Bosco with a cycle of the life of Saint Benedict interspersed with scenes from the life of Saint Cecilia was a watershed in the history of illusionistic painting. Here Lodovico surrounded the visitor with scenes of life-sized figures on adventurous compositions painted floor to vault. The painted architectural system extended the real one so that the panorama appears to open behind and beyond the walls, as if to invite the spectator to step into the picture. In addition to designing the overall scheme and executing several scenes, Lodovico used the occasion to showcase the achievements of the Carracci academy, attempting to enlist the best of the former pupils who had gone to Rome and assigning work to even the most modest of his pupils. From 1605 to 1609 Lodovico made several visits to Piacenza where he was occupied with the decoration of the cathedral in collaboration with Camillo Procaccini (1550/1555–1629). There he used powerful, simplified forms that registered clearly in the huge spaces of the basilica, and the previous decade’s sensuous approach to technique was irrevocably abandoned. Neither of these cycles, Lodovico’s most ambitious commissions, survives intact.

Until the end of his life Lodovico was showered with commissions from important patrons in Bologna and elsewhere in northern Italy. His works commanded the highest prices. Critics have been less enthusiastic about his late style, which is emphatically didactic and, depending on the subject, varies from the stern and austere to the ethereal. More important for subsequent generations of artists, and especially for Guercino (q.v.), was Lodovico’s work of the 1590s. The sensuous quality of his paint, the powerful, tangible evocation of solid form, the innovative chiaroscuro, and the dynamic approach to composition all opened a path toward the baroque.
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1952.5.59 (1138)

The Dream of Saint Catherine of Alexandria

c. 1593
Oil on canvas, 138.8 × 110.5 (54 ⅞ × 43 ⅜)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Inscriptions
On book at left: EΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ (Gospel of Christ)

Technical Notes: The original support is a medium-weight, tightly woven twill fabric. The thin red ground shows through selectively in the paint layer. The paint was applied in a thin paste with little impasto. X-radiographs reveal several artist’s changes. Saint Catherine’s right hand was originally turned upward to support her face. The fingers of her left hand extended slightly beyond their present position. The upper fold of her sash and bodice were higher on her waist. The green pillow may have been an afterthought, as it was painted over completed forms.

Scientific analysis using both optical microscopy and
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x-ray fluorescence revealed that the original blue of the Virgin’s cloak consists of ultramarine with a small percentage of small, perhaps as a drier. The overpaint in this area is azurite, suggesting an early date for its application. The original blue has discolored to a pale blue-brown, and its folds are rendered darker and flatter by overpaint that could not be removed. The brown glaze over the green skirt may not be removed.

There is a large vertical tear at the center-right edge. Many of the dark, thin transitional tones around the forms and in the drapery shadows are abraded; these, and the large area of abrasion below the Child’s feet, were inpainted during the conservation treatment of 1986. During this treatment, Sarah Fisher reinforced the edges of the lined painting with a strip-lining. Conservation files record that Mario Modestini removed discolored varnish and restored the painting in 1948.

Provenance: Louis-Jacques-Aimé-Théodore de Dreux, marquis de Nancré [d.1791]; who probably gave it to Philippe II, duc d’Orléans [1674-1723]; Louis, duc d’Orléans [1703-1752];4 by inheritance to his grandson, Louis-Philippe-Joseph [Philippe Égalité, 1747–1793];5 sold 1792 to viscount Fédouard de Walkers; sold to François-Louis-Joseph, marquis de Laborde-Méréville [d. 1801], who took it to London;6 bought at (Jeremiah Harman’s London)7 by a consortium consisting of Francis Egerton, 3d duke of Bridgewater [1736–1803], Frederick Howard, 5th Earl of Carlisle and the earl Gower; retained by Francis Egerton, 3d duke of Bridgewater, upon whose death it entered a trust held in succession by the following: George Granville Leveson-Gower, 2d marquess of Stafford and 1st Duke of Sutherland [1758–1833], nephew of preceding; Francis Egerton, 1st Earl of Ellesmere [1806–1857], son of preceding; Francis Charles Granville Egerton, 3d Earl of Ellesmere [1847–1914], grandson of preceding who inherited the trust in 1903,8 by descent to John Sutherland, 4th Earl of Ellesmere and Duke of Sutherland (his sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 18 October 1946, no. 67); bought by (Hans Callmann).9 (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); purchased 1950 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.10


Most of Lodovico Carracci’s paintings are of religious subjects, and in addition to the series of altarpieces for which he is best known, he had great success with devotional pictures such as the Dream of Saint Catherine. As with most of these religious paintings, which were probably made for private patrons, nothing is known of its early history. In 1727, when it was first cited in the collection of the Palais Royal, the Dream of Saint Catherine was known to be by Lodovico and noted as having come from the collection of the marquis de Nancré.11

Certainly the style is typical of Lodovico’s mature work and his authorship is now universally accepted. Establishing the date, however, has proved more difficult. Most twentieth-century scholars, including Bodmer12 and Shapley,13 have placed it c. 1591 on the basis of a strong stylistic resemblance to the Holy Family with Saint Francis (Pinacoteca e Galleria d’Arte Moderna, Cento), which is dated that year.14

Freedberg’s proposed date of 1612, likewise made on stylistic grounds, did not find immediate acceptance; both Ferretti and Roli disagreed, defending the traditional dating at the beginning of the 1590s.16 Arguments for a later dating emerged again after the painting was exhibited in 1993–1994, with Keazor proposing c. 1600 and Schleier 1610–1612.17 The question is difficult to decide, because powerful arguments can be made for both the early and later dates. Supporting an early date, resemblances to the Cento altarpiece are especially insisted. Yet the Dream of Saint Catherine goes beyond that altarpiece to attain a new and sophisticated unity of composition, an effect that Lodovico pursued vigorously in other works datable in the early nineties. Where in his earlier paintings figures seemed to be installed in their setting, here they seem to create the space around them. Basking in a bronze radiance and pressed close to one another and to the viewer, the bodies exude warmth. In this—as also in the sfuma-to, soft treatment of flesh, and tender characterization—Lodovico divulgés his debt to Correggio. Lodovico’s engagement with Correggio is evident in other works in this period, such as the Galatea of c. 1592 (Galleria Estense, Modena).18 The fusion of forms that is so striking in the Dream of Saint Catherine is never more predominant in Lodovico’s work than in his Martyrdom of Saint Ursula of 1592 (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna),19 which also has in common the idiosyncratic, sinewy patterning of drapery folds. In the Saint Ursula altarpiece Lodovico employed similarly vibrant, jewellike colors, which, juxtaposed, tend to have a muting effect on one another. The angelic countenances in the Saint Catherine, meltingly soft and barely coalescing as if in transition from spirit to matter, are closely related to those of the Cento altarpiece and to the
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The figural type of Christ with shining black eyes and glinting copper curls finds its twin in the Vision of Saint Hyacinth of 1594 (Louvre, Paris). In view of these relations, a date of 1592–1594 would seem most likely.

On the other hand, there are undeniably strong relationships with works dating in the years just after 1605. The Assumption of the Virgin (Galleria Estense, Modena), for example, which savors a resurgent interest in Correggio, also offers many similarities in the rendering of draperies, and in particular the wing of the Virgin’s mantle billowing out behind her. Another work generally dated c. 1605–1610, the Visit of the Empress to Saint Catherine (Collezioni Comunali, Bologna), shares with the Dream of Saint Catherine the sense of thick atmosphere and a languor that affects both the actors and the composition. It might be argued, then, that the Saint Catherine belongs to this moment around 1606.

To make a strong case for placing the picture either c. 1600 or c. 1610–1612 (the dates suggested by Arcangeli and Keazor, and by Freedberg and Schleier, respectively) is more difficult. For around the turn of the century Lodovico’s work featured a crisper, harder definition of form, a colder light, a more staccato disposition of figures, jerky rhythms, and exaggerated facial expressions, all of which are best exemplified in the Martyrdom of Saint Ursula (San Domenico, Imola) of that moment. Closer to 1610, Lodovico’s paintings become increasingly characterized by a stony solidity of form and uninflected surface treatment, a mode he developed in the choir decoration of Piacenza Cathedral. The Saint Sebastian Thrown into the Sewer (J. P. Getty Museum, Malibu), securely dated 1612, is a stark example of how the approach in this later period to rendering of the figure and handling of surface is far removed from the richly textured paint and vaporous atmosphere in the sensuous dreamscape of the Dream of Saint Catherine. It must also be noted, in this regard, that Lodovico generally did adjust his style to the theme he depicted, and that he returned periodically throughout his career to the softer mode of Correggio when the subject warranted. Nevertheless, in sum it seems the preponderance of stylistic evidence supports the traditional dating in the early nineties, while the possibility should be kept open that the painting belongs to a later moment, shortly after 1605.

The draftsmanship of a pen-and-wash study in the Louvre, Paris (fig. 1), which can be connected with the preparation for the Dream of Saint Catherine, is difficult to date with precision, but is not incompatible with a date in the early nineties. Though the drawing differs from the painted composition in many details, the link between them can now be confirmed by data from the x-radiographic examination. In the course of execution, several changes were made to an original composition that at first had more closely resembled the Louvre sheet. In the drawing Catherine sits slumped slightly forward, one elbow propped up and her cheek supported on her open palm. Revised in the painting to a more graceful, semirecumbent arrangement, the new pose makes reference to the iconographically pertinent model from ancient sculpture of the sleeping Ariadne type, widely diffused in Renaissance art. The x-radiograph reveals that when Lodovico first blocked out the composition, he retained the gesture of Catherine cupping the side of her face with her
hand, a natural, but inelegant attitude. In the course of executing the painting, he transformed the gesture into a dainty one, in which Catherine rests her head gently on the back of her curved fingers.

Other alterations in the course of the execution include a pentimento visible to the eye: the fingers of Catherine’s other hand, which once extended slightly beyond their present position. Catherine’s sash and bodice were lowered, and the x-radiograph also shows that the green pillow was painted over other forms, suggesting that it was not at first part of Lodovico’s design.

Scenes of Saint Catherine were widespread in the period, and Lodovico depicted the dream or marriage of Saint Catherine several times, as did his cousin Annibale. Lodovico’s copy after Correggio’s Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine, a painting to which the present picture owes a significant debt in composition and mood, is lost. Saint Catherine was a popular subject for paintings intended for young women of marriageable age, especially upon the occasion of a betrothal or wedding. By the sixteenth century Catherine was considered the patron saint of young girls, seamstresses, and, because of her learned disputation with scholars, students of theology. The saint’s mystic marriage was a relatively late development in her iconography. According to legend, Catherine dreamed that the Virgin appeared to her and led her to Christ. Though Mary told her son that she had brought Catherine to him as a servant who out of love for him had renounced all earthly things, Jesus turned his back on Catherine saying she was as yet unworthy to see him. Catherine awoke from her dream in grief and sought the counsel of a hermit who instructed her in the Christian faith and baptized her. That night as Catherine slept the Virgin and Child accompanied her and placed a ring on her finger to signify her instruction and baptism. Catherine considered representing the first vision that preceded her conversion. He departed sharply from traditional representations of the Mystic Marriage, which make no allusion to Catherine’s state of dreaming or sleeping but show her awake as Christ slips the ring on her finger. Perhaps it was the influential Bolognese Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti’s call for artists to avoid confusing the spectator by passing tumultuously in a painting between the states of nature, grace, and glory without clearly designating the difference that prompted Lodovico to insist on showing Catherine asleep.

Her pose, with its ancient association with slumber, and the soft modeling of her face make her the very embodiment of sleep. Thus what emerges languorously in the ether just over the saint’s shoulder is understood to exist in the realm of a dream. But in its material density and proximity it is more than a dream. The supernatural impinges on the earthly realm, leaving the ring as a material souvenir of its existence. Christ pointedly turns his countenance toward the viewer while the physical press of the forms and embracing warmth of the atmosphere translate the joys of Catherine’s mystic marriage into earthly sensual terms that might be empathetically shared by the viewer.

Notes
1. The Greek inscription on Catherine’s book might have been supplied by Ascanio Persii, doctor of philosophy and professor of Greek language at the University of Bologna, who was a frequent visitor to the Carracci academy.
3. Stryiensky 1913, 13, 167, no. 218. Nancré had accompanied the duke to Spain and was appointed Capitaine des Suisses at the Palais Royal. Stryiensky states that Nancré had given the painting to the duke out of gratitude for honors received. On Nancré see Bonnaffé 1884, 229.
4. Dubois de Saint-Gelais 1727, 298; this is the first documentation of the painting in the Orléans collection.
5. Couché 1786–1808, i: no. 5.
7. Catalogue of Pictures at Cleveland House 1812, no. 25; Ottley and Tomkins 1818, no. 37, repro.; Catalogue of Pictures at Cleveland House 1825, 1: no. 33, pl. 10; Bridgewater Collection 1851, no. 48; and Waagen 1838, 2: 320.
8. The history of the trust is recounted in Cust 1903, v–vii. The painting is recorded in the following catalogues: Britton 1808, no. 25; Catalogue of Pictures at Cleveland House 1812, no. 25; Ottley and Tomkins 1818, no. 37, repro.; Catalogue of Pictures at Cleveland House 1825, 1: no. 33, pl. 10; Bridgewater Collection 1851, no. 48; and Waagen 1838, 2: 320.
9. According to marginal notations in the copy of the auction catalogue held by the Getty Provenance Index.
10. According to Kress 1951, 134.
11. Dubois de Saint-Gelais 1727, 298.
12. Only once in modern times has it been doubted, by
Arslan 1941, 272, who attributed it instead to a painter "between Annibale and Lodovico."

13. Bodmer 1939, 43.
15. The Dream of Saint Catherine is dated to c. 1590 by W. E. Suida in Kress 1951, 134.
18. Freedberg has suggested to the author that the same design, possibly even the same cartoon, used for the Virgin's sharply tilted head in the Saint Catherine, might have been reused in the Saint George and Catherine Led to Martyrdom painted in 1618. Emiliani 1993, 80, no. 37, repro.
20. Emiliani 1993, 64, no. 30, repro.
27. Louvre, inv. 7662, pen and brown ink and wash heightened with light beige body color, laid down, 27.6 x 23.8 cm. First associated with the present picture by Bodmer 1939, 43. Bohn 1982, 217, no. 72, dates the Louvre sheet to c. 1594. In the seventeenth century the drawing was in the collection of Everhard Jabach, and, as is the case with numerous other sheets that Jabach sold to the king, this drawing is partially reworked. Heavy highlights have been laid in over Lodovico's original delicate heightening. On Jabach's collection see Monbeig-Gogucl 1988, 821-835. A second drawing identified as preparatory to this painting was in the Collezione Comunali dell' Arte, Bologna, pen and chalk heightened with white on gray-green paper, 26 x 35 cm, published by Zucchini 1938, 292, no. 4. Unfortunately the drawing disappeared from the collection at some point before 1978 and was evidently never photographed.
28. Other Saint Catherines preserved by Lodovico include a very early canvas in a private collection, Bologna, for which see exh. cat. Bologna 1986, no. 101, repro., and a large canvas from the mid-1580s in the Konstmuseum, Gothenburg, Sweden, discussed in Feigenbaum 1984, no. 21. Several versions ascribed to Lodovico in the literature and in sales catalogues cannot now be traced; a complete list is included in this author's monograph on the artist (forthcoming). None of these references can be connected with the National Gallery painting. The version in Capodimonte, Naples, dating to the mid-1580s is by Annibale: Posner 1971, 2: 16, no. 32, fig. 32.
29. Lodovico's copy after Correggio was in the collection of the duc d'Orléans as well, for which see Dubois de Saint-Gelais 1727, 299.
30. It has also been argued that the burgeoning popularity of the subject in the sixteenth century reflected the worsening social problem of clandestine marriages. Defiant daughters who refused to accept the husbands their parents had chosen for them were increasingly inclined to form clandestine alliances on their own. The problem was debated at the Council of Trent, and Gabriele Paleotti, archbishop of Bologna, spoke out firmly against such marriages. For a woman unwilling to accept the prospective mate chosen by her parents, the virtuous alternative was to become a bride of Christ after the example of Saint Catherine. Presumably paintings of the saint would be commissioned by parents who wanted to provide daughters with a morally acceptable model to follow in case their choice of a mate proved unacceptable. See Zapperi 1989, 80-81, 95-96, n. 31.
31. For the iconography of the vision of Saint Catherine, which can be understood as a transmutation of symbolic thought into historical event in the course of development of the legends, see Sauer 1906, 339-351, and Meiss 1964, 106-108. According to Meiss, the earliest account of the mystic marriage is that of 1337, for which see Varnhagen 1891; see also Giovanni B. Bronzini, "Caterina di Alessandria," BiblSS 3: 966, who cited a fresco in Pozzouli dated c. 1200 that may represent the mystic marriage. The text of 1337 specifies that the ring was placed on Catherine's right hand, while Lodovico represents it on her left. For other early manifestations of the legend, consult Bronzini 1952, 75, and 1960, 257-241.
32. In Annibale's Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine, Capodimonte, Naples (see note 28), the saint's eyes are closed, though she is not in a pose of sleep.
34. A small copy on copper (30.5 x 25 cm), by a later hand, sold at Sotheby's, Sussex, on 20 May, 1991, lot 146. The National Gallery painting was engraved by R. Deaunay for the Orléans catalogue (Couque 1786-1808, 1: no. 5) and by I. Scott for the Stafford catalogue (Ortley and Tomkins 1818, no. 37); an etching was made by John Young for the 1825 Stafford catalogue (pl. 10) (see note 8 for references).
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Giuseppe Cesari, called the Cavaliere d’Arpino

Giuseppe Cesari, the son of a painter of votive images, was likely born in the small town of Arpino, located between Rome and Naples. After moving to Rome, probably in 1582, he was apprenticed to Nicolò Circignani (1530/1535–1596?), a painter working in a maniera style developed in Rome under the influence of Federico Zuccaro (1540–1541–1609). Cesari participated in the decoration of the Logge of Gregory XIII in the Vatican and in subsequent projects executed by groups of artists working under Circignani’s direction. Many papal commissions of the late sixteenth century were given to such well-organized teams of artists who could quickly execute the large narrative cycles required by the Counter-Reformation church. In this environment Cesari found an opportunity to develop his precocious talent and to experience the styles of other painters, particularly Cristoforo Roncalli (Il Pomerancio, 1552–1626), a fellow student of Circignani. The soft, transparent color of Cesari’s early style is close to that seen in the works of Giovanni de’ Vecchi (1536–1615), Andrea Lilio (1555–1610), Francesco Vanni (1563–1610), and others working in the idiom of Federico Barocci (1535–1612).

Cesari received his first independent commission in 1588, at the age of twenty, for frescoes in San Lorenzo in Damaso (lost but known through copies). These frescoes broke with the style of his teacher Circignani and reflected study of earlier Roman fresco cycles by Girolamo Muziano (1532–1592), a Brescian trained in Padua. Cesari’s San Lorenzo frescoes constituted the first step toward what Röttgen has called a “stile cerimoniale e rappresentativa,” characterized by symmetrical compositions, narrative clarity achieved through frontality and schematization, and a larger, more imposing figure canon. Cesari further developed this style in a series of major commissions executed in Rome and Naples during the 1590s. In the frescoes of the Olgiati Chapel in Santa Prassede, Rome, he made a significant, forward-looking break with earlier Roman ceiling decoration, creating a realistic expansion of the vault that may reflect the experience of northern Italian ceilings during a probable trip in 1590–1593.

Cesari’s position as the most prominent painter in Rome brought him the commission for scenes of Roman history in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in 1595 (executed 1595–1640) and close, personal ties to the papal court. He was made a Cavaliere di Cristo by Pope Clement VIII for his accomplishments in supervising decoration of the transept of the Lateran Basilica (1599–1601). Like the works of his collaborators in the Lateran, his own painting, the Ascension over the main altar, advances his mature style, resulting in his most significant contribution to the new classical ideal in Roman painting of the seventeenth century. Yet for all its anti-maniera innovations, Cesari’s mature style retains the graceful elegance of the maniera and a continuing dependence on forms and motifs derived from Raphael (1483–1520), Michelangelo (1475–1564), and Sebastiano del Piombo (1485–1547).

In addition to large fresco cycles and altarpieces, Cesari made a specialty of painting small pictures for private patrons, both Roman and foreign. These cabinet pictures were quite unlike those of his Roman contemporaries and expanded a market previously served by foreigners or artists working outside Rome. Cesari executed these paintings on wood, copper, or slate to accentuate their delicate technique and high finish; whether religious or mythological in subject, such paintings exhibit to a high degree the elegance and rarefied grace characteristic of Cesari’s art.

Although he never adapted to the radical changes in Roman painting instituted by his former student Caravaggio (1571–1610) and by the Carracci (q.v.) and their followers, Cesari continued to receive significant commissions until his death. His late style, after about 1610, became reactionary and reverted to a rigid preference for gracefully refined figures and schematized compositions. Pursuing a current tendency in official Roman painting, this late style also looked to early Renaissance and early Christian models.

Except for his sons Muzio (1619–1676) and Bernardino (d. 1703), Cesari had no direct followers, yet his art influenced a number of his contemporaries. Both Caravaggio and Andrea Sacchi (1599–1661) studied with him at the beginning of their careers and continued to express admiration and
respect for him. He was instrumental in Guido Reni's (1575–1642) initial success in Rome and influenced the younger Bolognese painter's style, at least for a time. Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610/1620) probably studied Cesari's small cabinet pictures, and Paul Brill (1554–1626) was said to have benefited from studying the treatment of landscape in his paintings.
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1984.4.1

**Martyrdom of Saint Margaret**

c. 1608/1611
Oil on wood, 85.1 x 62.6 (33 1/2 x 24 9/32)
Gift of David Edward Finley and Margaret Hustis Finley

**Inscriptions**
Signed on rock at lower left "IOSEPHUS CAESAR ARPINAS"

**Technical Notes:** The support is a poplar (populus sp.) panel with the woodgrain oriented vertically. The 1.6 to 1.8 cm thick panel has not been thinned and retains scrub plane toolmarks on the reverse. Three butterfly cleats on the reverse of the panel, one of which has fallen out, were later reinforced by two flush, dovetailed battens spanning the width of the panel. Traces remain of two wider battens attached to the surface of the panel, in the same location as the dovetailed battens. The ground was applied thinly using a toothed or combing tool or a stiff brush, creating horizontal strokes. Where visible in the sky, the ground appears reddish in color, but it is not certain if this color was applied consistently under the entire image. The paint was applied with a variety of strokes and handling from thin glazes, as in the foliage, to relatively high impasto in the white and yellow highlights and in the Virgin's blue robe. Reserves were left for the figures, but much overlapping occurred and is now more evident where layers have become transparent, particularly in the center angel's wings and in Saint Peter's robe. Additional pentimenti appear in the three putti and the angel at the top, due to the positioning of their limbs and wings.

Several checks run from the top center and bottom edge. The slight abrasion is most visible in the sky. Scattered losses along the center split, in Saint Margaret's hair, along the bottom edge, in Saint Paul's robe and forehead, and in the central angel's frond and wreath have been recently inpainted. The slight abrasion is most noticeable in the sky. The varnish is clear and even. The painting has not been treated since acquisition.


Since its appearance on the art market in the 1970s, the Martyrdom of Saint Margaret has been recognized as an authentic work by Giuseppe Cesari. Stylistic aspects of the painting accord with other works by the artist, and the signature at lower left may indicate that the panel was considered important within the Cavaliere d'Arpino's oeuvre. The dating, provenance, and commission of the painting are less secure, and Rüttgen's analysis of the Saint Margaret as a royal commission for Queen Margaret of Spain, wife of Philip III, needs reconsideration.3

A painting of this subject attributed to Cesari is listed in the Spanish royal collections in the Palacio Nuevo from at least 1772 until 1794.4 Although the inventory descriptions note dimensions that agree with the present work, they classify the support as copper. It is possible that the luminous quality of the surface and the delicate smoothness of the paint handling could have been confused with a work on metal. Identification of the Saint Margaret as this painting and as a royal commission is based on van Mander's account that Cesari painted a canvas of the *Presentation of the Virgin* (1597) for Margaret's mother, Maria of Bavaria,5 and that Pope Clement VIII later presented both Margaret and the queen mother with paintings on copper (whose subjects van Mander did not record) when the two met with the pope in Ferrara for the celebration of Margaret's marriage by proxy to Philip (13 November 1598).6 Moreover, the artist appears to have been meticulous in signing paintings for his most important patrons.7 The Cavaliere d'Arpino's previous relationship with the Spanish royal family and the rarity of the subject might support the claim that the National Gallery painting was for Queen Margaret. If this is the case, the painting must have been executed before the queen's death in 1611.8

The presence of her attribute, the dragon at lower right, identifies the fourth-century martyr from Antioch, who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was portrayed alone or with other saints as a
Giuseppe Cesari, Martyrdom of Saint Margaret, 1984.4.1
devotional image.9 According to legend, Margaret, the daughter of a pagan priest, was converted to Christianity by her Christian nurse. By the time she was fifteen, her beauty had attracted the notice of the Roman prefect Olybrius, who wanted to marry her. She would not give up her faith, so she was tortured and thrown into prison. There she was visited by her enemy in the form of a dragon, who sought to devour her. In one version of the story she vanquished him with the sign of the cross; in another he devoured her but burst open when she made the sign of the cross. After conquering him again when he reappeared as a young man, the next day she was again physically tortured and finally beheaded. Before her execution she was allowed to say her last prayers, which she did for her persecutors and for women in labor.

Except for a painting by Lodovico Carracci contemporary with Cesari’s depiction, the martyrdom seems to have appeared in the visual arts rarely except in complete cycles of the life of Saint Margaret, which were mostly executed before 1500.10 Unlike Lodovico’s painting, in which Margaret is shown dramatically anticipating the fall of the executioner’s sword, Cesari’s panel portrays that moment before her death when the martyr was granted time to say a last prayer. The numerous onlookers, some of whom (legend says five thousand) were converted to her faith when witnessing her tortures, are not identifiable. However, the bearded figure who gestures commandingly behind the soldier at right might be the prefect Olybrius. The painting emphasizes the power of the intercession of prayer more than the saint’s physical sacrifice. The Virgin and Child above, between the apostles Peter and Paul, look down approvingly as an angel carries the crown and palm of martyrdom. Certainly the depiction from Margaret’s life, her regal bearing, and the saint’s closeness to the deity in a heavenly vision above would have made Cesari’s painting appealing to a queen with the same name.11

The archaizing composition and color scheme are typical of paintings from the latter part of Cesari’s career after about 1610. The direct, triangular design of the Virgin and Child with the symmetrically arranged saints and angels overlooking a static and balanced relieflike grouping of figures recalls the early sixteenth-century examples of Raphael (1483–1520), Andrea del Sarto (1486–1530), Fra Bartolommeo (1472–1517), and others. The primary and saturated colors of the heavenly figures, the iridescent yellow and red of Saint Margaret’s robe, and the brightly, almost frontally lit scene suggest this early Renaissance influence. Only the executioner at left with his face partly in shadow and his dramatically turned muscular shape might suggest a flirtation with Caravagggesque naturalism.

As with so many of Cesari’s paintings, dating of the Martyrdom of Saint Margaret must rest on stylistic comparisons with datable works. Röttgen proposed the date 1615 because of affinities in color and composition with dated paintings of the same year, including the Martyrdom of Saint Stephen (Santa Giusta, Aquila) and the Coronation of the Virgin (Santa Maria in Valicella, Rome).12 The Coronation, however, may have been begun much earlier, since it was commissioned in 1592, or at least its compositional arrangement was probably already decided. In the signed and dated Saint Stephen, on the other hand, the composition and background are reduced to essentials, the main figures are flattened against the forward picture plane, and the contours of the figures hardened as in many of the Cavaliere’s later works. In contrast, the Martyrdom of Saint Margaret shares characteristics with some earlier paintings by the artist. Similar archaizing compositions can be found in works such as the Madonna del Rosario in San Domenico, Cesena, of 1601 and the Immaculate Conception, Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, Madrid, of around the same date.13 Analogous in its primary colors, friezelike composition, reduction of drapery to planar folds, and broad brushstrokes for the sky is the Deposition in the collection of the Marchese Mario Incisa della Rocchetta in Olgiata, which dates to c. 1608.14 The feathery foliage of the trees at left recur in paintings from both the first and second decades of the seventeenth century.

If the Martyrdom of Saint Margaret dates from as late as 1615, which is not supported by the stylistic evidence, it is unlikely that it is the same painting mentioned in the inventories in the Palacio Nuevo.15 However, the rarity of this subject in seventeenth-century Italian painting, its apparent connection with Queen Margaret, and its proximity in size to the painting in the Palacio Nuevo are strong arguments for identifying it as the painting in the inventories and for suggesting a date somewhat earlier than Röttgen originally proposed, possibly c. 1608–1611.16
The Martyrdom of Saint Margaret is one of the elaborate and refined compositions in a small format that were unlike those of the Cavaliere’s Roman contemporaries and earned him a glowing reputation abroad. A probable near contemporary copy on canvas recently on the art market underscores the popularity of these pictures.

Notes

1. Pérez Sánchez 1965, 224, citing inventories of 1772 and 1794: “otro en lámina, del Martirio de Santa Margarita, de vara de largo y tres cuartos de ancho, original de Joseph Arpina.” The dimensions correspond exactly and it would seem logical that an inventory-taker might confuse copper and panel. A painting identified as “el martirio de una Santa” by the Cavaliere d’Arpino was listed with the same dimensions but no record of support in the royal inventory of 1789–1790: Inventarios reales, 19, no. 73. It has not been identified in the inventories of Charles II: Testamentaria del Rey Carlos II.

2. The painting was also seen by visitors to the Royal Collections: Ponz 1776, 6: 526; Cumberland 1777, 51; Conca y Alvarez 1793, 116.


4. Sec provenance. The present painting first appeared in France in 1970, leading Röttgen 1973, 126, to suggest that it left Spain shortly after these inventories were written and entered France as Napoleonic war booty.


6. Van Mander 1604, fol. 189v, translated in Röttgen 1973, 182. According to van Mander, Cesari accompanied the pope to Ferrara and there painted three small works in oil on copper. One was of Saint George and the Dragon; the other two were given to Margaret and to her mother. On the Saint George see Röttgen 1973, 98, no. 23. The style of the present painting suggests that it was not painted as early as 1598 and should therefore not be associated with the papal gift. The marriage was later celebrated in Valencia on 18 April 1599.

7. Röttgen 1973, 126. The Presentation for Margaret’s mother is also signed, as are other paintings.

8. Margaret died in childbirth on 3 October 1611, and exequies were held for her in San Jerónimo, Madrid, 17–18 November 1611. See Orso 1989, 17, 28. Further exequies were held in Florence on 6 February 1612. See Bertelé 1969, 138–141.

9. On the life and images of Saint Margaret of Antioch see Maria Chiara Celletti in BiblSS 8: 1150–1166. See also Golden Legend, 351–355, and Lexikon der Christlichen ikonogra-
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1985 NGA: 78, repro.
Giuseppe Maria Crespi  
1665 – 1747

Crespi learned the rudiments of drawing and painting from his first teacher, Angelo Michele Toni (1640–1708), a professional copyist. His unique style, however, evolved over years of essentially self-directed study in the 1680s. After leaving Toni, he began to draw and copy the fresco decorations of the Carracci (q.v.) in the cloister of San Michele in Bosco and in Palazzo Magnani and Palazzo Fava. For all its originality, Crespi’s style never abandoned its roots in the art of the Carracci and their followers, particularly Guercino (q.v.) in his first manner.

During the 1680s Crespi formed loose associations with leading Bolognese painters. He worked briefly in the studio of Domenico Maria Canuti (1626–1684), who represented the more exuberant current in Bolognese painting, but he soon returned to his independent study of the Carracci. Eventually Crespi entered the studio of Carlo Cignani (1628–1719), the leading exponent of a Bolognese classicism derived from the late styles of Guido Reni (1575–1642) and Guercino. When Cignani moved to Forli in 1686, Crespi and Giovanni Antonio Burrini (1656–1727), another student of Canuti, rented Cignani’s studio; Crespi soon adopted Burrini’s Venetian color and brushwork. He also frequented the drawing academy in the palace of Senator Ghisilieri, where he was awarded several prizes. With the financial support of the Bolognese collector Giovanni Ricci, Crespi followed his own version of the Carracci’s “studioso corso” to Parma, Urbino, Pesaro, and Venice to study and copy (also for resale by Ricci) the works so important in the initial formation of the Bolognese school. Crespi made a second brief trip to Venice in 1690 when he felt constrained to flee Bologna, having, in an expression of his characteristic humor, caricatured the very learned biographer and critic Carlo Cesare Malvasia as a dead chicken. In Venice, Crespi again studied the loose, loaded brushwork and rich surfaces of the great sixteenth-century masters, as well as Sebastiano Mazzoni (1611–1678).

Although no chronology can be established for Crespi’s works of the 1690s, it was in this decade that he attained his distinctive mature style and developed new subject matter. Crespi’s scenes of mythological and genre subjects set in delicate landscapes reinterpret in a more playful and often earthier mode the Bolognese pastoral tradition begun by Francesco Albani (1578–1660) and continued in a more refined vein by Cignani. In developing a new type of genre painting, Crespi also drew upon a local tradition stretching back to Bartolomeo Pasarotti (1529–1592) and Annibale Carracci, whose drawings of Bolognese artisans were continued in the etchings of Crespi’s associate Giuseppe Maria Mitelli (1634–1718). Crespi’s genre paintings capture common people and laborers in the activities of everyday life, generally set in a dark, monochrome brown atmosphere relieved by carefully studied light effects. As he cultivated a clientele of private collectors and connoisseurs for his pastoral and genre subjects, he turned away from the altarpieces that seemed to dominate his production up to about 1690.

By the first years of the eighteenth century, Crespi had developed a considerable clientele in Italy and northern Europe. While he refused a lucrative commission to execute frescoes in Vienna for the prince of Liechtenstein, Crespi actively cultivated the patronage of Ferdinando III de’ Medici, to whom in 1708 he personally gave a Massacre of the Innocents (Uffizi, Florence), painted especially to show his ability in disposing many figures engaged in complex actions. The grand duke took a particular interest in the artist, and Crespi presented him with some of his most innovative and complex genre works. On several trips to Florence, Crespi was able to study the genre scenes by the Netherlandish painters known as the Bamboccianti in the extensive Medici collections. From these he assimilated new types of subject matter and new modes of observation into his already well-developed genre style.

After the intense genre production of the 1710s, Crespi in his last years received an increasing number of religious commissions in and around Bologna. In these works he continued to develop his style with reference to the early seventeenth-century Bolognese masters rather than to contemporary developments in altar painting. In the 1720s he also returned to his earlier pastoral subjects, but now with a lighter palette and more elegant conception, and continued to execute portraits. From the later 1720s he with-
drew increasingly into himself; he closed his studio and relied only on his sons Luigi (1709–1779) and Antonio (1700/1704–1781) for assistance. Yet he did not cease to be an innovative, creative artist, exploring light effects with a camera obscura and remaining open to new artistic influences, such as that of Rembrandt (1606–1669).

Despite his fame, Crespi had little influence on Bolognese artists; he had withdrawn quite early from active participation in the Accademia Clementina, which he had helped to found in the first decade of the eighteenth century. His genre painting was the most influential aspect of his art, especially for the Venetians Giovanni Battista Piazzetta (q.v.), who almost certainly studied in Bologna for a time, and Pietro Longhi (q.v.). Crespi’s sons were his closest and most successful followers; Luigi had particular success as a portrait painter, but is now better known for his biographies of Bolognese artists.
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1939.1.62 (173)

Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs

C. 1690/1705
Oil on copper, 52.4 x 75.5 (20 7/16 x 29 7/16)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a hammered copper sheet 0.01 cm thick. It is mounted on a plywood panel with metal edge strips. Its surface was prepared with a layer of opaque green paint with large particles of white, perhaps applied over an initial priming layer. Before it was completely dry, palm or thumb prints were pressed into the green layer to produce a texture that is also apparent in the subsequent paint layers. The green ground serves as a middle tone that constitutes the lighter horizon level in the sky and serves as the basis for the darker areas. The paint is applied wet-in-wet in thin, opaque layers with semitransparent glazes in the sky, leaves, and shadowed drapery folds. Semitranslucent glazes were used for the facial details, which are not sharply delineated and thus produce a slightly blurred, sfumato effect. While there is no high impasto, drapery folds and other details are applied in thick, pastose paint more textured by the brush.

There are small scattered losses along the lower edge. Minor abrasion has occurred along the remaining edges and in the sky. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored in 1931 by Stephen Pichetto. The varnish is now slightly discolored.

Provenance: (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome), by 1928; purchased 1930 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.1


Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs represents one of Crespi’s most popular subjects: at least twelve variations of the theme are known, either entirely by his hand, with workshop assistance, or through copies. An almost exact replica of the Washington picture is in Paris.3 Another variation, location unknown,4 lacks the landscape at top but includes additional cupids. Two others, on the New York art market,5 reprise in one the left half of the Washington picture with the putto at far right disarming cupids, while the other takes up the theme of nymphs disarming sleeping cupids. Paintings in the Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna; the Museum der Bildenden Künste, Leipzig; the Suida-Manning Collection, Forest Hills; the Pushkin Museum, Moscow; private collection, Strasbourg; and on the art market also represent this pendant subject of the nymphs disarming cupids.6 In addition, two small paintings of frolicking cupids in the El Paso Museum of Art are related in spirit to the pictures of nymphs and cupids.7 The National Gallery’s Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs, whose authenticity has never been questioned, is considered one of Crespi’s major statements in this genre.

The twelve known variations of these two subjects indicate that Crespi and his studio were active in perpetuating a theme that reverted to one made popular in the first half of the seventeenth century by the Bolognese artist Francesco Albani. As Merriman has pointed out, following the exhibition of...
Lorenzo Pasinelli’s (1629–1700) painting of *Cupids Disarmed by Nymphs* in 1690, other Bolognese artists turned to similar arcadian scenes based on Albani’s much earlier pastoral subjects. If Crespi indeed was spurred on to this subject by Pasinelli’s painting, he turned to Albani for his figures and composition. Merriman has shown that Albani’s series of paintings of Venus (including the theme of Cupid disarmed), known in Bologna through engravings and copies, were the models used by Crespi. Other than the subject of Cupid disarmed, Crespi appropriated the general compositions of these paintings and others by Albani in which small figures cavort in idyllic wooded landscapes at twilight. Albani was the first to depict the subject of nymphs disarming sleeping cupids, but Crespi’s theme of the cupids disarming the nymphs was his own invention. Unlike Albani, however, Crespi’s nymphs and cupids are not idealized, porcelainlike figures but down-to-earth types. This penchant for genre as well as for a naturalistic representation of form suggests influences from other Bolognese painters, particularly Burrini, with whom Crespi shared a studio, and Guercino, whom Zanotti said Crespi copied. In fact, the darkened sky and the slip of light on the sunset horizon in this and other paintings by Crespi suggest that he studied Guercino’s paintings in depth.

The dating of paintings by Crespi is hampered by his habit of repeating themes at various points in his long career and by the less-than-linear progression of his stylistic development. The *Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs* has been placed within the artist’s first mature period (1690–1706), but scholars differ on exactly when in these years it was produced. The problem is complicated by the existence of the “Cucc” paintings represented *Cupid Disarmed by the Nymphs of Diana* and *The Nymphs who Make Various Jokes on Cupid*. There appears to have been but one cupid in each of those paintings. It is certainly possible that the Washington and Moscow pictures were conceived as pendants of complementary subjects, if not for “Milord Cucc,” then for another patron interested in the pastoral mode. Luigi Crespi mentioned a *Nymphs Making Fun of the Sleeping Cupid* in the house of the Bolognese Tubertini. Oretti knew of several capriccios of women and putti in the air in the collection of the Bolognese Eneas Caprara, who was resident in Bologna before 1700. The terminus ante quem for paintings by Crespi in Caprara’s collection is Caprara’s death in 1701, and for this reason some scholars have dated this type of painting to the 1690s. Unfortunately, given the few contemporary notices and the similarity in subject of the pictures with cupids and nymphs, the search for the patron as well as the date of the Washington picture must continue.

According to Merriman, the taste for this type of pastoral subject matter reappeared in Bologna in the 1690s. In the Bolognese Accademia dell’Arcadia a new genre of poetry emerged in which nymphs and shepherdesses frolicked and the seriousness of life was discounted in favor of the pleasures of laughter and the burlesque. The lightness and simplicity of the poetry of this period was a reaction to the grandiosity and pomposity of seventeenth-century baroque literature. Crespi’s paintings suggest a similar reaction to what was considered a bombastic trend in painting.

Some of Crespi’s paintings reflect not only the general mood but the specific subjects of the Bolognese Arcadian poets. Perhaps the Washington and Moscow nymphs and cupids were conceived in this atmosphere and illustrate one of the anacreontic pastoral poems favored by the Accademia dell’Arcadia. The small scale of the figures, exquisitely delineated with delicate effects on the copper support, suggests the quiet nature of the subjects, conceived as counterpoints. As the nymphs disarm the fatal power of the cupids, so do the cupids make fun of
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the seriousness of the nymphs. The very frivolity of the simple jokes represented\(^2\) may have been seen by some as *bizarrerie* and lighthearted *poésie*, but was possibly conceived as the representation of Arcadian values in contrast to the high-handed seriousness of previous literature. As messengers of love these cupids combine a playful innocence with an underlying eroticism. The pairing of the opposite subjects may suggest, however, a deeper meaning; the struggle between chastity and lust could represent the struggle between divine and carnal love.\(^2\) Whether the informal Arcadian atmosphere is meant as jocund entertainment or the seriousness of elevated wit, the paintings were meant to be enjoyed with friends in the surroundings of private households. They could even have been destined for the patron's bedroom, the subjects reflecting the room's function.\(^2\)

It may not be possible to determine if the Washington painting was painted in the 1690s or early 1700s. The very frivolity of the chaste goddess, the huntress Diana. They disarm cupids of their dangerous weapons of love and clip their wings to keep them from willfully spreading their message. In contrast, the cupids disarm the nymphs of their hunting equipment. The fawn at lower left, although it appears to sleep, may have been slain by the nymphs. The dogs could represent their hunting companions.

11. For Buriti's influence on Crespi see Angelo Mazza in exh. cat. Bologna 1990, LIV-LVII.


14. For the Moscow painting see note 6, above. It measures 52 x 74 cm and is also on copper. Giordano Virol in exh. cat. Bologna 1990, 192, agreed with Merriman's late dating of the Moscow painting but rejected the idea that it could be paired with the Washington picture, which he dated in the 1690s. Rolli 1977, 106, saw the two paintings as a pair.


16. Victoria Markova, curator of Italian Paintings at the Pushkin Museum, agrees with the present writer on the earlier dating for the painting in Moscow (conversation with the author 23 July 1993).

17. Zanotti 1739, 2: 56, and Crespi 1769, 214, spelled the name "Cuc." The idea was taken up by Lasareff 1929, 17; in exh. cat. Bologna 1935 and exh. cat. New York 1938; and by Liebmann 1976, 20. Rolli 1982, 131–132, also thought that the theme of the Moscow painting was one of those for "Milord Cuk" but believed the picture at Algranti was the first version of the theme painted in the teens and that the Moscow painting dates from c. 1730.

18. Suggestions as to the identity of "Milord Cucc" include Thomas Coke, who was in Italy from 1713–1717 and who bought an Albani in Bologna, or a member of the Cooke family (notes by Ross Watson in NGA curatorial files).


22. On the pastoral mode and some of the ideas mentioned here see Merriman 1980, 77–101.

23. In the first half of the eighteenth century, certain paintings of putti were influenced by poetry. Giambattista

---

Notes


2. This exhibition of nine paintings from the Golden Gate International Exposition held earlier that year in San Francisco is recorded in *ArtN* 38 (1939), 13.


4. Merriman 1980, 283, no. 174, sold at the Dorotheum, Vienna, 15–18 February 1961. From the photograph this painting appears to be not from Crespi’s hand.

5. The inferior quality of these two suggests that they are copies: exh. cat. Bologna 1990, nos. 34–35, repro. Other paintings with themes similar to the Washington painting and Moscow paintings have passed through the sales rooms, for example, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 19 March 1982, lot 48, and Sotheby’s, London, 10 December 1980, lot 33.


8. For Pasinelli’s painting see exh. cat. Bologna 1959, no. 77, repro.

9. For the history of the commission of Albani’s paintings in the Louvre (which were in Paris when Crespi painted his cupids), see Askew 1978, 291–293, figs. 23–29. See also Puglisi 1983, 114–115, for a discussion of Albani’s other pastoral and mythological paintings. On the meaning of the Louvre cycle as representing the Four Elements see von Fleming 1990, 309–312. Merriman noted too that the figure on the far right of the Washington painting is based on the cupid pulling Adonis in Albani’s *Adonis Brought by Cupids to Sleeping Venus*.
Marino supposedly inspired Poussin in a new lyricism in painting in which the tenerezza of the "putto moderno" was favored over the "putto antico," that is a smaller infant portrayed in acts beyond his physical capabilities. See Colantuono 1989, 207–214.

24. Merriman 1980, 84, thought the putto at the center of the Washington painting is surveying his genitals in the mirror and that the cupid’s arrow lands on an operatic bill, referring to the allure of the opera singers of this period. The cupid appears instead to look past himself, perhaps at the dog, who poses.

25. Albani said that the subject of nymphs disarming sleeping cupids reflects the struggle between chastity and sensual love (Malvasia 1841, 2: 163; Puglisi 1983, 119–120).
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1952.5.30 (842)

**Tarquin and Lucretia**

c. 1695/1700

Oil on canvas, 195 × 171.5 (76 ⅜ × 67 ½), including 31.8 cm strip added at the top

Samuel H. Kress Collection

 Tribunal Notes: The support is a coarse, twill-weave fabric prepared with a white ground and a red-brown imprimatura. The image was blocked out using white and very dark brown paint, and then executed with fast brushwork in sweeps and dabs. X-radiographs show that Lucretia’s head was raised, and the position of her mouth was changed. The entwined limbs were executed as follows: Tarquin’s right side and head were sketched in, then the figure-eight loop was completed by adding Lucretia’s right arm, and finally Tarquin’s left hand was painted over Lucretia’s completed shoulder.

The original dimensions of the painting have been significantly altered. The tacking margins have been removed on all sides. In x-radiographs distinct cusping is visible only at the top, suggesting that the painting was cut down at the left, right, and bottom. A strip measuring 31.8 cm was added at the top early in the painting’s history, judging from its condition. The strip was painted to match the original composition, but its colors have not aged in the same way (see fig. 1). Alterations in the pigments of the main composition have changed its tonal balance and color; the reds have faded and the increased transparency in the darks has led to a loss of definition in the shadows. There are numerous small tears and losses of ground and paint. Areas of darkened overpaint are present throughout. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto about 1940.

Provenance: Possibly Palazzo Barbazza, Bologna, by 1739 until at least the 1760s.  
1 Probably Duke Albert von Sachsen-Teschen (1738–1822), Bratislava, Brussels, and Vienna, by 1768 (as Mattia Preti).  
2 (Guillaume Verbelen, Brussels); (his sale, Brussels, 8 October 1833, no. 148, as Mattia Preti). J. J. Chapuis, Brussels; (his sale, De Donker and Vergeote, Brussels, 4 December 1865, no. 320, as Mattia Preti).  
4 (Le Bouheler, Paris); purchased 1938 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


Crespi’s Tarquin and Lucretia represents the story related by Livy and Ovid of the Roman Lucretia, wife of Collatinus, who was raped by Sextus Tarquinius, the son of the Tarquin king Superbus. One night during a military campaign, various men spoke of their wives, each praising his own. Collatinus, believing his wife to be the most worthy, invited the men to meet her. They accompanied Collatinus to Collada, where they surprised the beautiful Lucretia making a cloak for her husband and crying for his safety. Tarquin, who was among them, was immediately smitten. Vowing to possess her, he returned alone later and was welcomed by Lucretia as a friend of her husband. During the night while the household slept, he approached the chaste Lucretia and was rebuffed in his advances even when he threatened her with death. He then threatened to kill her black servant, leave him in her bed, and tell Collatinus that she had committed
adultery with a lowly valet. Fearing the shame this would bring, Lucretia submitted to Tarquin, but, after the rape, summoned her husband and father. She recounted the rape and, before they could stop her, with a knife concealed in her clothes took her life rather than bring shame on her family. Lucretia’s father and husband sought vengeance on Tarquin, an act which eventually destroyed the monarchy and established the Roman republic. Lucretia’s courage and the republican outcome of the vengeance made her story an attractive subject throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Republic of Venice. Elsewhere in Italy, its drama and representation of exemplary morality, steadfastness, and chastity extended its popularity.7

Crespi portrayed the best known episode from Lucretia’s life, the intensely emotional moment before the rape. Rather than brandish the knife at his innocent victim, Tarquin raises his hand to his lips to silence her, the threats having already taken their effect. On the floor lies the sword Tarquin had used in his initial threat to kill Lucretia. Also below is a rose whose petals have fallen, perhaps as a portent of the end of Lucretia’s marriage and life.8 Crespi’s Tarquin and Lucretia is a highly original depiction of an often represented subject. In no other extant painting of the theme is Tarquin seen without his sword raised in anger or with his hand at his lips to quiet Lucretia, nor does one see elsewhere Lucretia resisting with her hand on Tarquin’s head or the addition of the symbolic, violated rose. The gestures of the defiler and the victim and the effect of the fallen flower strengthen the pathos of the scene.

Although Crespi’s interpretation of the rape of Lucretia was unique, he turned to Venetian examples for stylistic authority. The chromatic effects of the thinly applied paint in the dress of Tarquin and the diaphanous draperies of Lucretia are directly dependent on late paintings by Titian (c. 1488–1576), especially his treatment of the same subject for Philip II in 1571.9 Although Crespi was also impressed by the interpretations of Tintoretto (1518–1594),9 it is Titian’s style that one discerns in the muted, scumbled passages of paint and in the shimmering, almost iridescent fabrics. Because of these evident Venetian influences, scholars have agreed that the Tarquin and Lucretia, whose authorship is unquestioned, must date after Crespi’s trip(s) to Venice c. 1690, reported by both Zanotti and Crespi’s son Luigi.11 Suggestions for the date of the painting have ranged from c. 1690 (by Spike, who sensed the influence of Crespi’s teacher Burrini in the profile of

---

**Fig. 1.** 1952.5.30, cropped to show original size

**Fig. 2.** Giuseppe Maria Crespi, *Hecuba Blinding Polynestor*, c. 1695/1700, oil on canvas, Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique [photo: Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique, © A.C.L.-Bruxelles]
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Tarquin) to c. 1700 (by Merriman, who saw the painting as more developed and structurally sophisticated than earlier works). Considering the difficulty in dating any of Crespi’s work on the basis of style, it seems wise to place the Tarquin and Lucretia within a broad time span. Closest comparisons stylistically and compositionally are found in the frescoes in the Palazzo Pepoli Campogrande in Bologna; the two pendant paintings for Prince Eugene of Savoy, Achilles and the Centaur Chiron and Aeneas, Charon, and the Sibyl (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna); and the Hecuba Blinding Polymnestor (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Brussels; fig. 2). Scholars have been unable to reach a consensus on the dates of these paintings, placing them variously within the years 1690 to 1705.

The loose, Venetian-inspired handling of paint and the squat format of the composition, in which the figures are pressed down by the top of the frame (see fig. 1 for original size of composition), have suggested close connections of the Tarquin and Lucretia with the three easel paintings mentioned above. Two of these, Achilles and the Centaur Chiron and Aeneas, Charon, and the Sibyl, although similar in composition, style, and format, are somewhat smaller in dimension and probably do not, as has been argued recently, belong to the same commission as the Washington and Brussels paintings. The proposal that Tarquin and Lucretia and Hecuba Blinding Polymnestor are pendants, however, deserves serious consideration. Dimensions are similar, and the paintings exhibit complementary diagonal movements across the canvas. The subjects from Roman history and Greek tragedy suggest vengeance and portray strong women forced to violent acts in defense of family and country. The dark backdrops, diaphanous drapery, color harmonies, and loose handling of paint are the same in both.

The question of the pairing of these paintings is dependent on the provenance of the Tarquin and Lucretia, until now not satisfactorily explained. When Zanotti wrote in 1739, he had seen a painting of this subject, along with another by Crespi of Queen Tomyris with the head of Cyrus, in the collection of Senator Barbazza, Bologna. No painting by Crespi with the latter subject is known. The Tarquin and Tomyrus were not mentioned as pendants nor are dimensions given in the sources; thus, the identification of the National Gallery painting with the one in the Barbazza collection is speculative. On the other hand, the comparable Hecuba Blinding Polymnestor and the Tarquin and Lucretia are said to have appeared in the sale of Albert von Sachsen-Teschen’s collection in the early 1820s. A third picture was sold with these two: a Ulysses Abducting Andromache’s Son Astyanax, lost but known through a drawing after the painting by Duke Albert (fig. 3) and an engraving by Jacob Schmuzer (1733–1811) after this drawing. All three paintings, of similar size and once in the duke’s collection in the late eighteenth century, were attributed erroneously to Mattia Preti (1613–1699).

Unlike the Tarquin and Lucretia, which depicts an episode from Roman history, the two other paintings represent tales from Greek tragedy. In the first, Hecuba, wife of Priam, king of Troy, takes vengeance on Polymnestor, king of Thrace, who had been entrusted with her son Polidorus and the treasure of the city of Troy. When the city fell, Polymnestor killed Polidorus and stole the treasure. For this heinous crime Hecuba, aided by the women of Troy, took revenge. Crespi reduced the chorus of women to one, who holds Hecuba as she ferociously attacks and
The identification of the Washington painting with the one in Duke Albert’s collection does not preclude the Barbazza provenance nor the inclusion of the Queen Tomyris with the Head of Cyrus as part of this group. The story of Tomyris is related by Herodotus. During the battles between the widow Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae, and Cyrus, ruler of Persia, who sought to subdue her country, Tomyris’ son Spargapises was taken captive by Cyrus and committed suicide. In one of the fiercest encounters of the war Tomyris attacked Cyrus, who fell in battle with much of his army. To show contempt for her enemy, Tomyris put the head of Cyrus in a skin filled with blood, having threatened earlier to give him his share of blood if he attacked. The four paintings thus represent women from ancient history and literature forced into violent and heroic acts by outside forces thrust upon them. Three of the heroines are mothers protecting their sons or taking revenge for their deaths. In the fourth, the Roman Lucretia’s act is also the catalyst for revenge. Each story connects the woman with her husband, family, and country, and in each the future of the city or country is at stake. This free association of subjects is not unusual for a seventeenth-century series of paintings and does not in any way preclude the four paintings from conforming to a single commission. It is also possible that the paintings were ordered at different times and that the patron or artist suggested appropriate subjects to conform with the paintings already in the collection. Whether the lost Queen Tomyris was one of the group is unknown; however, Tarquin and Lucretia, Hecuba Blinding Polynestor, and the Ulysses Abducting Astyanax (whose composition is known from the later drawing and print) appear to have been conceived as a series or at least were thought of as such when in Duke Albert’s collection.
disposition and general thrust of the figures in Crespi’s painting repeat those in Titian’s. Spike also saw the influence of Titian’s late brushwork in the National Gallery painting and cited his late painting of Tarquin and Lucretia in the Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna (exh. cat. Venice 1990, no. 73, color repro.).

10. As first noted by Howe 1941, 3. See also Merriman 1980, 284, no. 177. Crespi is documented as having made a copy of a painting by Tintoretto when in Venice (see letter of 26 February 1708, published by Spike 1986, 224, doc. 8).

11. Zanotti 1739, 2: 39 noted one trip to Venice; Crespi 1769, 204, 206, stated that there were two trips. On the Venetian trips and their influence see Merriman 1980, 25, 66, 68–75, and Spike 1986, 29.


13. Merriman 1980, nos. 158, 150, and 258, respectively, and exh. cat. Bologna 1990, nos. 21, 15. See also the following note.

14. The Vienna paintings measure 120 × 172 cm (Aeneas, Charon, and the Sibyl) and 136 × 124 cm (Achilles and the Centaur Chiron). Roli 1989, 265, implied a connection between the Washington painting and those for Eugene: “dipinte per Eugenio di Savoia oggi al Kunsthistorisches Museum di Vienna, cui possono aggiungersi anche il Tarquinio e Lucrezia di Washington e l’Ecuba che acceca Polimnestore dei Musei Reali di Bruxelles.” It is not clear if Roli meant to connect the paintings stylistically or if he believed that Eugene was the patron for each. Burkarth 1990, 269–270, believed that Tarquin and Lucretia and Hecuba Blinding Polyphemus were probably executed for Prince Eugene in c. 1700–1705 for his palace at Ráckeve. There is no proof that the paintings were commissioned by Prince Eugene.

15. Hecuba measures 173 × 184 cm, Tarquin approximately 175 × 172 cm without the strip that was added subsequently (see technical notes). The Tarquin has also been cut at the left, right, and bottom.

16. Also mentioned by Oretti, see note 1.

17. See provenance.

18. An example of Schmuzer’s print is in the Albertina, Vienna. The drawing is in the Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna (inv. 17.129, 340 × 340, chalk).

19. Voss seems to have been the first to recognize the Tarquin and Lucretia as by Crespi when he saw it in Paris in 1937, according to Shapley 1979, 1: 146, n. 1. The paintings for Prince Eugene in Vienna were also misattributed to Mattia Preti in the late eighteenth century: Heinz 1966, 69–70.


21. For the various sources of the story of Ulysses and Astyanax see Pauly-Wissowa 2, 2: 1866–1867.

22. To judge from the description of the painting in the Chapuis sale catalogue (106–107, no. 319), the red mantle covering Ulysses’ legs might complement that in the Tarquin and Lucretia. There, the paintings of Tarquin and Lucretia and Ulysses Abducting Astyanax were considered pendants. Each measured 190 × 194, close enough in height to assume that each had a strip added at top, which can be seen in the drawing by Duke Albert. On the other hand, the width is about 20 cm larger than the present width of the Washington painting, which, however, has been cut down by approximately 10 cm on the left and right (see technical notes).

23. The paintings for Prince Eugene, not much smaller and of similar format, were known to have been overdoors. See Burkarth 1990, 266–268.

24. The four paintings could have been together in the Barbazza collection while only two were mentioned by Zanotti, according to Shapley 1979, 1: 146, n. 4, or, conversely, Crespi certainly could have repeated the theme of Lucretia for different patrons.


26. As an analogous example, the series of paintings for Louis Phélypeaux, sieur de La Villière, secretary of state to Louis XIII, changed from stoic themes to scenes of heroic and beautiful women probably after the patron’s purchase of Guido Reni’s Rape of Europa, according to Mahon 1992, 163, under cat. 39. A series of paintings by Luca Giordano (q.v.) included a Rape of the Sabines together with Old Testament stories, according to Oreste Ferrari in a forthcoming article on paintings formerly in the collection of Nelson Shanks (in notes shown to the author by Gerald Stiebel).

27. For example, as Spike 1986, 117–118, has shown, Prince Eugene of Savoy had commissioned Aeneas and the Centaur Chiron with three other paintings by Benedetto Gennari (1633–1715), Gian Gioseffo dal Sole (1654–1719), and Giovanni Antonio Burrini, and that Crespi’s second painting of Aeneas, Charon, and the Sibyl was commissioned later. The first has a terminus ante quern of 1697 and the second probably also dates before that year. The two hung as pendants in the eighteenth century.
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Donato Creti
1671 – 1749

Donato Creti was born in Cremona, the son of Giuseppe Creti (1634–1714), an undistinguished Bolognese quadratura painter. After the family’s return to Bologna, Donato’s natural talents came to light and he soon entered the studio of the local painter Giorgio Raparini (1660–1725). While learning only the rudiments of the painter’s art from Raparini, he spent his time drawing after prints by Guido Reni (1575–1642) and Simone Cantarini (q.v.).

The young Creti’s precocious talent did not go unnoticed, and at the urging of an associate of his father’s he moved to the studio of Lorenzo Pasinelli (1629–1700), then the preeminent painter in Bologna. It is unclear how long he spent with Pasinelli before entering the household of his first patron, Count Alessandro Fava. Around 1700 he made his only trip outside Bologna, traveling to Venice in the company of the younger Fava, Pietro Ercole, a colleague from Pasinelli’s life-drawing classes. Here Creti gained firsthand experience of the Venetian painters who had been and would continue to be so important in his development, particularly Veronese (1528–1588) and Titian (c. 1488–1576).

Creti began painting at the age of fifteen, and after an initial, as yet sparsely documented period to about 1700, he settled into a mature style that changed little. This style derives principally from that of his teacher Pasinelli, a student of Cantarini, who was, in turn, a student of Reni. Creti is thus linked directly to the Renian current in the Bolognese school by both temperament and training. According to his friend and biographer Anton Maria Zanotti, Creti was an obsessive perfectionist who took particular pains over the poses, expressions, and draperies of individual figures. A similarly meticulous attention to detail is seen in his small, neat brushstrokes and his highly finished surfaces. His flesh is smooth and porcelainlike, and his bold colors have a deep, almost metallic brilliance, for, as Zanotti recounted, Creti shunned the dark varnishes used by other painters to imitate the patina that builds up naturally over time.

Creti’s initial output was destined primarily for the collection of his principal patrons, Alessandro Fava and his son Pietro Ercole. From the first years of the eighteenth century he was mainly engaged in executing easel paintings for Bolognese nobles, as well as for Roman cardinals and foreign collectors. These paintings are primarily of mythological or pastoral subjects, generally consisting of a few graceful figures carefully disposed in idyllic landscape settings. In the latter part of his career, from c. 1730 on, he executed a number of large altarpieces for churches in Bologna and also sent many to nearby cities. In creating these religious works he continued to look to Reni and the earlier Bolognese masters, drawing on them for compositional schemas and individual figures.

Along with Zanotti, Creti was active in the founding and subsequent activities of the Accademia Clementina in Bologna, but, perhaps due to his difficult personality, had few students of his own. In any event, he had little impact on the development of the Bolognese school, which looked increasingly to outside, particularly Venetian, influences in the later eighteenth century.
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1961.9.6 (1363)

Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father

Probably 1700/1705
Oil on canvas, 129.7 x 97 (51 x 37 1/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support consists of a large piece of somewhat coarsely woven fabric with an additional strip approximately 4.5 cm high added at the bottom, which itself consists of two pieces of a different fabric. All three pieces were sewn together prior to application of a moderately thin ground layer. On the main section the ground is tan; on the bottom strip it is gray. X-radiographs reveal a random pattern of sweeping strokes created by the instrument used to apply the ground, probably a palette knife. The paint was very thinly applied with a range of paste to fluid consistencies. The numerous pentimenti visible to the eye are not vis-
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ible in x-radiographs, but can be more clearly discerned using infrared reflectography. Among the innumerable small shifts in drapery contours and figure poses, the most notable are the changes in position of Alexander’s legs. Also, the supine figure at lower left was added over different pre-existing compositional elements.

The tacking margins have been removed, resulting in losses around the edges. There is cusping along all four sides of the main fabric section. Cusping on the added fabrics occurs only on the outside edges and does not match that on the main section, indicating that ground was applied on each at different times. There are areas of abrasion overall. The blues have sunken in and darkened, as have the shadowed flesh tones. Glazes may have been lost in Alexander’s chair. The varnish is yellowed and somewhat hazy. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored in 1955 by Mario Modestini.

Provenance: Possibly Count Alessandro Fava; his son, Count Pietro Ercole Fava [1667 or 1669–1744], Bologna, by 1739;1 his son, Carlo Fava [d. 1790], Bologna, until at least c. 1770.2 (Julius Weitzner, New York), by 1938;3 purchased 1952 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York, 1952.4


Donato Creti’s Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father was first recorded in Palazzo Fava by Gianpierio Zanotti in 1739 as a work lauded by the critics and the one that earned Creti his early reputation.5 In his biography of Creti of 1769, Luigi Crespi cited the painting as “la più bell’opera di questo professore,”6 and its fame has only increased over the centuries.7

The subject of this painting, recounted by both Plutarch and Quintus Curtius, is almost unknown in the visual arts.8 Incited by his mother Olympias, Alexander quarreled often with his father, Philip of Macedon, over the latter’s amorous adventures, which culminated in Philip’s marriage to a woman named Cleopatra (not the Egyptian queen). At the wedding feast, Attalus, the drunken uncle of the bride, toasted the union saying that the Macedonians should pray that now a legitimate successor to the throne would be born. Enraged at the offense and proclaiming his legitimacy, Alexander threw a cup at the old man. At this, Philip rose to attack his son with his sword and probably would have killed him had he not, in his own drunkenness, tripped and fallen.9 It is the moment of the attack, before Philip stumbles, that Creti captured so dramatically. Philip lunges at his son, who recoils from the assault as the entire wedding party reacts in astonishment. Between father and son appears the seated Attalus, surprised after the cup, now lying below the steps at right, had been hurled by the angry Alexander. Behind Alexander at left, the young bride, identified by her crown, clutches an attendant for comfort. To the far left the spurned Olympias,10 with a somber gaze toward her son, flees from the action and toward the viewer. The rest of the scene reflects the ensuing mayhem: Alexander’s chair is tipping over, the tablecloth is about to be pulled off the table, a servant has been knocked off his feet. In the middle ground spears are raised to enter the fray. The drama of the scene is enhanced by the subtle contrasts of color: cool blues and whites dominate the background, while the hot red of the capes worn by Alexander and the servant and the yellow of Philip’s cuirass accentuate the battle erupting in the foreground.

According to Voss, Creti painted this exceptional subject in response to his own tumultuous relationship with his father, the mediocre quadratura painter Giuseppe Creti, whose abuse caused the young artist to leave the household after a violent argument.11 Several facts contradict this theory, however. Most important, Zanotti, Creti’s friend and biographer, did not refer to the artist’s familial disputes when praising this work. Also, Alexandrian subjects were common in Creti’s oeuvre,12 and it is possible that he had previously painted exactly this scene for the count of Novellara. According to Oretti, this canvas was a “pensiero” for a painting for the count.13 Oretti often repeated descriptions from other authors and it is possible, even though he used the term “quadro,” that he believed the National Gallery picture to be a bozzetto for the series of Alexandrian frescoes for the count of Novellara c. 1700. Zanotti, however, mentioned the Fava canvas as having been painted after Creti’s return from Novellara, and implied that it was an independent commission. In any case, both Zanotti and Oretti listed the episodes of the Novellara frescoes, but Alexander threatened by Philip is not among them.14 Since Zanotti did not connect the painting with any Novellara commission and because the painting was already in the collection of Count Fava by 1739, it is likely that either Pietro Ercole or Alessandro Fava was the patron.15 Fava’s and Creti’s erudition and the
intellectual and classically minded atmosphere in which they worked would have made the selection of such an arcane Alexandrian incident natural. Finally, precedent for the subject lies in a drawing in the Albertina, Vienna (fig. 1), by the Bolognese Domenico Maria Canuti (1626–1684), whose artistic production Creti would have known well. Creti's interpretation of the event is based either on Canuti's drawing or a subsequent painting by the older artist. A buff-colored grisaille bozetto by Creti, preparatory for the Washington picture (private collection, Bologna; fig. 2), is even closer to Canuti's drawing than is the fully developed painting. In both, the action takes place on the forward plane in front of a backdrop in which a curtain is opened to reveal a columned courtyard full of wedding guests, some of whom carry spears. Although the movement in the drawing progresses from left to right and some of the figures are in reverse arrangements, the protagonists display similar emotions and gestures. The servant boy with his arm raised in fear, at left in the painting, repeats the pose of the one at right in the drawing. In both, Attalus is held back behind the table by a servant. In the final painting, as in the drawing, Alexander has knocked over a chair, and his helmeted and cuirassed figure recoils from the onslaught of his father, whose demeanor has quieted somewhat. Creti clarified the space, details of the scene, and the action by expanding the movement vertically and elucidating the features and gestures of the various participants at the wedding feast.

Further changes between the grisaille preparatory study and the painting continued after Creti began the final work. Although the artist had blocked out the background and most of the main protagonists in the grisaille, he must have decided that Alexander and Philip were too close to the frontal plane and that the action needed more drama by further emphasis on movement at the left of the picture. He added a strip of several pieces of canvas, which can be detected along the bottom edge, evidently as a last thought in order to extend the forward thrust. Apparently the substitution of the fallen figure at lower left for the two figures in the grisaille and the torso and leg of a person fleeing out of the composition at left were part of these afterthoughts to add excitement to the story. The numerous pentimenti discernible in the final painting are typical of Creti's working methods and indicate his continued refinement of the composition after he began to paint.

Relying on Zanotti's placement of Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father in his chronology of Creti's works, scholars have agreed on a date between 1700 and 1705. In his biography of the artist, Zanotti indicated that Creti worked for the count of Novellara painting the frescoes from the life of Alexander mentioned above. From letters of Creti we know that he was finishing his work in Novellara.
in 1700. After leaving Novellara, Zanotti continued, Creti became ill; after his recovery, he painted this small canvas. Immediately following this work in Zanotti’s biography come paintings of a Europa (lost) and an old woman telling the story of Psyche to a young girl (Il Racconto, private collection, Bologna), which Zanotti said Creti painted in his thirty-fourth year, that is, in 1705. Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father is close stylistically to Il Racconto; also, two heads to the left of Alexander in the Washington picture are repeated in the faces of the old woman and the young girl in Il Racconto.

Creti’s repertory of figures, based stylistically on the examples of Cantarini and Reni, remained rather constant in his oeuvre. For example, women similar to Olympias with her scarf tied at the forehead are found in the Cleopatra (Hercolani-Fava-Simonetti collection, Bologna) and the Sibyl (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), and the embracing women at left reappear in the Idolatry of Solomon (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Clermont-Ferrand). Figures like that of Alexander are found in many other paintings, including the fresco of Alexander Cutting the Gordian Knot (1708, Palazzo Pepoli Campogrande, Bologna).

The architecture represented in Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father is of a type found in the backgrounds of other Creti works such as Alexander and His Physician Philip (1736, private collection, Italy) and Solomon and the Queen of Sheba (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Clermont-Ferrand), and at first glance appears to be a re-creation of a Bolognese palace courtyard. The impossibility of the spatial relationships and the combination of various architectural modes, however, indicate that this is a scenographic or fantastic conception. The contrast between the highlighted foreground and the darker background, as well as the pulled back curtain, emphasizes the theatrical atmosphere of the composition. The sumptuous interior is neither wholly religious nor palatial but rather a combination of both, which makes it reminiscent of festival and stage designs from c. 1680–1700, a period of classicizing tendencies in Bolognese architecture. The balcony in the middle ground and the marbleized columns recall those in the apse of San Petronio, Bologna, whereas the pilasters with trophies in low relief in the foreground and the Corinthian pilasters in the background are elements more closely associated with palace architecture, especially Bolognese grand salons and stairways.

Two preparatory drawings by Creti are known for Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father. One, for the head of Philip, in the collection of Marco Mignani, Bologna (fig. 3), appears to precede the grisaille bozetto. The menacing features of Philip accord more with the bozetto than with the finished canvas. The second sheet, in a private Bolognese collection, is a study of the recoiling Alexander and must follow the bozetto, as the left leg reflects the higher position of the final composition. Several other drawings have been associated with the painting, but they are either for other works or by other hands.

An unpublished monochrome painting of the same subject, formerly in the collections of Pico Cellini, Rome, and Gilberto Algranti, Milan (not

---

Fig. 2. Donato Creti, bozetto for Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father, probably 1700/1705, oil on canvas, Bologna, private collection
known to the author), is said to be a copy after the Washington picture.\(^{33}\) It is possible that the figures of Alexander and Philip, as well as the architecture of Creti’s picture, inspired Vittorio Maria Bigari’s (1692–1776) interpretation of the same subject painted in the 1740s (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna).\(^{34}\)

Notes

1. Zanotti 1739, 2: TOO, places the painting in Palazzo Fava; it is listed in Pietro Ercole’s posthumous inventory of 1745, published in Campori 1870, 602. Alessandro Fava was Creti’s first patron and collected many of the artist’s drawings.

2. It appears in the list of paintings in Bolognese houses compiled in the 1760s and 1770s by Oretti 1984, 90. According to Guidicini 1868–1873, 2: 186–188, Carlo Fava had no heirs and the palace passed to another branch of the family.


6. Crespi 1769, 258: “La piu bell’opera di questo professore si è il quadro rappresentante Alessandro in mezzo al convito, che sfugge il colpo vibratogli dal padre in figure piccole, e che si conserva in casa Fava.”

7. Lanzi 1809, 5: 178 (English ed. London, 1828, 211): “his Alexander’s Feast also boasts some merit, executed for the noble Fava family; by some even it is supposed to be his master-piece.” Riccomini 1989, 420, calls it “one of his best-known paintings.” Miller in DBI 30: 750: “che può forse essere considerato il suo capolavoro.”


9. After this episode Alexander questioned his father’s ability to lead a campaign from Europe to Asia when he could not even cross the room. He later took Olympias away and settled her in Epirus. Some relate that Olympias had Cleopatra murdered to prevent other children from usurping Alexander’s claims to the throne.

10. Quintus Curtius rejects the idea that Philip first divorced Olympias, since she was present with Alexander at the wedding feast. All agreed that her ill temper had alienated her from her husband.

11. Voss in TB 8: 100.

12. Riccomini 1989, 420, noted that “Scenes from Alexander’s life were something of a specialty of Creti’s” and gave a list of such scenes in Creti’s oeuvre.

13. Oretti n.d., 8: 166: “Il bellissimo quadro, nel quale evis Alessandro in mezzo al Convitto fatto da Filippo suo Padre per le seconde Nozze con Cleopatra, scampa dal colpo tiratogli dal Padre, è il Pensiero del quadro che fece pel Co: di Novellara.” See also Oretti 1984, 61–62. Roli 1967, 59, n. 28, pointed out Oretti’s connection of the work with the count of Novellara, suggesting that the painting may have been executed for him.

14. Oretti n.d., 8: 174, gives the most complete list: Alexander and the Family of Darius, Alexander retrieving the Body of Xerxes, Alexander and His Physician, Alexander visiting Diogenes, and Alexander setting fire to the Palace of Xerxes. Also noted are many scenes in chiaroscuro, but their subjects are unidentified. One would assume that Zanotti, who described the Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father in such detail, would have mentioned had there been any connection to the Novellara frescoes or if the painting had been made for the count.

15. There is no proof that the present painting was commissioned by Pietro Ercole, but he and his father Alessandro had been patrons of Creti’s from his youth. Creti and Pietro Ercole both studied with Pasinelli and Creti lived in the Fava household. (See also text below.) Pietro Ercole’s inventory lists four paintings of the subject of Alexander, the name of the count’s father, two of these by Creti, including the present work. For the inventory see Campori 1870, 602–615.


18. This claim was made already by Roli 1967, 59, n. 28.

19. Oil on canvas, 70 × 54 cm: exh. cat. London 1971, no. 24; Roli 1977, fig. 1933. JoAnne Paradise checked the Heim archives, now housed at the Getty Center, and found no information regarding the provenance of the grisaille (oral communication, 4 June 1992). Renato Roli informed the author of the present whereabouts of this picture (letter of 7 September 1992, NGA curatorial files).

Influenced by Canuti but part of a long tradition of Venetian banquet scenes is the display of silver dishes at left, indicative of family wealth. Canuti and Creti could have looked to Giuseppe Maria Crespi’s Wedding at Cana (Art Institute of Chicago, repro. in Spike 1986, 110–111, no. 1) for a similar banquet scene, which in turn was influenced by Venetian and other precedents going back to the sixteenth century.

20. Zanotti 1739, 2: 100, noted how Creti was never satisfied with a painting but was constantly perfecting it.


23. Zanotti 1739, 2: 107–108. The paintings were done for Senator Paolo Marnani, Bologna. For Il Racconto, see Roli 1967, 93, no. 60 and fig. 16.

24. Creti’s handling of brushstrokes, too, has its source in the earlier Bolognese artists’ paintings and graphic works. Zanotti 1739, 2: 101, stated that as a youth Creti helped to form his style by copying Reni’s and Cantarini’s prints. William Barcham has pointed out similarities between the expression of Cleopatra and that of one of the mothers in Reni’s Massacre of the Innocents (letter of 25 September 1993, in NGA curatorial files).

25. For the Cleopatra, see Roli 1967, fig. 14; for the Idolatry of Solomon, fig. 68. For the Sibyl, see Roli 1988, fig. 2. Such figural repetitions are numerous in Creti’s oeuvre.

26. Roli 1967, fig. 18.

27. Riccomini 1989, fig. 58, for the picture in Italy, and Roli 1967, fig. 67, for the Clermont-Ferrand picture.

28. For Bolognese stage designs, see, for example, Muraro and Povoledo 1970.

29. Deanna Lenzi has kindly provided information on the background of Creti’s painting and compared it with Bolognese architecture of c. 1700 (letter of 1 January 1992, NGA curatorial files). She has noted some similar stairways in the Palazzo Marescotti Brazzetti by Gian Giacomo Monti (1680) and the Palazzo Ruini Ranuzzi by Giuseppe Antonio Torri and Giovanni Battista Piacentini (1695). For the palaces see Crippini 1974, pls. 59–61, 64, 99–101.

30. Red chalk, 10.3 × 9.8 cm. Two other sketches are laid down on the left of this sheet. This and the following sheet were brought to my attention by Renato Roli (letter of 7 September 1992).


32. A drawing of various heads and a helmeted figure, formerly on the art market, bears no resemblance to the painting or to Creti’s authentic sheets, contrary to the suggestion of Neerman and Neerman 1969, 158, no. 51. Roli, “Drawings,” 1973, 31, n. 21, dismissed the drawing from Creti’s oeuvre. Shapley 1979, 1: 148, suggested that these heads could be copies after the National Gallery painting.

A sheet of studies of talking women and a kneeling helmeted figure in the Albertina, Vienna, is likely related to Alexander Cutting the Gordian Knot in the Palazzo Pepoli rather than to the present, earlier work. Birke and Kertész 1996, 4: inv. 24546; Katalog der Handzeichnungen 1926–1941, 3: 61, no. 543, repro. This drawing was connected with the National Gallery painting by Roli 1967, 111, but then placed in relationship with the Palazzo Pepoli painting by the same author in “Drawings,” 1973, 27, and pl. 13a. The vaulting, curved indication of the steps, and bending, helmeted figure with a standing figure behind appear in the fresco but not in the National Gallery painting.

33. Roli 1967, 98, under cat. 101. Shapley 1979, 1: 148, n. 8, noted that Roli had seen the painting but had no photograph of it. According to Roli (letter of 7 September 1992, NGA curatorial files), the painting passed from Cellini to Gilberto Algranti in Milan. According to Algranti, the painting was sold to a private collector. The collector’s name has been lost and the painting cannot by traced (oral communication by Giacomo Algranti, December 1992).
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Creti 83
Domenico Fetti
1589 – 1623

Domenico Fetti, almost certainly born in Rome, was educated at the Collegio Romano. He probably received his initial artistic training from his father, Pietro Fetti, a painter, perhaps from Ferrara, about whom little is known.

Contemporary sources refer to Domenico Fetti as a student of Ludovico Cardi, called II Cigoli (1559–1613). Domenico could have entered Cigoli’s shop as early as 1604, the year in which the Florentine painter came to Rome. Prior to this, Domenico may have studied with Cigoli’s associate Andrea Commodi (1560–1638), but the sources are inconclusive. Domenico’s earliest known works, those of c. 1610–1614, show his awareness of contemporary developments in Rome, particularly the works of Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) and other Netherlanders, as well as the landscapes of the German painter Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610/1620); Domenico also appears to have studied the works of Federico Barocci (1535–1612), Annibale Carracci (q.v.), Caravaggio (1571–1610), and Orazio Borgianni (1578–1616). In this early period, led by his teacher Cigoli and by the example of Rubens and Annibale Carracci, Domenico developed an interest in sixteenth-century Venetian painting.

By 1611, or perhaps a year or two earlier, Domenico had established a close relationship with his most important patron, Cardinal Ferdinando Gonzaga, who became duke of Mantua in 1613. Domenico, accompanied by his father, brothers, and sisters, went to Mantua as court painter in 1613 or 1614. In the extensive Gonzaga collections Domenico continued his study of the Venetian masters: his brushwork became increasingly loose, almost liquid; his palette richer and more silvery; his light effects more atmospheric and expressive. He created a subtle blend of a transcendental, dreamlike mood, close observation of nature, especially of landscape, and genre elements in the Venetian realist tradition, but with echoes of Barocci and Caravaggio.

At first Domenico’s Mantuan commissions were largely outside the court, consisting of small devotional works and some altarpieces. Eventually the duke engaged him in extensive decorative cycles for the Palazzo Ducale. By 1618 Domenico seems to have established a considerable workshop in which his assistants and students made many copies of his paintings. His family was active in the shop, including his sister Giustina (active c. 1614–1651?), whom he had trained. She took the name Lucrina upon entering the convent of Sant’Orsola.

Domenico’s first documented trip to Venice, a buying expedition for Duke Ferdinando, occurred in 1621, but he may have gone earlier. He is reported to have visited Bologna in 1618–1619 and probably spent a few productive months in Verona in 1622, either before or after his flight from Mantua to Venice in August of that year. This precipitous departure was occasioned by an argument between Domenico and a cleric from an important Mantuan family at a soccer match. Although an initial break with the duke was resolved, Domenico seems to have been reluctant to return to Mantua for a variety of reasons. He expressed dismay at the constant hostility of the Mantuan artists, but had also cultivated a lucrative clientele among the Venetian patriciate, most notably Giorgio Contarini dagli Scrigni, and had obtained a commission to paint a large canvas for the Palazzo Ducale (not executed). This promising new stage of his career ended with his death in April 1623. His final works show continued observation of the sixteenth-century Venetian masters, to the point that he is often considered to have become a member of the Venetian school.

Indeed, the lessons of Domenico Fetti’s style were much more influential in Venice than in Mantua, where the members of his studio never established significant careers of their own. Throughout the seventeenth century, painters in Venice, such as the German expatriate Johann Liss (c. 1597–before 1630), and the Venetians Pietro della Vecchia (q.v.) and Sebastiano Mazzone (1617–1678), were inspired by Domenico’s loose, liquid brushwork, rich chromatism and shimmering light effects.
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The Veil of Veronica

c. 1618/1622
Oil on wood, 82.5 x 68 (33 x 27 1/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a two-member panel, probably poplar,1 with a vertical join just left of center. The ground is a smooth white layer under a warm, pale red imprimatura that shows through in thinly painted areas. The paint was applied thinly and opaquely, often with a small feathered brushstroke. A larger brush was used for the drapery folds, but without creating impasto. Wood strips on all four sides were added in 1944 when the panel was marouflaged and cradled. The paint surface is abraded, especially in the shadows of the face and hair. Areas of discolored inpainting are visible here as well as in the shadows of the cloth folds and along the panel join. The varnish is discolored and the otherwise thick varnish is much thinner in the whites and flesh tones.


Scholars agree that the Veil of Veronica is an autograph work by Domenico Fetti.10 The broad brushstrokes are typical of Fetti’s manner, as are the iridescent highlights on the face and drapery. The facial features repeat those in other secure works by the artist.11 The panel must be the one recorded in the Gonzaga inventory of 1627 and purchased by Pierre Crozat in the early eighteenth century.12 It is certainly this painting that was engraved in reverse by Charles Simonneau when in Crozat’s collection (fig. 1).13 Scholars do not concur on the painting’s date. Although the work was clearly executed after Fetti be-came court painter to the duke of Mantua in 1613, the lack of dated pictures during this period makes it difficult to place the Veil in a specific year. Shapley alone thought that the painting lacked the Venetian traits of Fetti’s late works and dated it to c. 1615.14 Other scholars have remarked on the pictorial manner that was characteristic of Fetti’s brushwork after c. 1618.15 The Veil of Veronica lacks the detailed figure analysis, harsh lighting effects, and tight brushwork of his early Mantuan period of the mid-1610s.16 Paintings that exhibit similar dry, feathery, but fluid brushstrokes, such as the Penitent Magdalene, the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes, the Ecce Homo, and the Portrait of Francesco Andreini, date toward the end of his Mantuan period, c. 1618–1622.17 Such comparisons suggest that the Veil of Veronica probably belongs to this period.

Fetti seems to have painted this subject at least one other time, in a picture formerly in the collection of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, Brussels and Vienna, but now lost. The work is known through a painted copy by David Teniers the Younger (1610–
1690) and an engraving by Jan van Troyen (c. 1610–active to mid-seventeenth century). From these two interpretations of the lost painting, it appears that the second Veil differed from the National Gallery example in minor details. In both paintings, the cloth fills most of the picture space and rests on a plain, flat (probably) wooden surface. In the Leopold Wilhelm version the cloth is lace-trimmed on all edges, while in the Washington painting it is fringed on only one edge. In addition, the veil in the present painting does not float in space but hangs from a horizontal bar. Because the second version is lost, it cannot be dated or examined in relationship with the National Gallery painting through the representations by Teniers and van Troyen, each rather different from the other.

The so-called Veil of Veronica was one of the four principal relics of the Passion belonging to Saint Peter’s, Rome, where it was recorded as early as the twelfth century. A miraculous picture of Christ’s face imprinted on the cloth, known as the sudarium, was shown to the faithful during special feast-days. It had been displayed in the jubilee year of 1300, and in the Middle Ages was considered the most important and true image of Christ. Various legends sprang up to explain the origins of the miraculous effigy. According to the most popular story, Veronica offered Christ her scarf to wipe his sweat and blood-soaked face on his way to Calvary. Although in the thirteenth century the name “Veronica” was explained as a conflation of “vera icon” (i.e., true icon of the image of Christ), legends of the female saint who had given aid to Christ during his Passion abounded. Like the relic itself, the earliest images of the sudarium showed Christ either bare-headed, or alternatively, with a halo. By the sixteenth century, however, the accepted iconography for Christ of the Passion was with a crown of thorns. Representations depicted the sudarium alone or as held by angels, saints, or the legendary Saint Veronica. Portrayals of the Stations of the Cross always included Christ with Veronica holding the sudarium. Fetti’s painting is distinct from other known versions of the veil by the inclusion of the horizontal bar on which the cloth hangs.

The relic of the sudarium remained popular into the seventeenth century; it had been shown to the Roman crowds in 1601 and again on 21 March 1606 when it was transferred to the archives of the Vatican. Copies of it continued to be made in spite of Paul V’s prohibition of such copies in 1616. It is certainly possible that Fetti was able to see the “vera icon”; in any case, he would have known copies of it. Due to its fame during this period, it is not unusual that in the late teens Fetti’s patron Ferdinando Gonzaga would have requested an image of the relic. Besides the icon itself and its copies, Fetti would have had numerous precedents, both prints and paintings, on which to base his conception. Like most artists, however, Fetti was not influenced by the relic in representing the sudarium. For Christ’s elongated face, delicate features, and shoulder-length hair he relied on his own earlier Ecce Homo (Uffizi, Florence). While retaining his penchant for naturalistic detail Fetti solemnized his earlier portrayal. By eliminating any reference to human activity and by keeping colors within a limited, somber range of grays, deep reds, and browns (intensified by the red ground he allowed to show through), Fetti heightened the gravity of the image. At the same time, the light flickering over the cloth and the visibility of the brushstrokes enliven Christ’s image to create a mysterious blend of the tangible and the supernatural.

Notes
1. Wood analysis was not carried out because the panel itself is completely hidden behind edge strips and a wooden backing attached prior to cradling. The appearance of the grain in x-radiographs, however, suggests an even-grained hardwood, possibly poplar (Populus sp.) or walnut (Juglans regia).
2. The 1627 inventory has been most recently published in Lettere e altri documenti 1976, 25. The relevant entry reads “il sudario di Nostro Signore di mano del Sig. Perfetti.” As Pamela Askew has suggested, this is most likely a mistranscription of “per (mano di) Fetti” and not a reference to the “prefetto delle fabbriche.” Anton Maria Viani (letter of 14 October 1990, NGA curatorial files). Safarik 1990, 241, also admits this possibility.
3. Both the Mantua inventory and the posthumous Venice inventory have been most recently published in Lettere e altri documenti 1976, 51, 60. Following the fall of Mantua to imperial troops in 1707, Ferdinando Carlo went into exile first in Venice and later in Padua, where he died intestate. While the Venetian courts attempted to determine Ferdinando Carlo’s legal heir, his art collection was exhibited in one of his Venetian properties, the Palazzo Michiel dalle Colonne. Those works not confiscated by disgruntled heirs during transport to Venice or ceded to the declared heir, Charles of Lorraine, were sold on the Venetian art market, as recounted by Vivian 1971, 8–9.
4. Crozat seems to have purchased most of his paintings by 1726 and is listed as the owner on the engraving by Charles Simonneau (1645–1728) in the Recueil d’Estampes 1729–1742, 2: 106. On Crozat’s collection see Stuffmann.
Domenico Fetti, *The Veil of Veronica*, 1952.5.7

5. In the Catalogue des tableaux et sculptures 1751, prepared by Mariette, the painting is listed as no. 119 in the group of works owned by “M. Crozat,” and not in the group owned by Joseph Antoine Crozat, baron de Tugny, as is often erroneously stated. Stuffmann 1968, 33–35, has demonstrated that the “M. Crozat” in question is in fact Louis-François after seeing the painting in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, of c. 1613–1614 (Safarik 1990, 169–172, nos. 47–48, repro.). He also saw a “sweet patheticism” in the Veil akin to Fetti’s late portraits, such as Francesco Andreoni (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; Safarik 1990, 243, 284–287, no. 127).

18. Stuffmann 1968, 243, 106a. The painting was in the archdube’s collection in Brussels. David Teniers’ painting of the gallery (Alte Pinakothek, Munich; Safarik 1990, 242, repro.) showed this work as attributed to Fetti. Van Troyen’s print was made for Teniers’ Theatrum Pictorium. The collection was transferred to Vienna and the painting listed in the 1659 inventory.


20. The word sudarium comes from the verb “sudare” (to sweat) and refers to the sweat from Christ’s face that miraculously imprinted his image onto the cloth.

21. For example, that a sculptural group with Christ was miraculously changed into the image on the cloth, or that a painting made by a devout woman (known as the earliest “Veronica”) was divinely transformed after her encounter with Christ himself.

22. For images of the sudarium and its representation over the centuries, see Fagiolo and Madonna 1984, 106–130, which includes a copy of the relic in Saint Peter’s and another in a private collection in Rome (figs. II.7a–m and II.8a–l).

23. As Strinati pointed out, the theme of Veronica holding the veil was rare in Italian iconography except in those places with strong northern influences (in Fagiolo and Madonna 1984, 117).

24. This apparently insignificant difference connects the miraculous cloth with the everyday world: one can imagine the cloth hanging from a bar in the artist’s studio.


26. Safarik 1990, 243, suggested that Fetti based his sudarium on Dürer’s 1513 print of the veil carried by angels (Fagiolo and Madonna 1984, fig. II.6h), but on that veil Christ’s head fills the space of the cloth, unlike in Fetti’s painting. There were numerous other precedents that were closer to Fetti’s interpretation, such as the northern prints by Lucas van Leyden (1494–1533) and Raphael Sadeler (1560–1632) (Fagiolo and Madonna 1984, figs. II.8 [b–c]).

27. Strinati, in Fagiolo and Madonna 1984, 117, pointed out that the stiff, iconic representation of the relic was transformed by most artists from the thirteenth century onward.

28. Safarik 1990, 158; see also note 11.

29. The image of the sudarium continued to be popular in the seventeenth century in Rome and in Catholic Europe. In addition to those reproduced in Fagiolo and Madonna 1984, see the various versions by the following—Philippe de...
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Workshop of Domenico Fetti

1939.1.88 (199)

The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man

1618/1628
Oil on wood, 61.6 x 45.4 (24 1/4 x 17 7/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Inscriptions
Inventory number in golden brown paint, lower-left corner: 101.

Technical Notes: The support is a poplar panel (Populus sp.) with vertically oriented grain. The ground is a thin layer of yellowish brown textured with brushstrokes, which shows through thinly painted passages such as the foreground steps. The blue of the sky was painted over a locally applied layer of white underpaint. The architecture was painted first, its main lines having been incised into the ground layer. Broad areas were left in reserve for the figures, which in many cases overlap the architecture. Infrared reflectography reveals underdrawing in the form of broad, sketchy contours for the background musicians and for one of the arches. The paint application varies from pastosate opaque whites in the architecture and some details, to thin translucent glazes for the darker drapery folds, costume, and curtain. The paint was applied mostly wet-into-wet, but the added details were only partially blended into the underlying paint layer. Red grid lines, possibly in chalk, are apparent only along the bottom edge of the painting, over the white paint of the steps. Fingerprint texture, employed in selected areas, is most evident in the buttocks of the kneeling figure in red and the faces of the two central musicians.

Several artist’s changes are visible. The top edge of the wall on the left was shifted upward by about 1 cm, covering the bases of the urns, and the arms of the kneeling figure in red were shifted slightly. The musician playing the wind instrument was also changed: his right arm and leg were originally raised and extended out further, and his gaze was originally directed toward the musicians rather than the viewer. At first he wore a dark beretlike hat over the back of his head, but this was changed to a red cap similar to that seen in the engraving after the Crozat version of the composition (see text). A line next to his chin may suggest that he was originally shown playing a violin.

The support has been thinned to 0.7 cm and subsequently cradled at an unknown date; wooden edge strips have also been added. The paint is abraded in the upper sky, the faces of the musicians and background figures, and the entablature above the left arch. These areas were inpainted in 1992–1993 when the painting was treated by Carl Villis. Conservation records show that Stephen Pichetto removed discolored varnish and restored the picture in 1932.

Provenance: Don Taddeo Barberini [1603–1647], Rome, by 1645; his son, Prince Maffeo Barberini [1631–1685]; remained in the Barberini family collection until at least 1922; (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome); purchased 1932 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.

Exhibited: Florence, Palazzo Pitti, 1922, Mostra della pittura italiana del seicento e del settecento, no. 409.

Certainly the best known of Domenico Fetti’s paintings is the series of parables executed for Ferdinando Gonzaga, duke of Mantua, for a room in the Palazzo Ducale, Mantua. Although scholars dispute whether these small paintings on panel were originally conceived all at once as a series, at least some of the parables were placed in the so-called Grotta Isabelliana in the appartamento del Paradiso of the Palazzo Ducale. An inventory of 5 March 1627, made after the duke’s death, listed the grotta as “where the parables are.” A letter of 1631 noted that
in the grotta were “diversi quadretti fatti del Fetti di parabole del nostro signore.”

Already in 1627–1628 the duke’s collection of Fetti parables was beginning to be dispersed: seven or nine were sold to the British Crown, ending in the collection of the duke of Buckingham. But, at least two parables by Fetti—Lazarus and the Rich Man and The Pearl of Great Price—remained in the Gonzaga collection until its final dissolution in 1709, after which they were apparently purchased by Pierre Crozat for his collection in Paris. In the 1751 sale of the Crozat collection, the paintings passed to a certain Goüy; Lazarus may be the one purchased by John Trumbull in Paris in 1795 and sold in London two years later. The Gonzaga-Crozat Lazarus is now lost.

Until recently scholars had assumed that the National Gallery Lazarus was the work mentioned in the seventeenth-century Gonzaga inventories and consequently Fetti’s original composition. Indisputable evidence proves, however, that the Lazarus was already in the collection of Taddeo Barberini in Rome by 1645. Until the realization that the Washington Lazarus could not be the same painting that remained in Mantua throughout the seventeenth century, the attribution of the panel to Domenico Fetti was almost unanimous. With further study of the panel, scholars now believe that the Lazarus is a good workshop copy, possibly executed under Fetti’s supervision, of the lost Gonzaga original. Despite the high quality of execution, several factors advise against ascribing the painting to Fetti himself: the smooth surface, undifferentiated lighting effects, insistence on detail, stiffly rendered figures, and lack of broad, smooth brushstrokes.

As court painter to Ferdinando Gonzaga, Fetti was required to execute various series of paintings, such as the parables, as well as portraits, religious subjects, and copies of paintings by other artists. By the time Fetti was established in Mantua, the demand for his work seems to have induced him to set up a kind of workshop to aid in the execution of paintings and to make copies of preferred subjects. Copies of all the parables exist, often in large numbers. Many of these evidently were made after Fetti’s death, but in several cases it seems that he made more than one version of a parable, or that he assisted in copying it, or that the copy was made under his supervision. During Ferdinando’s lifetime, replicas of paintings were produced to be given as gifts. In 1618, for example, he had Fetti copy one of his paintings as a gift for Cosimo II de Medici, the grandduke of Tuscany. In addition, he certainly made presents of paintings to other important noblemen, possibly including the Barberini. It is tempting to think that the National Gallery panel was presented either directly to Taddeo Barberini or to his uncle Pope Urban VIII, whose collection he inherited. It was especially common to give gifts of paintings to papal nephews, and perhaps the Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man entered the Barberini collection after Urban VIII’s ascension to the papal throne in 1623.

Fetti’s “bottega” certainly included two painters in his family: Pietro, his father, and Lucrina, his sister, whom he is said to have taught. We know that Lucrina Fetti made copies of other artist’s works, and since some of her paintings come close in composition to those of her brother, she probably also

Fig. 1. Jean Haussart after Domenico Fetti, Lazarus and the Rich Man, 1729–1742, engraving, from Recueil d’Estampes
copied Domenico’s paintings. Secure paintings by Lucrina are rare. The style of the extant altarpieces for the convent of Sant’Orsola and the portraits of the Gonzaga women for the Palazzo Ducale differ from her signed and dated work, the Saint Barbara (1619) in the collection of Claudio Strinati, Rome. Because some of Lucrina’s paintings are characterized by a delicate handling, a high degree of finish, and a penchant for detail, both Safarik and Askew have suggested that she may be the author of the National Gallery Lazarus. The similarity in style of the Washington picture with other parable copies indicates that the same hand is responsible for a series of these imitations, but not enough evidence exists to equate the hand with that of Lucrina Fetti.

The painting of Lazarus and the Rich Man that remained in Mantua in the 1600s and passed to Crozat’s collection is assumed by scholars to have been Fetti’s original; it was engraved by Jean-Baptiste Haussart (1679/1680–1749) and published in Paris in the Recueil d’Estampes in 1742 (fig. 1). If the print accurately reflects Crozat’s painting and if the painting was not another copy, it is evident that the Washington Lazarus closely resembles the artist’s prototype except for minor variations. Most noticeable is the addition of the third dog licking Lazarus’ sores at lower right and the embellishment of the architectural entablatures. Comparison of the extant painting and the print suggests that the National Gallery panel may have been cut down at the sides and bottom, since slightly more of the scene occurs in the print. Another copy of Fetti’s parable may, in fact, be an interpretation of the present picture since the extra dog occurs in both. More freedom occurs in this replica, however, with changes to the costumes, and number and positions of the figures.

Fetti’s Lazarus and the Rich Man recounts the parable related by Luke 16: 19–21 in which Lazarus, bleeding from open sores, begged for scraps at the table of a rich man. While dogs licked his wounds, Lazarus was rebuffed by the wealthy man, who continued to eat at his sumptuous banquet. After the death of Lazarus he was taken to heaven by angels, but when the rich man died he was sent to hell and tormented. The lesson of the parable suggests that those who suffer in life will be rewarded in heaven, while those who do not repent will be punished. In the Lazarus and the Rich Man, as in the other parables, Fetti based his interpretation on the functions and forms of everyday life. By following the evangelists’ texts closely, Fetti followed also the purpose of Christ’s teaching: to explain religious truths through prosaic experience. The visualization of parables was not widespread in the sixteenth century but became more popular during Fetti’s lifetime due to their didactic effectiveness, which was exploited in Counter-Reformatory teaching. There were, however, precedents, especially in Venice, for painted series of parables as well as individual representations of the parable subjects. In addition, Fetti may have been influenced when he was in Rome by the work of Carlo Saraceni (1579–1620), who produced several parable subjects, including a Lazarus and the Rich Man.

If the subject of Fetti’s Lazarus and the Rich Man relied on north Italian antecedents, the artist looked elsewhere for the stylistic and compositional elements in the scene. The facial types, hair, and costumes of the rich man and his guests depend on Fetti’s Florentine mentor Ludovico Cigoli. As others have remarked, the banqueting scene in the open courtyard with architecture in the style of Palladio (1508–1580) and Sansovino (1486–1540) is reminiscent of paintings by Veronese (1528–1588) such as the Feast in the House of Levi, and Fetti undoubtedly remembered Francesco Salviati’s (1510–1563) grand scene with a similar composition and components of the Marriage at Cana in San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome. The figure of Bacchus at right may be based on earlier sculptures of the same subject.

Reconstructions of the parable series in the Grotta Isabelliana have called for the pairing of Lazarus and the Rich Man with the Prodigal Son: each portrays a courtyard scene with similar architectural elements, and the subjects are balanced in their contrast of repentance rewarded and extravagance punished. The importance of these compositions, both morally and stylistically, has led Safarik to conclude that they were the first paintings seen upon entering the room. The slight di sotto in su viewpoint accords with the placement of the paintings slightly higher than eye level above the carved wall paneling.

As few documents relate to the commissioning of works by Fetti and his original panel of Lazarus and the Rich Man is lost, dating the composition remains problematic. Most scholars place the entire parable series between 1618 and 1621/1622, locating the autograph Lazarus toward the beginning of the series. Dating the National Gallery copy is yet more difficult. Although the terminus ante quem remains
1645, the date by which it entered the Barberini collection, the copy almost certainly was made before 1627–1628, the year after Ferdinando Gonzaga’s death and the date of the breakup of the parable series.48 Ferdinando had ordered the agent Daniel Nys to have copies made to be kept in the Palazzo Ducale.49 The quality of this copy suggests that it was made in Fetti’s workshop, which may have continued after his death. It is also very close stylistically to copies of other parables in the series, perhaps suggesting that several copies of the entire series were made under the artist’s supervision. Even before 1627–1628, works in the Gonzaga collection were classified as copies,46 and, as suggested above, the Washington Lazarus may have been ordered by Ferdinando to present as a gift to the Barberini. As there is no proof that the copy was made before Fetti’s death in 1623, a broad dating of 1618/1628 seems appropriate.

Notes
1. Taddeo left Rome in 1645 for Paris, where he died two years later. The painting is listed in his posthumous inventory of 1647–1648 and again in Maffeo’s posthumous inventory of 1686; both are published in Lavin 1975, 196, no. 168, and 406, no. 138. This information was provided by Burton Fredericksen and Margaret Clark of the Getty Provenance Index (letter of 24 February 1986, NGA curatorial files); Safarik 1985, 52, had reached the same conclusion. Shapley 1973, 68, and still in 1979, 1: 178, was unaware of the inventories published by Lavin and of other versions of the subject. She thus conflated references to these versions in the Gonzaga, Crozat, and various English collections into a single erroneous provenance for the Barberini/Washington panel. Lavin 1975, 687, placed the painting owned by Taddeo and Maffeo in the Galleria Corsini in Florence, but as Fredericksen noted, her reference is to Alnari no. 45390, which is a photograph taken of the NGA painting when it was exhibited at the Florence exhibition in 1922.

2. The expert opinion by Roberto Longhi, dated 1932, on the back of a photograph in the Kress Files, NGA, states that this is the painting he discovered in the Barberini collections in 1922 and selected for the Florence exhibition that year, where it was listed as still being in the Barberini collection.


4. On the series of parables see Askew 1961 and Safarik 1990, 67–133. According to Askew there were twelve parables and two parabolic utterances painted by Fetti. The parables were The Lost Silver, The Note and the Beam, The Lost Sheep, The Unmerciful Servant, The Great Supper, The Prodigal Son, The Devil Sewing Tares, The Hidden Treasure, The Pearl of Great Price, The Laborers in the Field, Lazarus and the Rich Man, and The Wicked Husbandman; the parabolic utterances were The Blind Leading the Blind and The Good Samaritan. Safarik counts instead eleven parables and two utterances, noting that the subject that Askew identified as the Parable of the Wicked Husbandman is instead the story of Tobias Finding the Dead Israelite. For a suggested reconstruction of the series of parables in its original location see Safarik 1990, 70–71.

5. Askew 1961, 24, divided the series into two groups, dating the former before Fetti’s trip to Venice in the summer of 1621, and the latter, which included the horizontal parables, after this date. This division, however, has been questioned by Lehmann 1967, 98–100, who saw the series evolving over time and suggested that the works were painted in twos and threes. See also Safarik 1990, 67–72, who does not discuss the parables in groups.

6. Safarik 1990, 68, noted that this grotta was transferred sometime in the early seventeenth century from the Corte Vecchia to the appartamento del Paradiso. In 1917 it was transferred again to the Corte Vecchia.

7. The letter was written on 24 January 1631 by Colonel Ottavio Piccolomini at the request of Emperor Ferdinand II to assess the damage of the imperial troops to the Palazzo Ducale in the war for the succession of the duchy.

8. On this sale and the further disbanding of the series, see Luzzio 1974, 62–86. Seven parables were recorded in the duke of Buckingham’s inventory of 1635; these found their way to Prague by the 1650s (the collection of Archduke Leopold William of Austria). Two additional parables were inventoried at Prague in 1685, leading Safarik 1990, 70, to conclude that these also came from Buckingham’s collection.

9. The paintings were listed in the inventory of the Gonzaga Villa Favorita of 10 December 1665 and again in the Palazzo Ducale in 1706. They were cited in Crozat’s inventory of 1740. See Safarik 1990, 130, no. 31, for documentation.

10. For the details of this provenance see letters (NGA curatorial files) from Burton Fredericksen of the Getty Provenance Index (13 August 1990) and Pamela Askew (5 November 1990). Both argue convincingly that the Trumpbull painting was not that owned by Sir Joshua Reynolds, as speculated by Safarik 1990, 130–131, no. 31. See note 32 for further discussion of the different versions recorded in inventories and sales catalogues.

11. See provenance.

12. Except for Lehmann 1967, 124, 209, who rejected the painting on the basis of quality, calling it a copy of a lost original, and Arslan 1954, 291, n. 2 who expressed reservations about the attribution.

13. As noted by Askew (oral and written communications 1990, in NGA curatorial files) and Safarik 1990, 130–133, nos. 31 and 31a. Lehmann, who had rejected the painting in 1967 on the basis of a photograph, confirmed his opinion when he saw the painting in 1970 (letter of 23 January 1991 in NGA curatorial files).

14. See 1952.5.7 for stylistic comparison with an accepted painting by Fetti.


16. According to Safarik 1990, 16, Fetti’s early works are not seen in copies from his hand or that of his workshop. His late Venetian works are also not known in workshop copies, since he would not have had a workshop in Venice.
where he fled in 1621. According to Askew (letter of 27 November 1990, NGA curatorial files), Fetti did not have a workshop in the sense that Safarik indicated.

17. For the copies of the parables, see Safarik 1990, 72–133, nos. 19–31, repro.

18. The vagueness implied here is the result of the differences of opinion on the authenticity of some of the copies and versions of the parable replicas.

19. According to Safarik 1990, 16, who noted four paintings attributed to Fetti that were owned by the Barberini.

20. See Lavin 1975, 188.

21. For example, much of Ludovico Ludovisi's collection was made up of gifts from those seeking favors. Carolyn Wood delivered a talk on this subject at the symposium, "Guerzino, Art and Nature," held at the Delaware Art Museum, 25 April 1992.

22. Ferdinando had good reason to curry the favor of Urban VIII, who had upheld the validity of his brother Vincenzo's marriage to Isabella Gonzaga of Novellara and declared her innocent of the accusation of witchcraft leveled at her by the brothers. Ferdinando had also considered poisoning Isabella in order to free Vincenzo for another marriage that would produce an heir to the duchy. On these problems see Coniglio 1981, 435–424.

23. According to Baglione 1642, 155, Duke Ferdinando paid for Fetti's family to accompany him to Mantua (in 1613 or 1614). Pietro was still alive in 1619 (Safarik 1990, 17). Baldinucci 1845–1847, 3: 283, said that Domenico was Lucrina's teacher. Duke Ferdinando paid for Lucrina and another sister to enter the Convent of Sant'Orsola in Mantua.

24. A copy by Lucrina of a painting by Francesco Francia is signed and dated 1629 (Safarik 1990, 17). She also copied a painting by Lodovico Carracci: Askew 1976, 125.

25. See the Saint Barbara mentioned in the text, which comes close to paintings by Domenico Fetti, such as the Penitent Magdalene (Safarik 1990, 229–232, no. 100, repro.).

26. An excellent analysis of Lucrina's work is provided by Askew 1976, 124–130. Also on Lucrina see Perina 1989, 2: 728, and Zerbi Fanna 1989, 35–33, with reproductions of works attributed to her.

27. Zerbi Fanna 1989, 49, pl. 5.


29. For example, the Wicked Husbandman at Burghley House (Safarik 1990, 129, no. 303, repro.) may be by the same hand as the Washington picture.

30. Safarik 1990, 130, no. 31. Lehmann 1967, 209, noted an engraving by Pietro Monaco (active 1575–1575) of a Lazarus by Fetti from the collection of the Giovannelli. Attempts to trace this print have proved unsuccessful. According to Alpago-Novello 1939–1940, 544, no. 74, Monaco's Raccolta di opere scelte rappresentanti la storia del Vecchio e Nuovo Testamento..., published in several editions in the eighteenth century, includes a print after Bonifacio Bembo's (second half of the fifteenth century) Lazarus owned by Doge Pietro Grimani.

31. These additions may be due to the printmaker's alterations, since the extra step slightly skews the perspective and the addition of more plates and an extra jar at right are distortions of the sizes in the Washington Lazarus.

32. Wood panel, 59.7 x 43.2 cm: Safarik 1990, 133, no. 31b–bis, repro.; last sold at Christie's, London, 17 February 1956, lot 54. Two other copies of Fetti's Lazarus are known: Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nancy, inv. 594 (as school of Veronese), canvas, 61 x 47 cm (Safarik 1990, 133, no. 31c); and another on canvas sold at Christos Rosset, Geneva, 19–20 October 1978, no. 243, 58 x 48 cm. Unclear references, usually without dimensions, to a Lazarus and the Rich Man by Fetti occur frequently in English sales catalogues from the late eighteenth century and in Venetian and French inventories from the seventeenth century. It is almost impossible to trace the movements of any single painting and none can be certainly identified with any of the three copies cited above. For the various references see Safarik 1990, 130–133, and letters (NGA curatorial files) from Burton Fredericksen (13 August 1990) and Pamela Askew (5 November 1990). Askew cites the largest number of references and conjectures that there may have been as many as five or six different versions of the composition in addition to the Gonzaga-Crozat and Barberini-Washington paintings.

33. On this see Askew 1961, 22; Lehmann 1967, 97–99; and Safarik 1990, 67–68, who sees the entire series as a kind of human comedy.

34. On this see Askew 1961, 22.

35. Precedents include works by Schiavone (c. 1500–1565), Vasari (1511–1574), Benedetto Caliari (1538–1598), Palma Giovane (1544–1628), the Bassano, and others. On this see Lehmann 1967, 98–99. See also Pigler 1974, 375–376. For the function of these images see Aikema 1980, 71–98.

36. See Ottani Cavina 1968, pl. 41 (Lazarus) and pl. 63 (The Good Samaritan). On the connection see Askew 1961, 32.

37. Noted also by Safarik 1990, 132.


39. Pamela Askew (oral communication 27 November 1990) suggested that the Bacchus was based on Michelangelo's (1475–1564) sculpture of the same subject, but the position of the arms, basket, and satyr suggest only a distant relationship. Askew also saw Florentine elements in the architecture, especially in the reclining figures that may depend on the Medici tombs. One assumes that Fetti did travel to Florence at some point, even after his transfer to Mantua, which would have taken him through Tuscany. Askew also suggested a Veronese source of the Martyrdom of Mark and Marcellinus for the dog and a Veronese or Tintoretto (1518–1594) source for the kneeling boy.

40. Michelin 1955, 135, paired the Lazarus with the Pearl of Great Price because paintings of these subjects were mentioned in the Gonzaga inventories in the seventeenth century. Longhi (opinion for Kress cited in note 2); Askew 1961, 31; Perina 1965, 464; Lehmann 1967, 100; Shapley 1979, 1: 178; Pallucchini 1981, 138; and Safarik 1990, 116, paired the painting with the Prodigal Son.

41. Safarik 1990, 116. Although Safarik may not have been correct in his exact arrangement of the paintings, which vary in size, he certainly was correct in placing them around the room above the paneling.

42. The height of the room from floor to cornice is less than three meters and thus the di sotto in su perspective would not have been extreme. Micheline 1955, 127, n. 2, was incorrect in interpreting Piccolomini's letter ("nell'alto") as indicating that the paintings were on the ceiling.

43. Askew 1961, 24, divided the series into two sets: paintings before the trip to Venice in 1621 (i.e., 1618–1621) and those after (i.e., 1621–1622). She dated the Lazarus
Orazio Gentileschi
1563 – 1639

Orazio Gentileschi was born in Pisa to Giovanni Battista Lomi, a Florentine goldsmith. In 1576 or 1578 Orazio moved to Rome, where he took the surname of a maternal uncle who was captain of the guards at the Castel Sant’Angelo. Nothing is known of Orazio’s early training as a painter beyond now discredited reports that he studied with his brother, Aurelio Lomi (1556–1622), a painter schooled in the late maniera style of Florence.

In Rome, Orazio is first mentioned as a painter in a team of artists decorating the Vatican Library in 1588–1589. Throughout the 1590s he participated in the large collaborative projects that dominated Roman artistic production of the period. Unlike Giuseppe Cesari (q.v.), who quickly distinguished himself in this environment, Orazio remained a competent but undistinguished practitioner of the dominant late maniera style.

It is not clear when Orazio first encountered the revolutionary style of Caravaggio (1571–1610), or precisely when he incorporated the younger Lombard’s innovations into his own work. Caravagggesque elements are not yet fully evident in Orazio’s badly damaged frescoes of 1599 in Santa Maria dei Monti, as Barroero claims, but his easel paintings after 1600 clearly reflect Caravaggio’s reliance on the model, dramatic lighting, and simplified compositional structures with a restricted number of figures close to the picture plane. Most important for the development of Orazio’s style were Caravaggio’s private commissions of the 1590s, with their light overall tonalities and quiet mood. Orazio may also have known works by the Tuscan reformers, particularly Santi di Tito (1536–1603) and Ludovico Cardi (Il Cigoli, 1559–1613), who were also attempting to overcome late maniera style with increased reference to earlier masters.

After Caravaggio’s departure from Rome in 1606, Orazio adopted a more openly Caravagggesque style, in which he worked until c. 1613. This change in style also brought a shift from religious commissions to works for the private collectors who had been the first supporters of Caravaggio. Orazio’s works of these years tend to place a single monumental figure or restricted figure group in sharp relief on a dark background or a delicately depicted landscape in the manner of the German painter Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610/1620), then active in Rome. In this period Orazio established his lasting interest in the careful, almost illusionistic depiction of rich fab-
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rics and developed his characteristic sensuous, fleshy facial types with full lips, deep-set almond eyes, and thick necks.

A turning point in Orazio’s career was marked by the trial of 1612, in which his daughter Artemisia (1593–c. 1652) accused Agostino Tassi (1566–1644), a quadriatur painter then working with Orazio, of repeatedly raping her and reneging on a promise of marriage. Following the trauma and public scandal, Orazio actively sought work outside Rome. Earlier he had sent paintings to Ancona, in the Marches, and success there, as well as the influence of his patrons the Borghese and the Savelli, may have helped secure subsequent commissions in Fabriano, beginning with the Chapel of the Crucifixion in San Venanzo. He executed frescoes in the chapel in 1616–1617, following a likely but not securely documented trip to Florence, where Artemisia was then living. It has been suggested that works created in the Marches look to both local and Florentine prototypes. Orazio’s private works of this period retain stronger echoes of Caravaggio, yet with increasingly precise rendering of flesh tones and fabrics and a more reflective mood.

In 1621 Orazio accepted the invitation of a Genoese nobleman, Giovanni Battista Sauli, to work in Genoa. From this point onward, Orazio became primarily a painter for courts and nobility. He appears to have actively pursued an appointment at the court in Turin, where he may have stopped before proceeding to Paris to the court of Marie de’ Medici, to whom he had presented a painting. Although he was the leading Italian painter in France, he remained only until 1626, when he left for a post as court painter to Charles I in London, remaining there until his death. In the works painted for his noble and royal patrons, Orazio shows an even greater tendency toward refinement and often executed several versions of a single composition.

Orazio enjoys special prominence among the many Caravaggiosque painters active in the first two decades of the seventeenth century as the first to respond to the new style and because, of all these many artists, he developed the most individual style. Within the ferment of Caravaggiosque circles, Orazio’s influence is evident in the works of the Italians Bartolomeo Cavarezzi (c. 1590–1625), Orazio Rimondi (1593–1630), and Giovanni Francesco Guerrieri (1589–1655/1659), as well as the Dutch painter Hendrik Terbrugghen (1588–1629), through whom he had an impact on painters in Utrecht. Orazio’s most prominent student was his daughter Artemisia, who established a successful independent career in Florence, Rome, and later Naples.
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1962.8.1 (1661)

The Lute Player

Oil on canvas, 143.5 x 129 (56 1/2 x 50 3/4)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund

Technical Notes: The support consists of three pieces of medium-weight herringbone-twill fabric sewn horizontally prior to the application of the ground. The ground is a dark, grayish brown color. Areas of thin dark underpaint were applied under the background and the tablecloth, and possibly throughout the composition. The paint was applied in fluid opaque layers, with glazes employed to enhance the shadowed folds of the red and yellow drapery and the tablecloth. The figure’s right knee, shown in deep shadow, is composed entirely of thin translucent glazes. The thickest areas of paint were applied in broad pastos strokes in a wet-into-wet technique. Details and highlights of the hair were applied in thin strokes using a dry paint dragged across the surface. X-radiographs reveal that the left profile of the figure’s face and the right sound hole of the violin were shifted slightly. X-radiographs also reveal a distinct swatch of drapery at the extreme left edge just below center; it bears no relation to the surface composition and most likely remains from an earlier use of the support. Examination with a stereomicroscope reveals that the tablecloth was painted directly over this bit of drapery. Air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy suggests that the yellow drapery consists of Naples yellow and lead white and possibly lead-tin yellow, and the red highlight may contain vermilion and lead white and possibly lead red.

A vertical strip approximately 10 cm wide is butt-joined to the right side of the painting and was added at a later date. Cusping is visible only along the top, bottom, and right edges of the original support, suggesting that the left edge has been trimmed. The varnish is slightly discolored. The paint is somewhat abraded, especially the tablecloth on the left and the shadowed drapery folds over the figure’s right knee. Generously applied overpaint in the shaft of light at the bottom left and on the bottom and right added strips has discolored. The shaft of light in the background may also have been heavily reinforced. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored in 1963, probably by Frank Sullivan.
Provenance: Girolamo Cavazza [d. 1717], Bologna; purchased 3 June 1697 by (Marc Antonio Franceschini) for Prince Johann Adam Andreas von Liechtenstein, Vienna; in the Liechtenstein collection, Vienna, subsequently Vaduz, until 1962.

Exhibited: Florence, Palazzo Vecchio, 1911, Mostra del ritratto italiano dal fine del sec. xvi all’anno 1661, 151, no. 11 of exhibition list; 162–163 of subsequent catalogue Il ritratto italiano dal Caravaggio al Tiepolo alla mostra ai Palazzo Vecchio collegamento in 1697 as a work by Gentileschi. The influence of Caravaggio is clearly evident and has been repeatedly remarked upon, most often in the context of Caravaggio’s Lute Player in Saint Petersburg. Like Caravaggio’s painting of the late 1590s, Gentileschi’s picture portrays a figure at a table with a still life of various instruments and partbooks. Besides the musical theme, the restricted space of the composition, the shaft of light that strikes the figure from the upper right, the naturalistic rendering of the model and her surroundings, the emphasis on the mundane, and the sharp contrast of light and shadow are all reminiscent of works by Caravaggio. Characteristic of Gentileschi are the diagonal placement of the forms against the picture plane, the complicated and detailed folds of the drapery, the delicacy and rendering of hair and cloth, and the sumptuous material.

Although the attribution of the painting is now unquestioned, its date is problematic in the absence of a secure chronology for Gentileschi’s Italian period, which ended in 1623. Most scholars date The Lute Player between 1610 and 1615, citing its similarity to dated frescoes and other paintings considered to have been executed about the same time. The comparative frescoes, The Musical Concert Sponsored by Apollo and the Muses, which Orazio executed in collaboration with Agostino Tassi for the Casino of the Muses for Scipione Borghese (now Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi), are documented by payments to 1611–1612. The poor condition of the frescoes, the viewpoint di sotto in su, and the difference in medium make it difficult to judge some of the stylistic similarities to The Lute Player. In spite of this, morphological characteristics, the handling of the delicate folds of drapery, and the casual arrangement of costumes could suggest a chronological analogy. Yet, the softer light crossing the face and arms of the lutist lends a delicacy not apparent in the frescoes or in other paintings believed to date to the first half of the second decade. Two of these, Judith and Her Maidservant (Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum) and A Young Woman with a Violin (Detroit Institute of Arts), represent women with features similar to figures in the Casino delle Muse and purportedly resemble Artemisia Gentileschi, Orazio’s daughter. Artemisia, who left Rome in 1613, was nineteen years old in 1612, about the age of the girl in the Detroit painting. Attempts to identify the sitter in The Lute Player with Artemisia have been discredited, and thus the date of the Washington painting cannot depend on Artemisia’s age. In addition, not only do the model and figural type differ from those in the Hartford and Detroit paintings, but the softer light molds rather than chisels the features, somewhat like that in the painting Martha and Mary Magdalene (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), usually dated c. 1620 or even later. Such stylistic comparisons of paintings with no secure chronological base suggest that Orazio’s style remained fairly consistent in the teens; consequently, without further documents The Lute Player should be given a broader time span than previously proposed, that is, c. 1612–1620.

The comparison of Gentileschi’s Lute Player with a painting of the muse Terpsichore (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Arras) by Giovanni Baglione (c. 1573–1644) may help date the National Gallery picture and indicate a similar subject. Baglione’s Terpsichore belongs to a series of the muses painted for Ferdinando Gonzaga, duke of Mantua, in (or after) 1620. More likely, the connection here is one of compositional appropriation. The ingenious and informal portrayal of the figure in three-quarter view from behind, her head inclined in rapt attention to the
music, implies that Baglione’s Terpsichore is inspired by Gentileschi’s lutist. Her vacant expression and uncomfortable position suggest a misunderstanding of Gentileschi’s original, which portrays a woman engaged with her instrument. Baglione’s Terpsichore reflects an open gesture, emphasized by her nudity, appropriate to her role as the muse of dance. Baglione’s reliance on the National Gallery painting is supported by the Gentileschi-like flavor of the rest of his series. The Lute Player, known to Baglione in Rome, therefore must date to or before 1620.

The meaning of The Lute Player has eluded scholars. The identification of the young woman with Saint Cecilia is doubtful. The musician quietly concentrates on her music rather than on the divine, and the saint’s usual vision of the angel is absent. In the seventeenth century Saint Cecilia was usually portrayed at an organ, sometimes with a violin; the lute was the instrument least associated with this dance. Baglione’s reliance on the National Gallery lute was the instrument least associated with this chaste saint because of its connotations of carnal love. Indeed, the young woman’s disheveled dress, mended at the side, and the loosened bodice may imply that she is a prostitute, but her flushed cheeks and her distant, melancholy expression may allude to the seductive power of music. The musical instruments on the table—violin, recorder, flute, cornetto—and the partbooks suggest an informal concert about to take place or recently disbanded. Identifications of the woman as Harmony, the Sense of Hearing (she may be tuning the lute rather than playing it), or as an allegory of Music cannot be substantiated. The music on the table, so far unidentified and reworked by a later hand, could possibly lead to the clarification of the subject matter and identity of the sitter. The grace of the young lute player, her quiet contemplation, and the timelessness, melancholy spirit, and poetic stillness of her solo performance raise the subject of The Lute Player from a genre scene to what Ward Bissell described perfectly as “an idealization of the act of musical creation, a commentary on a beauty that transcends the ordinary.”

The numerous depictions of musicians in Rome in the early seventeenth century accord with the strong interest in instrumental and voice performances of madrigals throughout this period and with the rapid development of theatrical music. Gentileschi’s Lute Player belongs to the tradition of Caravaggesque paintings of musicians and musical performances that were produced in intellectual Roman circles, especially in that of Cardinal Del Monte, Caravaggio’s important patron in the 1590s. The Lute Player fits easily into this refined atmosphere of musical appreciation that pervaded the Roman literary scene of the early seventeenth century, and one assumes that the patron who commissioned it belonged to the Roman literati. Given the prevalence of musical themes in this period, Camiz’ suggestion that Gentileschi’s similar interest came from his membership in the painting academy of the Virtuosi del Panteon, located in the same building as the seat of the Congregazione dei Musici di Roma, cannot be sustained without further evidence.

The mystery and beauty of The Lute Player have led to numerous copies, both engraved and painted. The earliest extant copy, on the art market in 1897, appears from photographs to date to the seventeenth century and reflects Gentileschi’s originally more restricted composition, without the ten-inch vertical strip along the right edge. All other known copies include this addition, which must predate 1767. Besides Baglione’s interpretation of the painting, The Lute Player seems to have been an inspiration to other seventeenth-century painters as well. Longhi first suggested that Hendrik Terbrugghen’s paintings of musicians were motivated by Gentileschi, and other scholars have believed that this northern artist, who left Italy in 1614 and never copied Gentileschi directly, drew on the Italian’s poetic representations. The figure of the lute player in Pietro Paolini’s (1603–1681) Concert (J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu) of 1620–1630 is probably fashioned after Gentileschi’s young woman. The early diffusion of this image in its many copies indicates its significance both in Gentileschi’s oeuvre and within the tradition of musical paintings of the seventeenth century.

Notes
1. The signature on the 1697 bill of sale (copy in NGA curatorial files) has now been deciphered to read Girolamo Cavazza. Cavazza was apparently a wealthy Bolognese merchant who owned a number of paintings. On Cavazza see Miller 1991, 36, n. 4, 63, 209, n. a; Guidicini 1868–1873, i: 43, and Miscellanea 1872, 255.
2. In December 1693–January 1694, Franceschini, at Prince Johann Adam’s request, began looking at paintings that Cavazza was reportedly willing to sell; some of the paintings mentioned at this time appear in the bill of sale of 1697. The letters are published in Miller 1991, 209, no. 34;
Orazio Gentileschi, *The Lute Player*, 1962.8.1
212–213, no. 38. As Franceschini's letters for the period May 1694–December 1698 are lost, it is not possible to follow the exact transactions. See also Wilhelm 1911, Beilage, cols. 87–142.

3. Recorded by the following, always as Caravaggio: Fanti 1767, 91, no. 452; Dallinger and Lucchini 1780, 173–174, no. 579; Waagen 1866, 261–262; von Falke 1873, 9, no. 61 (al. 50 1886, 6, no. 31); Kronfeld 1927, 8, no. 31; Strohner 1943, 93, pl. 18.


5. The painting was first published in the 1767 Liechtenstein catalogue with the attribution to Caravaggio.

6. See, most recently, Christiansen 1990, with additional bibliography.

7. Other works by Caravaggio that emphasize music are his Concert of Youths, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; the Rest on the Flight into Egypt, Galleria Doria Pamphil, Rome; Amor Victorious, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. On these and on Caravaggio’s treatment of musical themes see Christiansen 1990, with further bibliography.

8. The suggestion by Gamba 1922, 244, that Orazio painted this work on a visit to the Low Countries should probably be dismissed. Although we know that Gentileschi did visit Brussels briefly on a diplomatic mission for Charles I in late 1626, we know of no paintings he made or brought there (see Bissell 1981, 50). The purchase of the painting in Bologna by Marc Antonio Franceschini in 1697 strongly suggests that the work originated in Italy.


12. Bissell 1981, 154, under no. 26. These paintings, however, have also been dated to Gentileschi’s Genoese period. See Michael Mahoney in Cadogan 1991, 148–151.


14. For example, the National Gallery Saint Cecilia and an Angel (1601.9.73) has been dated by some scholars c. 1610–1612 and compared with the present painting; however, Bissell 1981, 166, suggested that it dates to Gentileschi’s trip to the Marches of c. 1617–1618, and the present writer believes it may be as late as 1621 (see 1961.9.73).

15. Eric Garberson made the comparison. For the Terpsichore see Arnauld Brejon de Lavergnée in exh. cat. Paris 1988, 125, no. 18, repro.

16. Baglione’s paintings in Dijon constitute the first of two series of the muses painted for Ferdinand; the second is lost. The first dates to 1620 (one painting carries the inscription “1620/Roma”), the second to c. 1623–1624. For a discussion of the commissions and further bibliography see Brejon de Lavergnée in exh. cat. Paris 1988, 121–126.


18. As implied by Andrea Bayer in Christiansen 1990, 74.

19. For the iconography of Saint Cecilia, with numerous examples, see de Mirimonde 1974.

20. As suggested by Eric Garberson.


22. Neither Franca Trinchieri Camiz (oral communication with the author, May 1991) nor H. Colin Slim (letter of 4 June 1991, NGA curatorial files) has been able to identify the music. Slim, who has written extensively on musical inscriptions in paintings, observed:

Concerning the female lutenist: a) next to the recorder on the table is a page of music, presumably from an opened book. This page has seven staves—each of an unclear number of lines—with stylized mensural notation; neither clef nor text is indicated; b) below her elbow is the verso folio of an opened partbook on which are visible three staves of five lines with stylized mensural notation and with stylized text below each stave; there is no clear indication of clef. The opening letter of the partbook is perhaps “S” as one sees in sixteenth-century partbooks printed by Dorico at Rome, and by Gardane and Scozzio at Venice. In the extreme upper left-hand corner of the folio there seems to be some verbal inscription: “… or 5° [*]


24. On this see Slim 1985, 241–263. To cite examples by the Gentileschi, there is the painting in Detroit by Orazio, Young Woman with a Violin (see note 11) and his daughter Artemisia’s portrayal of a Woman with a Lute in the Galleria Spada, Rome: Garrard 1989, pl. 3.


26. For the numerous depictions of musicians and concerts in this period see Nicolson 1989 and Slim 1985.

27. See Slim 1985 for a discussion of the music portrayed in Caravaggesque paintings.


29. Franca Trinchieri Camiz (letter of 23 July 1993 in NGA curatorial files) noted that the painting is a Nineteenth-century version of a painting similar to the one in the National Gallery in the 1647 inventory of Alessandro Ruffinelli: “Una figura che denota l’udito, et hà un liuto in mano da star per traverso con cornice tocca d’oro.” The same inventory noted a painting of Mercury by Orazio Gentileschi. See Lewine 1962, 312.

30. Oil on canvas, 144 × 122 cm. Sold Finarte, Milan, 10 June 1987, lot 108, repro. Of course, there is the very slight possibility that this copy was itself cut along the right edge.

31. The mezzotint by Johann Bernard (1784–after 1821) done after The Lute Player for the Kunst- und Industrie-Comp-tor (Vienna, 1804) shows the addition at the right edge (example in the Liechtenstein collection, photograph in the NGA curatorial files).

In addition to the painting mentioned in the previous note there are other painted copies recorded. A picture (with the addition at the right) that sold at Christie’s, London (to Rothschild), on 10 July 1959 (lot 151, 55 × 44 in.) appears to be the same as the painting (in spite of the five-inch difference in measurements) in the New Orleans Country Club, which was purchased by Charles Gresham in Europe in that year (photographs and letter of 23 February 1990 from John Paisant in NGA curatorial files). A painting formerly owned by Fred Herrigel, Newark, New Jersey, also includes the added strip (photograph in the photographic archives, Frick Art Reference Library, New York, cat. 720–23A). Sterling 1995, 118, n. 41, knew a “faithful replica” (which he thought might be the original) in a private col-
lection in Paris. (It is possibly the same painting that sold at Christie’s in 1959 as noted above.) Other copies (according to Bissell 1981, 159, under cat. 31) included a painting at the Villa Lante, Bagnaia, in 1964 and another in the Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna, with a landscape background (oil on copper, 31 x 26 cm), which was called late eighteenth century by Eigenberger 1927, 157, inv. no. 538. This small copper was destroyed during World War II, and no old photographs are known even at the Akademie (letter of 12 March 1990 from Heribert Hutter, director of the Gemäldegalerie at the Akademie, NGA curatorial files). It has not been possible to trace the copy in Bagnaia, and Bissell has informed us that he does not have a photograph (letter of 21 April 1992, NGA curatorial files).

32. The 1767 Liechtenstein catalogue gives the dimensions as 4 piedi 4 1/2 once x 4 piedi 2 1/2, which translates to c. 143.5 x 135.3 cm, or nearly identical to the measurements in the subsequent Liechtenstein catalogues (144 x 130 cm) and those at present.

33. Longhi 1927, 112. See also Bloch 1952, 15, and Bissell 1981, 92–93, n. 15–16. Two paintings by Terbrugghen of a flute player and of a lute player are reproduced in Bissell 1981, figs. 174 and 176. It has been suggested that Terbrugghen may have made a second trip to Italy and learned of Gentileschi’s more mature paintings at that time.

34. See Christiansen 1990, 70, no. 13, repro.

35. Bissell 1981, 38, called this painting the artist’s only genre painting; however, he thought the Young Woman with a Violin in Detroit to be a Saint Cecilia.

36. As is now known, the drawing of a lute player in the National Gallery, Washington (inv. no. 1964.3.1), is not a study for the painting but a later interpretation of it: Moir 1969, 163–164, fig. 11.
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Giovanni Lanfranco
1582–1647

Lanfranco was an avid student of Correggio (1489/1494–1534), whose works he encountered in his native Parma. From 1597 to 1598, and again from 1600 to 1602, Lanfranco was apprenticed to Agostino Carracci (1577–1602), who was then painting in the Palazzo del Giardino, Parma. At Agostino’s death, Lanfranco was sent by Ranuccio I Farnese, duke of Parma and Piacenza, to study with Annibale Carracci (q. v.) in Rome.

There Lanfranco collaborated initially with the other Carracci students on the wall frescoes in the Gallery of the Palazzo Farnese. In 1605 he was commissioned to decorate the Camerino degli Eremiti, behind the Palazzo Farnese, the first of many commissions from important Roman families. Lanfranco’s first decade in Rome marked the inception of a personal, if erratic, style: although grounded in the principles taught by the Carracci, as Bellori recounted, it retained an underlying Correggesque lyricism and strong reminiscences of Correggio in the features, gestures, and poses of individual figures.

In 1610 Lanfranco returned to Emilia for a stay of
two years, during which he received several altar commissions in Piacenza. His style quickly reflected an intense study of Lodovico Carracci (q.v.) and Bartolomeo Schedoni (1578–1615). He also renewed his study of Correggio’s frescoes in Parma. From this model Lanfranco developed his seemingly effortless abilities as a ceiling painter; as he told Bellori, “the air painted for him.”

After returning to Rome in late 1612, Lanfranco slowly reestablished his contacts among the major Roman patrons. In his easel paintings, echoes of Lodovico Carracci were quickly replaced by refined Caravaggesque effects derived from painters then active in Rome, such as Orazio Borgianni (1578–1616) and Orazio Gentileschi (q.v.). Lanfranco soon established himself as one of the most productive and inventive fresco painters of the day. In 1616 he decorated the Buongiovanni Chapel in Sant’Agostino, bringing Correggio’s upward-swirling masses of figures seen di sotto in sù to a Roman dome for the first time. Close ties to the Borghese brought him several significant commissions during the reign of Pope Paul V Borghese, the most important of which was the extensive decoration of the Benediction Loggia in Saint Peter’s (not executed).

Chief among Lanfranco’s major commissions of the 1620s was the dome of Sant’Andrea della Valle, in which he employed the Correggesque illusionism of the Buongiovanni Chapel on a monumental scale, thus establishing the predominant format for dome frescoes into the eighteenth century. He also received several significant commissions from Pope Urban VIII Barberini, including the Navicella altar (1627–1628) and the Chapel of the Crucifixion in Saint Peter’s (1629–1632). The 1620s saw the development of what is considered Lanfranco’s mature, “baroque” style, with strong chiaroscuro effects and expansive, energetic figures. A continuing hallmark of his style is the broad handling of drapery as large planar masses broken by a few simple folds, which Bellori praised for its suitability to the artist’s compositional structure and color. Some works of the later 1620s also reflect Lanfranco’s participation in the neo-Venetianism then popular in Rome.

While Lanfranco’s success brought him election as Principe of the Accademia di San Luca in 1631, major commissions fell increasingly to the younger artists favored by the court of Urban VIII Barberini. In 1633 Lanfranco accepted the invitation of the Jesuits to decorate the cupola of the Gesù Nuovo in Naples. Over the next thirteen years he received most of the important decorative commissions in Naples, leaving him little time for easel paintings. Bellori, who praised and even defended Lanfranco’s seemingly effortless facility, noted that in executing so many vast decorative cycles the artist fell into mere unreasoned practice and thus, as others had observed, painted below his abilities.

Passeri related that Lanfranco was not much given to teaching by precepts, preferring to let his works speak for themselves. The artist’s workshop, necessary for the execution of large fresco cycles, produced few students of note other than François Perrier (1590–1650), who worked as Lanfranco’s assistant from 1625 to 1629 and took the master’s style back to France. Lanfranco’s frescoes, and particularly his domes, were of great significance for the subsequent development of fresco decoration in Italy and elsewhere. In Naples Lanfranco had little impact on artists during his lifetime, but he was very important for younger painters such as Mattia Preti (1613–1699), Luca Giordano (q.v.), and Francesco Solimena (1657–1747).
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Orazio Gentileschi and Giovanni Lanfranco

1961.9.73 (1625)

Saint Cecilia and an Angel

c. 1617/1618 and c. 1621/1628
Oil on canvas, 87.5 x 108 (34 3/8 x 42 1/2)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support consists of four separate pieces of medium-weight, loosely woven plain-weave fabric sewn together in a pattern visible in x-radiographs (fig. 1). Although there is cusping along the edges of the center section, all technical evidence indicates that the painting was originally conceived at the present dimensions. X-radiographs show no interruption of any compositional lines at the edges of the central piece, and the analysis of cross-sections reveals an identical buildup of ground and paint layers over all four sections. Cross-sections reveal a white ground layer. The raised seams were smoothed by a thicker ground application.

X-radiographs suggest that the main figure of Saint Cecilia, which has several pentimenti, was painted first. The outlines of the red drapery over her left thigh originally extended to the right as far as the angel's sheet of music. These outlines were changed at least once, but were later hidden by the organ and the saint's right arm. The red skirt was at least partially modeled before the organ was painted on top. X-radiographs also indicate that the saint's hands have been raised 2 to 3 cm. The angel and organ pipes were planned and painted with no overlapping of forms. A slight change in the angel's forehead, making it more vertical, is visible to the eye. Air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy suggests that the main figure of Saint Cecilia was painted first. The varnish is slightly yellowed. There are losses in the saint's right leg and in the lower-left quadrant, and a vertical loss of about 5 cm in the angel's wing near the right edge. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored in 1955 by Mario Modestini.

Provenance: Probably Natale Rondinini, Rome (1540–1627); his son, Alessandro Rondinini (d. 1638), Rome; his wife, Felice Zacchia Rondinini [1593-1667], Rome, 1662; by inheritance to their grandson, Alessandro Rondinini (1660–1740), Rome, and inventoried at his death;2 to the Del Bufalo della Valle Cancellieri family, Rome, probably by inheritance through Alessandro’s sister, Felicità Rondinini, who married a Marchese Del Bufalo della Valle;3 by inheritance to Marchese Paolo Del Bufalo della Valle, Rome, by 1840; by inheritance to Monsignor Federico Fioretti, Rome, by 1944.4 (Vitale Bloch, Netherlands);5 purchased 1952 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.6


The Saint Cecilia and an Angel was first published by Hermanin in 1944 with an attribution to Orazio Gentileschi and, except for Santi, has been accepted by all subsequent published authorities.9 Even before stylistic and documentary evidence revealed the intervention of two hands, verbal opinions and written correspondence by experts noted discrepancies in the handling of the paint in various sections, suggesting either a pastiche by one artist or the intervention of a second hand.10 Recent stylistic analysis by Schleier and the rereading of the Rondinini inventory have revealed that the second hand was that of Giovanni Lanfranco (q.v.). As indicated below, study of the x-radiographs (fig. 1), pigment analyses, and x-ray fluorescence has begun to suggest how much of the painting may have been executed by Gentileschi before its completion by Lanfranco.11

Salerno correctly identified the National Gallery painting with one described in the 1662 inventory of Felice Zacchia Rondinini: “Un quadro Longo Palmi cinque, alto tre con una Santa Cecilia con Teste di m[an]i del Gentileschi, il resto di Gio:Lanfranchi con cornici intagliata et indorata nella Galeria del S.r Card.le.”12 In 1694 two paintings of Saint Cecilia in the Rondinini collection—one with an attribution to Lanfranco, the other to Gentileschi—were shown in an exhibition in the cloister of San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome.13 In a subsequent exhibition in 1716, two Saint Cecilias were again shown with the one by Gentileschi described as a “S. Cecilia che sona l’organo del Gentileschi.”14 In the inventory of the belongings of Alessandro Rondinini, Natale’s great-grandson, compiled on 19 January 1741, the painting is listed as “mano del Lanfranco con la testa del Gentileschi.”15 The name of Lanfranco was not reintroduced in connection with this painting until Schleier recognized his style in the hands and sleeves of the figures.16

Examination of the painting in 1982 revealed that the picture consisted of four pieces of canvas sewn together; all four pieces are of similar fabric and are prepared with a similar ground, implying that the entire composition was executed in one campaign.17 Cusping on the largest central canvas indicates that a piece of cloth measuring about 59 x 83.5 cm was stretched and primed. Before the paint layer was ap-
plied, however, the canvas was enlarged on three sides by three additional pieces of canvas. Pigment analyses, though incomplete, suggest that the artist worked up much of the composition before abandoning the canvas. The second hand involved (Lanfranco's) seems to have painted the organ, altered the position of the saint's hands, and added the left wing of the angel (see fig. 2). Additions to the composition also include the angel's hands holding the sheet of music and the diaphanous yellowish green sleeves that cover a layer of red in the saint's original garment. The x-radiographs show that the arms of Saint Cecilia were more vertical and closer to her sides, revealing her skirt between. Her bodice was originally closer to her neck; the angel's shirt also had a higher neckline. In completing the transformation, the second artist made changes to the skirt and hands of Saint Cecilia: her left leg and hands were originally conceived higher but were adjusted to make room for the organ. The addition of white lead pigment at the juncture of the canvas pieces obliterates a reading of the changes made in this crucial central area of the composition.

Due to the presence of cusping on the largest piece of fabric, it is not surprising that an earlier stylistic analysis of the painting concluded that the original composition consisted of the two heads on this piece before its additions. In addition to the technical evidence, studies of other small paintings by Gentileschi also contradict this hypothesis. The artist's paintings of a Young Girl with a Violin (Detroit Institute of Arts) and the Madonna and Child (Harvard University Art Museums, Cambridge) are made up of several pieces of fabric with the largest central piece exhibiting cusped edges. In each case, the composition was laid out after the fabric pieces were sewn together.

The attribution and dating of the Saint Cecilia and an Angel are complicated by the existence of a prototype for the heads of the two figures and another version of the composition. Hermanin first saw the similarity of the heads to those of the Madonna and

Fig. 1. X-radiograph of 1961.9.73
Orazio Gentileschi and Giovanni Lanfranco, *Saint Cecilia and an Angel*, 1961.9.73
Fig. 2. Sketch of 1961.9.73, with gray areas to indicate the hand of Lanfranco angel in Gentileschi’s Madonna Presenting the Christ Child to Santa Francesca Romana (also known as the Madonna della Casa Rosei or the Santa Francesca Romana) in the Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino, which has been dated by most scholars c. 1617–1618 (fig. 3).\(^{22}\) That painting was made for the church of Santa Catarina Martire in Fabriano, where Gentileschi’s activity in the mid to late teens is known but not documented.\(^{23}\) Almost as if the two heads and torsos were lifted from that painting and repositioned across from each other in the Washington canvas, they occupy a tighter space with the Madonna/Saint Cecilia sitting upright and looking down instead of bending over, while the angel is brought closer to her. Either the artist used the same models for both paintings or, more likely, appropriated the forms from the already successful Santa Francesca Romana. In the Washington picture the coiffure of Saint Cecilia and the unruly but delicate hair of the angel are repeated from the earlier painting.

In 1973 a variant copy of Saint Cecilia and an Angel was discovered in the Monastero di San Francesco in Todi (now in the Galleria Nazionale dell’Umbria, Perugia; fig. 4).\(^{24}\) Without the benefit of the x-radiographs of the National Gallery picture, which were made subsequent to his article, Santi declared the Perugia painting Gentileschi’s autograph version.

Fig. 3. Orazio Gentileschi, Madonna Presenting the Christ Child to Santa Francesca Romana, c. 1617–1618, oil on canvas, Urbino, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche [photo: Scala/Art Resource, NY]
and the present picture a copy by another artist. From the technical studies of the National Gallery painting, however, it is evident that the Perugia *Saint Cecilia and an Angel* was painted with the knowledge of both the uncompleted Washington picture and the Urbino *Santa Francesca Romana*, for it incorporates elements from both. Some parts of a composition, possibly of a Saint Cecilia, had been worked up in the Washington painting, because the x-radiographs suggest that Saint Cecilia’s skirt was once more ample, with her hands covering it. The original position of her right arm is lower and at a sharper angle, much as it is in the Urbino painting. Consequently, the sequence may have been as follows: after finishing the *Santa Francesca Romana* for Fabriano, Gentileschi, in c. 1617–1618,\(^{25}\) painted the two figures in the Washington picture.\(^{26}\) At this time another small painting of the head of Santa Francesca Romana, also copied from the large altarpiece, may have been in his workshop.\(^{27}\) Sometime soon thereafter the elaborate Perugia *Saint Cecilia and an Angel* was executed, taking Gentileschi’s unfinished picture as a starting point, but copying the color of the costume (although not the brocade), the angel’s wing, and the Madonna’s rolled-up right sleeve from the *Santa Francesca Romana* altarpiece. From Gentileschi’s *Saint Cecilia* he copied the figures and the saint’s voluminous skirt. At this point the paintings were separated and a second artist—Lanfranco, as argued here and documented in the Rondinini inventory—finished the Washington picture.

The attribution of the Perugia painting to Gentileschi cannot be sustained. Although the artist often repeated figures and compositions, he never did so by appropriating and enriching certain motifs as here.\(^{28}\) The Perugia copyist\(^{29}\) also simplified the delicate lace, strands of hair, and brocade in Gentileschi’s *Santa Francesca Romana* to summary indications.\(^{30}\) He showed less interest in contour by letting a softer light mold his forms. The long, slender, and wooden hands do not occur in authentic paintings by Gentileschi. Unlike the master, this artist was interested not in the tactility of the materials and flesh but in the texture of paint itself, which is built up in a rich impasto not found in Gentileschi’s autograph works. In addition, in the parts he had to invent himself because they were unfinished in Gentileschi’s canvas—such as the lower arms of the saint and the left shoulder and hand of the angel—he had difficulty representing forms consistent with the rest of the picture.

The attribution of the unfinished portion of the Washington *Saint Cecilia and an Angel* to Gentileschi is certain. Besides the early attribution to him, the emphasis on contour, the delicate rendering of individual strands of hair, and the strong but not harsh

---

*Fig. 4. After Orazio Gentileschi, Saint Cecilia with an Angel, probably late 1610s, oil on canvas, Perugia, Galleria Nazionale dell’Umbria*
light that sculpts the forms are apparent in other paintings by the artist in the second decade of the seventeenth century. That the figures relate to those in the Santa Francesca Romana strongly recommends a contemporaneous date of c. 1617–1618. Similar lighting is found in another painting in Fabriano, Saint Charles Borromeo Contemplating the Instruments of the Passion (San Benedetto, Chapel of San Carlo Borromeo), also dated toward the end of the teens. Nevertheless, in the absence of documents, dating Gentileschi’s paintings remains problematic; the subtle development of his style is sometimes difficult to judge.

If the argument advanced above for the sequence of the Saint Cecilia paintings is correct—that is, the unfinished Gentileschi composition, the Perugia copy, the finished Lanfranco composition—Orazio returned to Rome with a composition blocked out. When he departed the city definitively, probably in 1621, the artist may have left the canvas behind. How Lanfranco acquired it may never be known. He could have received it directly from Gentileschi, or, more likely, he may have been commissioned by Natale Rondinini to finish it. Passeri suggested that the two artists worked together in the Sala Regia of the Palazzo Quirinale, a collaboration that would have had to have taken place in 1616–1617. There is no proof that the artists were friends, but they certainly would have known each other. On the other hand, Rondinini’s inventory lists five paintings by Lanfranco, more than by any other contemporary artist, suggesting that Lanfranco was his favorite painter. If so, it is not surprising that the patron would ask him to complete an unfinished painting in his possession. How Rondinini acquired Gentileschi’s canvas is unknown. He did own a Judith and Holofernes by Gentileschi, and it is possible that Rondinini commissioned him to paint the Saint Cecilia. Trinchieri Camiz has discovered that Rondinini was a member of the Congregazione di Santa Cecilia, a group associated with overseeing the church and monastery of Saint Cecilia in Trastevere. This, and his association with Cardinal Paolo Emilio Sfondrato (1561–1618), the titular head of the church when the saint’s remains were discovered, may have intensified an interest in representations of Saint Cecilia.

In any case, Lanfranco’s finished composition of Saint Cecilia and an Angel may have a terminus post quem of 1621 and a terminus ante quem of 1627, the date of the collector Natale Rondinini’s death. Not only the attribution in the Rondinini inventory but the style of the Saint Cecilia and an Angel confirms Lanfranco as the artist who finished the National Gallery canvas. The fluid brushwork of the sleeves, suggested in general terms rather than carefully delineated, with the folds lying on the surface rather than wholly three dimensional, and the sketchily indicated wings are characteristic of his style. The boneless, rubbery hands painted in a silvery color with red highlights are almost a signature, found in most of his works. Lanfranco’s Saint Cecilia at a spinet with two angels (Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, The Bob Jones University Collection)
Greenville, fig. 5), dated c. 1620–1621 by Schleier, has
drapery folds and hands similar to those in the Wash-
goine painting; it also belonged to Natale Romance. The same drapery and boneless hands are
again found in his Venus Playing the Harp in the Palazzo Barberini, Rome, dated by Schleier to c.
1630–1634 because of its neo-Venetian tonality, which became evident in the late 1620s. After the rediscovery in 1599 of what were thought to be Saint Cecilia’s physical remains, a
plethora of devotional images of the saint emerged. Having already been considered the patron saint of
music, she was often represented at an organ (or, less often, with another instrument) either with or without an angel and sometimes wearing a crown of roses. On her wedding night, Saint Cecilia, a Roman of the second or third century, told her husband Valerianus that she had asked God to retain her virginity and that her request had been fulfilled by the visit of an angel. Valerianus demanded to see the angel but was not allowed the privilege until his conver-
sion, after which an angel appeared to the newly-weds carrying a crown of roses for Cecilia and one of lilies for Valerianus. Following this, Valerianus’ brother Tiburtius was also converted. All three subsequently suffered martyrdom for their faith. In the National Gallery painting Saint Cecilia plays the organ as the angel holds her music, which has been impossible to identify. According to the saint’s Passio, Cecilia was reading from the Acts of the Evangelists when she was visited by the angel. Thus the present picture could represent the saint at prayer on the evening of her wedding, as she appealed to remain pure.

It has been suggested that the visual source for Saint Cecilia and an Angel may be the print by Gerrit Pietersz (1566–before 1616?) of the same subject, signed and dated 1593. It has been proposed also that Gerrit van Honthorst (1590–1656) based a painting of the same theme on the Washington composition. Pietersz’ print, in the reverse direction, has only a generic connection with the National Gallery painting: although both play a pipe organ, the number of figures included and their positions differ markedly. Honthorst’s painting, too, portrays Saint Cecilia in song with several angels. Both Pietersz’ print and Honthorst’s painting are closer in mood to Lanfranco’s painting at Bob Jones University than to the Washington picture. Since many images of Saint Cecilia emerged during these years, it is difficult to trace any influence of this specific painting on later works.

Notes
1. A painting of Saint Cecilia attributed to Gentileschi and Lanfranco and measuring 3 x 5 palmi (approximately 70 x 116 cm) is listed in the 1662 inventory attached to the will of Felicita Zacchia Rondinini and published by Salerno 1965, 280; see also note 12, below. As no paintings by artists active after c. 1630 appear in the later inventories, Salerno concluded that this collection was amassed by Felice’s father-in-law, Natale Rondinini, during the first decades of the seventeenth century.

2. It was lent by the Rondinini to the art exhibitions in the cloister of San Salvatore in Lauro of 1694 and 1710 (see text and note 13). It also appears in Alessandro’s inventory of 19 January 1741: “Altro [quadro] in tela di cinque e tre posti di traverso rapp.te S. Cecilia che sona l’organo in cornice dorata et intagliato mano del Lanfranco con la testa del Gentileschi della sud. etra credita.” The “sud. etra credita” refers to Natale’s fideicommissum inherited via Felice. The inventory is in the Archivio di Stato di Roma, 30 notai capitolini, not. T. Pizzutus, Sept. 1649, brought to the writer’s attention by Erich Schleier and Franca Camiz. The present work is not included.

3. It is not known when Natale’s fideicommissum was violated, but this could easily have occurred during the difficulties that the family experienced in the eighteenth century. Like many others, the painting does not reappear in the 1807 inventory compiled after Alessandro’s second son Giuseppe had died without an heir. In the litigation for the inheritance, the descendants of Felicità Rondinini Del Búfalo della Valle were unsuccessful, further suggesting that the painting had passed to that family some time earlier. Salerno 1965, 281–315 and 73–74, published the 1807 inventory and chronicled the dissolution of the family collection. The line of descent from Felicita Rondinini remains unclear in the complicated history of the Del Bufalo della Valle Cancelleri. On this family see Amadyn 1914, 187–197.

4. According to Hermann 1944, 45, the paintings owned by Monsignor Fioretti in 1944, including the Saint Ce-
cilia, had been inherited from his mother, a Marchesa Del Bufalo della Valle. These were included in a list, dated 23 February 1840 and then in the possession of Monsignor Fioretti, of paintings belonging to Marchese Paolo Del Bufalo della Valle.

5. Listed in exh. cat. Milan 1951 as “Racc. del Dr. Vitale Bloch.”

6. According to Kress 1956, 82.

7. See text and note 13.

8. This catalogue is unavailable, but is cited in the 1951 Milan exhibition catalogue.


10. Internal correspondence between Seymour Slive, Sheldon Grossman, and Charles Parkhurst (July 1980) raised the problem of attribution several times. Erich Schleier noted that the painting was made up of several pieces of fabric sewn together and suggested that the original painting may have been cut down from a larger piece and then enlarged to form an independent composition of Saint Cecilia (letter of 20 December 1968 to Perry Cott in NGA files; Schleier did not at that time suggest that the painting was by two hands).

11. Scientific analysis by Barbara Berrie included study of paint samples, air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy, x-ray powder diffraction, scanning electron microscopy, and energy dispersive spectrometry. Her results will be published in a separate article.

12. Rome, Archivio di Stato, Miscellanea Famiglia, fasc. 148, busta 7, p. 118v. Published with slightly different transcription by Salerno 1965, 280. There is an unbroken provenance for the National Gallery Saint Cecilia from its purchase by the Kress Foundation back to the Rondinini family. See provenance.


14. Ghezzi ms, fol. 159r; in De Marchi 1987, 245. The other painting was described as “S. Cecilia di Lanfranco.” Although Bissell cited the Rondinini inventory and the Ghezzi manuscript, he did not take the Lanfranco attribution into consideration; he did note, however, that “the unusually fluid handling of the sleeves might have brought the painterly Lanfranco to mind” (Bissell 1981, 166). He did not have the x-radiographs at his disposal when he was writing.

15. See provenance and note 2.

16. Oral communication with this writer, Fall 1990.


18. See Technical Notes, above.

19. For example, the red skirt seems to be primarily by Gentileschi.

20. Analysis by Catherine Turrill, summer 1981 (NGA curatorial files). The present writer also believed this to be the case before a thorough study of the technical analysis revealed otherwise.

21. For these paintings see Bissell 1981, pls. 49 and 61; Alfred Ackerman and Ivan Gaskel kindly supplied x-rayographs and pertinent information regarding the paintings. It is not yet understood why Gentileschi would bother to stretch and prime canvases, remove them, sew them to other pieces, and then restretch them before painting the composition. Perhaps these small pieces were stretched with the idea of making smaller paintings and when the artist decided on larger compositions they were removed for enlargement. It is possible that in the workshop many of these pieces were stretched at the same time for convenience.


26. A painting of the Madonna of the Rosary with Saints Dominic and Catherine (the Madonna del Rosario) (Bissell 1981, 168–169, cat. 40, figs. 89–90) in the church of Santa Lucia in Fabriano also repeats the poses of the angel and Santa Francesca Romana in the Urbino altarpiece. Until recently, scholars have unreservedly accepted the Madonna del Rosario as autograph. Pizzorusso, however, questioned the attribution to Gentileschi (Pizzorusso 1987, 61–63), asserting that the painting is a pasteche of elements from Gentileschi’s Santa Francesca Romana and other paintings by the artist (Bissell 1981, 159–163, cat. 32, fig. 68).

27. A painting of the head of Santa Francesca Romana existed, but its location and dimensions are unknown. Formerly in the collection of Luigi Bonomi, Milan (Bissell 1981, 208, cat. X–23, pl. 158). On the basis of a photograph it is impossible to determine the authenticity of the painting, which was accepted by Longhi but rejected by Emiliani and Bissell. The purpose of the head of Santa Francesca Romana may have been a study for another composition.

28. See, for example, the paintings of David in Contemplation after the Defeat of Goliath in Berlin and Rome (Bissell 1981, pls. 34–35) and the Rest on the Flight into Egypt in Vienna and Paris (Bissell 1981, pls. 118–119).

In the Perugia Saint Cecilia the artist copied the pulled-up sleeve of the Madonna’s right arm from the Santa Francesca Romana, revealing her blouse underneath. Instead of logically repeating this on her left arm, he also copied
the Virgin’s draped mantle from the Urbino painting and then changed it to the covered sleeve of the red dress. In addition, he took the angel’s left arm that was folded in prayer in the altarpiece and stuck in the sheet of music without regard to the missing right arm and hand. He added a chair, poorly understood and barely sketched in, behind Saint Cecilia, where there is nothing indicated in the Washington picture.

29. Bissell 1981, 167, attributed the Perugia Saint Cecilia to Guerrieri, an artist from Fossombrone who worked in the Marches and in Rome. Erich Schleier does not believe Guerrieri is the author of the Perugia painting but considers it possibly an original by Gentileschi painted after the Washington picture (letter of 15 February 1991, NGA curatorial files). Another Saint Cecilia that Bissell attributed to Guerrieri (1981, fig. 159) does not accord stylistically with the Perugia painting. Neither canvas has been included in the most recent catalogues raisonnés of Guerrieri’s work (Emiliani 1991).

In his early period this fine, but little-known, artist followed the precision of Gentileschi’s style closely, attending to details of contour and texture of costume with care. In his mature style, although he built up his forms with a rich texture of paint, he did not abandon the goal of the suggestion of material richness and detail. For comparisons see his paintings from San Pietro, Fano, now in the Pinacoteca, Fano; and his Mary Magdalene, signed and dated 1611. For Guerrieri see also Emiliani, Guerrieri, 1958, and Anselmi, Emiliani, and Saporiti 1988.

30. Unnecessary embellishments considered only as extra adornment include the ribbons on Saint Cecilia’s shoulder; the lace border of her blouse; the halo; and the roses, an attribute of the saint.

31. See, for example, Judith and Her Maid servant, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford; Saint Cecilia (?), Detroit Institute of Arts; the Rest on the Flight into Egypt, City Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham (Bissell 1981, no. 29, fig. 45; no. 28, figs. 48–49; no. 38, fig. 85, respectively); and the Young Woman Playing a Lute, National Gallery of Art (1962.8.1).

32. Bissell 1981, no. 41, fig. 91. Although Hermann noted the relationship of the National Gallery painting to the Santa Francesca Romana, he did not date either. Longhi, Suida, Shapley, Moir, and Emiliani dated it c. 1610–1612. Only Bissell believed that the relationship with the Urbino painting indicated a similar dating in the second half of the decade.

33. For example, the painting of Saints Cecilia, Valerianus, and Tiburtius Visited by the Angel (Brera, Milan; Bissell 1981, fig. 92) was dated on stylistic grounds by most scholars to the second half of the 1610s or in the 1620s. Only Schleier 1962, 432–436, dated it prior to 1610. New documents published by Rovi 1992, 107–109, prove that the painting was executed by 25 November 1607.

34. According to Bissell 1981, 42, the ascension of the Bolognese Alessandro Ludovisi to the papal throne in February 1621 dashed Gentileschi’s hopes of great papal commissions. His patron, Antonio Maria Salli, archbishop of Genoa, who had not gained the papacy, invited Gentileschi to work for him in Genoa. See Soprani 1674, 316–317.

35. Passeri 1934, 123. Salerno 1960, 157, and Schleier 1970, 58, saw Gentileschi’s participation in the Sala Regia, where there are payments to Lanfranco, Saraceni, Tassi, and others. Bissell 1981, 223–224, argued convincingly, however, that there are no payments to Gentileschi, that he was at work in San Venanzio, Fabriano, in 1616, and that his hatred for Tassi would have precluded his participation in the Sala Regia project.

36. Franca Trinchieri Camiz noted the number of paintings by Lanfranco in Rondinini’s collection and made the suggestion that Lanfranco must have been his preferred artist (oral communication July 1992). See Salerno 1965, 279–282, for the inventory.

37. Inventory of 1662 (Salerno 1965, 279).

38. Information from Franca Trinchieri Camiz (letter of 20 October 1992, NGA curatorial files). Sfondrato ordered the restoration of the basilica, and the remains were found on 19 October 1599. This elicited much interest in the saint. On the discovery of the saint’s remains see Enrico Josi in BibSS 3:1078.

39. The Rondinini collection was probably amassed solely by Natale Rondinini (1540–1627). See note 1.


41. This painting was the other Saint Cecilia described in the San Salvatore in Lauro exhibition of 1716, mentioned in the text. In the 1741 Rondinini inventory (see note 2) it is more fully described as “S. Cecilia in atto di sonare il Cimbal con due angeli.” Franca Trinchieri Camiz, who discovered the inventory, made the connection with the Bob Jones painting.


43. On the story of Saint Cecilia and her relationship to music see de Mirimonde 1974, 1–8 and Enrico Josi in BibSS 5:1063–1062. The first stories of Saint Cecilia did not associate her with music. The Passio related that while musical instruments were playing during her marriage she asked God to keep her a virgin. A confusion in the reading of the text and the use of the word “organis” transformed the saint over time into a musician, as she was considered from the twelfth century on. By the end of the fifteenth century, the organ had become her most frequent musical attribute.

44. Gentileschi’s Saints Cecilia, Valerianus, and Tiburtius Visited by the Angel (see note 33) represents the moment when the angel delivers the crowns of flowers, which filled the room with a delicate and overwhelming fragrance.


46. Judson 1959, 177; Hollstein’s 17: Pietersz, no. 5, repro.

47. Judson 1959, 177; Herzog 1969, 85, cat. 43, repro.


49. A copy of the Washington picture, location unknown, reproduces the composition exactly: 97 x 109 cm, sold Sotheby’s 25 July 1924, lot 11 (as Guercino), formerly collection Mrs. Randolph Berens, London. Photograph in Frick Art Reference Library and in NGA curatorial files. Bissell also mentioned a painting that sold at Christie’s, London, 6 July 1936, lot 206 (not repro.) of Saint Cecilia with two singing cherubs, 46 x 34 1/2 in. (formerly collection W. Walton). Without examining the picture or a photograph, it is impossible to judge whether it is by Gentileschi, or related to the Washington picture.
Giuseppe Ghislandi, called Fra Vittore or Fra Galgario
1655 – 1743

Giuseppe Ghislandi was born in Bergamo to a perspective and landscape painter, Domenico (active 1656–1672). After training in his native city with local painters, Giuseppe continued his education in Venice between 1675 and 1688. There he became a lay brother in the monastery of San Francesco di Paola, taking the name Fra Vittore, though writers who have doubted the seriousness of his vocation have insinuated that he did so merely in order to gain financial support for his studies. According to early sources, he studied the works of Titian (c. 1488–1576) and Veronese (1528–1588) above all, and this initial contact with the great tradition of portraiture proved decisive for his later development. Although Ghislandi is best known as a portraitist, he also painted a number of history paintings (no longer extant) in Venice and Bergamo.

In 1688 Ghislandi returned briefly to Bergamo. Upon his return to Venice he converted decisively to the modern Venetian tradition of portraiture best represented by Sebastiano Bombelli (1635–1719), whose assistant he was for the next twelve years. Bombelli’s style of painterly aristocratic portraiture, designed to fulfill the somewhat contradictory requirements of grandeur, grace, and naturalness, may be considered a continuation of the grand manner introduced to Venice by Tiberio Tinelli (q.v.). During this second Venetian period Ghislandi painted the portraits of important Venetian nobles. He thus apparently became something of a rival to Bombelli, and the sources relate that he left the studio under the cloud of the master’s envy.

Sometime after 1702, Ghislandi returned definitively to Bergamo where he entered the monastery of Galgario (hence the sobriquet Fra Galgario). He immediately became the painter most often chosen to paint both official and private portraits of the Bergamasque gentry. In these decades, Ghislandi’s clientele also included Milanese patrons, and he often worked briefly in the Lombard capital. His style in this period is characterized by brilliant brushwork and color, and he still retained the highly stylized format of Venetian “official” portraits.

At this time he must also have begun to paint the many genre portraits for which he is now perhaps best known. In this painting type, called capriccio teste (“capricious heads”) by contemporaries, Ghislandi embellished his portrayals of lower-class characters by adding such attributes as were necessary to provide piquancy through fanciful or allegorical subject matter. Such character heads seem to have been suggested to Ghislandi by Rembrandt (1606–1669) through the mediation of the German painter Solomon Adler (1630–1709), whom Ghislandi knew in Milan. These heads had been a component of Venetian taste earlier in the century, too, as in the works of Pietro Della Vecchia (q.v.).

Ghislandi’s achievement in portraiture ultimately lies in his innovative blend of genre conventions and aristocratic portraiture. The combination of these two traditions strengthened Ghislandi’s contribution to each, and his best works are marked by both social realism and psychological insight. Ghislandi’s stylistic evolution mirrors his progressive at-
tempt to deformalize the aristocratic portrait. In his later years, he turned from highly keyed color and elaborately and minutely worked surfaces to a more monochrome palette and broadly applied brushwork. At the same time, his meticulous attention to surface detail, whether textiles or the physiognomic particularities (even deformities) of his sitters, goes far beyond the traditions of Italian aristocratic portraiture and is one of the most striking innovations in his oeuvre.

Ghislandi achieved international renown for both his real and imaginary portraiture. He was made a member of the Accademia Clementina of Bologna after a trip to that city in 1717. Though he had some pupils who continued his style, none achieved his success or attained his originality.
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1939.1.102 (213)

Portait of a Young Man

After 1720
Oil on canvas, 73 × 56.5 (28 3/4 × 22 1/4) Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a loosely woven plain-weave fabric. The paint was applied rapidly, wet-into-wet, and has a smooth surface with only a few slightly impastoed passages. The hair and face were finished after the background was painted. The highlights, planar changes, and modifications to contours to enhance three-dimensionality were created with glazes applied over the basic flesh color. X-radiographs (fig. i) reveal another head slightly lower than the present one; this position, as well as the presence of cusping only along the top edge, suggests that the first composition was much larger. The underlying head faces left in three-quarter view with an upward gaze and wears a bulky cloth cap. A dark brown layer may be an isolating layer between the two pictures or the ground layer.

The varnish is slightly discolored and hazy. The painting has been considerably inpainted, most probably to compensate for extensive abrasion. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1932. The inpainting was adjusted in 1959, by Mario Modestini, and in 1966, probably by Frank Sullivan.


The direct and sympathetic observation characteristic of Ghislandi’s portraits is evident in this painting. Employing a limited palette and a radically simplified composition, the artist relied on the subtlety of his technique and color harmonies to give the painting interest.

The Portrait of a Young Man presents problems typical of Ghislandi’s works, for both the identification of the sitter and the dating are in question. The work was once thought to be a self-portrait of the artist in his youth. This hypothesis is impossible on stylistic grounds, because the painting could not be from the 1690s, when Ghislandi would have been approximately the age of the sitter. Shapley also correctly pointed out that other, authentic self-portraits, such as that signed and dated 1732, in the Accademia Carrara, Bergamo, present different features. Shapley’s suggestion that the young man was one of the pupils in Ghislandi’s studio is, however, far from certain.

The sitter’s identity is not immediately apparent because this portrayal does not exactly follow the conventions of allegorical figures or aristocratic portraiture. While Ghislandi’s aristocratic sitters are usually recognizable as such by their sumptuous clothing and conventional poses, this young man is casually dressed and posed. At the same time, the absence of attributes makes it less probable that this work is merely a capricious head. The portrait certainly does not resemble the capriccios as characterized by the artist’s early biographer, Francesco Maria Tassi:

It is impossible to describe how everyone ran to him for portraits or for those bizarre and extravagant heads which have always been sought after even beyond the Alps. He always took these from life, and used to do them with heads shaven clean, cocky caps, shirts undone at the neck, ruffled hair, hands on hips, with sashes across the body, and to impart more of a subject into them, he put brushes in their hands, statuettes, compasses, squares, rulers, and similar attributes of the fine arts.

Though this sitter does have an open shirt and an extravagant swath of drapery, his individualized fea-
Giuseppe Ghislandi, Portrait of a Young Man, 1939.1.102
tures make clear that the work is a portrait rather than a capriccio.

This type of informal aristocratic portrait, not adequately considered by scholars of Ghislandi, is an important new category in his oeuvre developed in the 1720s. It combines elements of both the capricious heads and the formal "state" portraits. This relaxed mode of presentation was a conscious choice of one segment of the Bergamasque patrons, who thereby demonstrated their advanced taste and appreciation for Ghislandi’s innovations. This is certainly the case with sitters such as Count Galeazzo Vertova (private collection, Milan) and Count Giacomo Carrara (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo),9 the enlightened patron who founded the museum bearing his name. That this new mode of portraiture was considered remarkable in its day is shown by Tassi’s comment that Carrara’s “beautiful portrait” shows him dressed in “veste di camera” and without his wig.10 The National Gallery’s Portrait of a Young Man may also be compared with similar informal portraits of apparently aristocratic young men, such as those in a private collection, Milan, and in the Accademia Carrara, Bergamo,11 which have so far eluded identification.

These informal aristocratic portraits are datable later in Ghislandi’s career on the basis of brushwork, as well as by their naturalistic conceptions. Although Shapley dates the National Gallery’s portrait to the second decade of the eighteenth century, it likely bears a later date. According to Roberto Longhi, Ghislandi’s experience of the art of Giuseppe Maria Crespi (q.v.) during his Bolognese sojourn in 1717 would have confirmed his Rembrandtesque inclinations.12 The straightforward presentation and the monochrome palette of such works as Crespi’s Self-Portrait (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna)13 must also have been attractive to Ghislandi as examples of the naturalism coming into vogue early in the century. At the same time, Ghislandi’s later style may also be seen as a return to the sixteenth-century northern Italian ideals of realism and simplicity, exemplified by such works as the portrait of “Titian’s Schoolmaster” by Giovanni Battista Moroni (c. 1525–1578) in the National Gallery of Art, Washington.14

According to Tassi, Ghislandi’s later manner is characterized by a preference for busts over full- or three-quarter-length portraits, which he painted with his fingers rather than a brush.15 However, technical studies that would confirm whether Tassi meant his remarks literally have not been carried out. Perhaps Tassi merely attempted to justify the artist’s painterly style by claiming the illustrious precedent of Titian, who was also said to have painted with his fingers rather than brushes.16 In any case, Tassi is surely correct in noting that works securely datable after 1732 show an increasing openness of technique, seen in such examples as the signed and dated Self-Portrait of that year (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo) and the Portrait of a Gentleman (private collection, Rome).17

Portrait of a Young Man shows few traces of the extremely painterly style of Ghislandi’s last decade, however. Its conception as an informal portrait is typical of the artist’s later works, but its execution points to a dating in the crucial transitional period closely following the artist’s Bolognese sojourn in 1717, and probably before the radical shift in style that Tassi dates to 1732.

---

**Notes**

1. According to NGA 1941, 77.
4. NGA 1941, 77.
5. Shapley 1979, 1: 206, referring to NGA 1941, 77. The Bergamo self-portrait is treated in Gozzoli 1982, 102, no. 16, fig. 4.
7. In fact, the earlier image revealed by x-radiograph (fig. 1) appears to be a capricious head.
9. Gozzoli 1982, 123, no. 141, 173, fig. 4; 100, no. 8, 173, fig. 3, color repro. 92, respectively.
11. Gozzoli 1982, 123, no. 143, 176, fig. 2; and 101, no. 9, 179, fig. 1, respectively.
12. Roberto Longhi in Cipriani and Testori 1953, 12. See also Spike 1985, 92.
17. Gozzoli 1982, 102, no. 16, 165, fig. 4 and color repro. 73; 125, no. 161, 172, fig. 1, respectively. Gozzoli dates the second work to the 1720s, but it is more likely a work of the 1730s as suggested by Frangi 1991, 78, no. 1.25.
Luca Giordano
1634 – 1705

Luca Giordano was born in Naples, the son of Antonio Giordano, an undistinguished follower of Jusepe de Ribera (q.v.). Exhibiting a precocious talent for painting, the young Luca is said by the biographer De’ Dominici to have entered Ribera’s school at the age of seven or eight. This training is not otherwise documented, but the intensity of Giordano’s early imitation and interpretation of Ribera’s style is undeniable.

Shortly after 1650, Giordano, accompanied by his father, traveled to Rome, Florence, and Venice. In Rome he studied and drew after the works of Raphael (1483–1520) and other High Renaissance masters. He certainly knew Pietro da Cortona’s (1596–1669) works in Rome and Florence, and may even have studied with the older master. In Venice Giordano received his first known commissions for altarpieces and turned in earnest to the Venetian cinquecento painters, whose importance had been made clear to him by the neo-Venetianism then current in Rome and Naples, and by paintings, especially those of Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), in Neapolitan collections. Giordano is documented back in Naples in 1653. His works of the next ten years show a careful assimilation of the lessons learned on his trip, with conscious reference to the various stages of Ribera’s career. In these years Giordano gradually enlivened his compositions, lightened and varied his palette, and developed a more painterly technique inspired by his earlier models and the works of Guido Reni (1575–1642) and Mattia Preti (1613–1699) in Naples. A growing circle of patrons warmly accepted Giordano’s evolving style, although the painter Francesco di Maria (1623–1690) was harshly critical of the younger painter’s intense colorism.

Giordano made a second trip north in 1665. In Rome and Florence he returned with renewed interest to the works of Pietro da Cortona; in Venice he resumed his study of the cinquecento masters. He also expanded his contacts with Venetian patrons and sent many works to Venice and northern Italy in subsequent years. Aside from a possible but undocumented trip to Venice in 1672–1673, Giordano remained in Naples or nearby during the next fifteen years, which are among the least documented of his career. Paintings dated or datable to this period show that he was actively engaged in working through a new understanding of Pietro da Cortona as a colorist and a decorator, and in drawing from contemporary developments in Rome. Giordano’s openness to diverse artistic currents has long been recognized, and his ability to adapt his manner to fit a given subject or desire of a patron makes it difficult to chart his stylistic development. Indeed, De’ Dominici recounted that Giordano often executed paintings expressly “in the manner of” a given artist, either to satisfy the wishes of his patrons or as outright forgeries. Giordano also worked with great speed, producing a vast oeuvre in which few works are dated or documented.

In 1680–1685 Giordano was again in Florence to execute two large decorative commissions, the dome of the Corsini Chapel in the church of the Carmine and the gallery and library frescoes in the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi. The first shows his interpretation of Giovanni Lanfranco’s (q.v.) dome compositions with rings of upward-swirling figures. The Medici-Riccardi frescoes owe much to those of Pietro da Cortona in the Palazzo Pitti and reflect Giordano’s development toward a lighter, more painterly style. The Florentine frescoes and the many easel paintings executed in the 1680s show Giordano’s continued interaction with the stylistic currents of the day, as required by subject matter, patrons, and his own artistic aims.
In 1692 Giordano accepted the invitation of Charles II of Spain to the court in Madrid, where the painter was regally received and showered with honors. Giordano developed an increasingly free and painterly fresco style, as seen in the evolution from the staircase and nave frescoes at the Escorial (1692–1694) to the Casón del Buen Retiro in Madrid (1697). After the death of Charles II in 1700, Giordano worked mostly for private patrons until returning to Naples in 1702. His last frescoes in the Cappella del Tesoro in the Certosa di San Martino (1704) take the lyrical freedom of the Spanish frescoes to new heights. The late frescoes and easel paintings are generally seen as prefiguring and inspiring the light, decorative style of the early eighteenth century.

De’ Dominici reported that Giordano had numerous students, whom he treated very well; of these, none achieved real importance.
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Diana and Endymion

c. 1675/1680
Oil on canvas, 149.2 (58 7/16)x 164 (64 7/16)
Gift of Joseph F. McCrindle in memory of Mr. and Mrs. J. Fuller Feder and in Honor of the 50th Anniversary of the National Gallery of Art

Inscriptions
Lower right, “Jordanus / F.”

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, open plain-weave fabric. The ground is a dark brown layer of medium thickness. Using broad rapid brushstrokes, the paint was thickly applied everywhere but in the shadows, where its thin, transparent application allows the ground to show through and darken the shadows. X-radiographs reveal several artist’s changes. The moon was once directly over Diana’s forehead. Diana’s hand was placed lower, around Endymion’s neck, and her hairstyle was slightly different at the neck. The upper sections of Diana’s billowing blue drapery were somewhat larger, and the upper edge of the bottom section was originally higher. Endymion looked out at the viewer rather than up at Diana. The mouth of the dog at right may have been open.

The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is present along all four sides. The painting is in good condition aside from minor abrasion and small inpainted losses scattered throughout and concentrated just left of center. The dark appearance results from the paint having become more transparent with age, allowing the dark color of the ground to dominate. The varnish is clear. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition.

Provenance: (Sale, Sotheby’s, London, to May 1967, no. 147); Joseph F. McCrindle.


Diana and Endymion was a popular subject in seventeenth-century Italy, possibly for the opportunity it gave artists to portray the beauty of the human body both at rest and in motion. The story is found in classical literature, but versions of the event vary. For the Romans the sleep of Endymion signified death and immortality, thus his image was often found on sarcophagi. But in the seventeenth century the subject was represented as a mythological love story. Endymion was usually portrayed as a shepherd visited in the night by the moon goddess Diana, who had fallen in love with him. Most artists depended on Vincenzo Cartari’s version of the tale, in which Diana put Endymion to sleep solely to kiss him “at her pleasure.”5 Visual interpretations of the myth had already occurred in the sixteenth century,6 but Annibale Carracci’s (q.v.) rendition on the ceiling of the Galleria Farnese in the Palazzo Farnese, Rome, was the type most often followed in the seventeenth century.7 The sleeping Endymion was also portrayed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries without Diana, or with the goddess represented in the guise of her attribute, the moon.8 Yet another tradition represented Endymion awake and welcoming Diana’s approach.9

Here Giordano interpreted the first version of the story: Diana, flying on a cloud, caresses the shepherd as his dogs look on in silence. As was usual with the artist, who often repeated popular themes, Giordano took up this subject several times, changing only slightly the positions of the protagonists and surroundings. Two similar autograph paintings of the subject (in the Museo di Castelvecchio, Verona, and
on the art market) vary in the number of animals and putti present, the depth of Endymion’s slumber, and the energetic speed of Diana’s flight. A fourth version, for the queen of Spain, dating to the late 1680s, is lost. The three extant paintings have been dated by Oreste Ferrari to c. 1675–1680, a period in which the influence of Pietro da Cortona was especially evident in Giordano’s work: the luminous colors, soft contours, graceful movement, and hairstyles of the figures in these pictures reflect this Cortonesque inspiration.

Unlike the two other existing variants of the subject by Giordano, in which cupids and additional animals expand the composition, the National Gallery painting reduces the story to its essentials. The two protagonists fill the picture space as the moon goddess, surrounded by shadows, emerges from the dark of night to embrace the resting Endymion. The turbulence of her draperies and the churning sky contrast with her tender caressing gesture. More immediate than the other versions, Diana and Endymion suggests Giordano’s Neapolitan origins in the school of Ribera, whose dramatic lighting and candidly direct forms are echoed here. The face of Diana, half hidden in shadow, and the use of the dark ground to intensify the contrasts of light and dark reflect what Giordano absorbed from Ribera, perhaps suggesting that this painting may date slightly earlier than the other two. Also evident is the classical Roman beauty of both the sleeping mortal and his seducer, a probable influence of Carlo Maratta (1625–1713), whose early works Giordano would have seen in Rome. These features and the composition itself accord with Annibale Carracci’s rendition in the Farnese Gallery; Giordano may have looked directly at Annibale’s prototype.

The Diana and Endymion in Verona is balanced by a pendant with the theme of Bacchus and Ariadne. Although no companion to the National Gallery’s painting is known, it is not unlikely that one once existed; many of Giordano’s commissions called for pairs of complementary subjects. A Neapolitan inventory of 1677 records a pair of paintings as “copie di Giordano” with the subjects of Diana and Endymion and the Strength of Samson. The Diana and Bacchus themes in the Verona pair contrast the love of a goddess for a mortal man with the love of a god for a mortal woman. The association of the Endymion and Samson stories may have suggested the folly of total submersion in carnal love. Giordano is known to have combined Old and New Testament as well as mythological, religious, and literary subjects with only the loosest of evident iconographical associations.

The size and intimate theme indicate that the Diana and Endymion, a work signed by the artist, must have been executed for the private house of a wealthy patron. De’ Dominici recorded numerous paintings of similar subjects executed for Luca Giordano’s private clients.

Notes
1. Peggy Tolbert, associate registrar, reported the dates of the loan, but noted that there is no record of when the painting was on view during this period (letter of 5 October 1992, NGA curatorial files).
2. Elizabeth Marsh of the registrar’s office, Yale University Art Gallery, reported that there is no record of when the painting was on view during this period (letter of 16 July 1992, NGA curatorial files).
3. For the appropriation of the story in seventeenth-century painting and the various classical sources, see Colton 1967, 426–431.
4. See, for example, Colton 1967, figs. 57b and 57c.
5. The myth is repeated in various forms by many ancient authors, but seventeenth-century artists seem to have referred to the one told in Gli immagini degli Dei (Cartari 1571, 125): “Questo dice, perche le favole finsero, che la Luna s’inamarasse di Endimione pastore, e l’addormentasse sopra certo monte solo per baciarlo à suo piacere.”
6. See, for example, Cima da Conegliano’s (1459–1517/1518) painting in the Galleria Nazionale, Parma: Formari Schianchi n.d., 60–61, repro. For a list of paintings of this theme in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Pigler 1974, 2: 160–165. 
8. See the Cima, as in note 6 above, and Guercino’s (q.v.) painting in the Galleria Doria Pamphili, Rome (Salerno 1988, 320, no. 247). In these paintings Diana’s approach is subtly represented by her attribute of a sliver of moon. Often the mortal is shown being visited in the night by Diana in her full corporeal guise; see, for example, the drawing by Lelio Orsi (1511–1587) in the Galleria Estense, Modena, or Garofalo’s (1481–1599) painting in Dresden (both illustrated in Colton 1967, figs. 58a and 57d), as well as the painting by Pier Francesco Mola (1612–1666) in the Gallerie Capitoline, Rome: Cocke 1972, 54, no. 40, pl. 88.
9. The most famous of this type is that of Poussin (1594–1665; see Colton 1967, fig. 56a).
11. De’ Dominici 1742, 3: 415, mentioned the version, now lost, in a series of fourteen canvases for Maria Luisa of Orléans, queen of Spain; the paintings were completed after her death in 1689 and sold to another patron. The sur-
Luca Giordano, *Diana and Endymion*, 1991.20.1
viving paintings in the queen's series have different measurements from Giordano's three known versions of the Diana and Endymion story and also have more figures and extensive landscape backgrounds. The series is discussed in Ferrari and Scavizzi 1966 i: 119-120; 2: 158-161; 3: figs. 311-319; and 1992, i: 110-111, 323-325, nos. A447-A462, color pls. 80-85; 2: figs. 578-590. A painting of this subject attributed to Giordano was sold at Christie's, London, on 13 June 1913 (lot 101, 43 x 39 cm) from the collection of Sir Thomas Charles Colles Western, Bt. This smaller work cannot be identified as the National Gallery painting. Another Diana and Endymion attributed to Luca Giordano, dimensions unknown, was sold on 4 May 1777 at Squibb's, London, from the collection of a "nobleman": Graves 1918-1921, i: 358.

12. Oral communication, 24 October 1990. The second edition of Ferrari's and Scavizzi's book was in press when Ferrari first saw the National Gallery painting, and for this reason it was not included.

13. Erich Schleier in Whitfield and Martineau 1983, 175, under no. 67, noted the problems of dating Giordano's paintings of this period. He argued that paintings earlier in Giordano's Cortonesque period have "fluffy, swelling (and swollen) forms" and a darker tonality. These characteristics apply to the National Gallery painting. For a discussion of the chronology of the 1670s see Ferrari and Scavizzi 1966, i: 67-87, and 1992, i: 54-75.

14. Ferrari and Scavizzi 1966, i: 87. Ferrari mentioned this specific influence when examining the National Gallery picture (oral communication, 24 October 1990).


16. The inventory is that of Guglielmo Samuei, a Venetian financier living in Naples, published by Gerard Labrot in Ricerche sul '600 napoletano 1984, 139. The size of these paintings, approximately 132 x 158.4 cm, suggests that the Diana and Endymion recorded is not the National Gallery painting.


18. Oreste Ferrari (oral communication, 24 October 1990) mentioned that the artist signed his paintings in this period in this cursive script.

19. De' Dominici 1742, 3: 416 did not list paintings in private houses because of their vast number.
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Francesco Guardi

1712 – 1793

Fra ncesco Guardi’s initial training and career remain the subject of intense speculation. It cannot be assumed that he was trained by his elder brother Antonio (q.v.), who was too young to have inherited the family workshop upon the death of their father Domenico (1678-1716). Furthermore, the differences in the brothers’ styles indicate that Francesco was probably trained by another master. Yet suggestions that he received this initial training in the family’s native Trentino, in Vienna, with a north Italian painter, or in Venice remain highly conjectural.

By about 1730 a Guardi family workshop was in existence in Venice: a will of 1731 refers to copies by the “fratelli Guardi.” Because Francesco would have been only eighteen at this time, Antonio probably functioned as the head of the shop. It appears, however, that Francesco soon collaborated on and made independent contributions, primarily as a figure painter, to the shop’s large projects. He also accepted independent commissions, as clearly indicated by two letters of 1750 in which he attempted to recover payment on sketches for unexecuted figure compositions. After Antonio’s death in 1761, Francesco continued to work occasionally as a figure painter, but was active mainly as a painter of views and capriccios.

Francesco’s activity as a view painter probably grew out of the Guardi family practice of copying the works of other artists rather than from any formal training with another master, and it appears to have begun in the early to mid-1750s: none of his views can be dated before about 1754 based on topographical details. Francesco’s earliest views, such as those in the collection of the duke of Buccleuch, are characterized by clear luminous colors, hard surfaces, and carefully depicted architecture. This style was derived primarily from the mature Canaletto
Francesco often borrowed entire compositions from paintings and prints by both artists, although he increasingly worked from his own drawings. The earliest view with both Francesco’s signature and a date, 1758, is a Mardi Gras in the Piazzetta (Sotheby Parke-Bernet, New York, 11 January 1990, no. 121). In comparison with earlier views, this work shows a darkening and softening of Canaletto’s cool hardness with atmospheric effects, reminiscent of Luca Carlevarijs (1663–1730), and looks forward to Francesco’s style of the 1760s.

In 1764 Francesco publicly exhibited two views that met with universal applause according to the chronicler Pietro Gradenigo, who referred to the artist as a “buon scolaro del rinomato Canaletto.” By this Gradenigo most likely meant that Francesco, who was fifty-two in that year, had studied the works of the older master, and the two views, generally identified as those in the Iveagh Bequest, Pyrford Court, show him turning to Canaletto’s early, dark “romantic” manner of the 1730s. Succi (1987, 1988), in reevaluating the evidence, has now convincingly dated to the 1760s works characterized by darker, predominantly brown tonalities, strong contrasts of light and dark, and larger figures similar to those of Marieschi. Scholars had proposed various dates for these works, and Succi’s revised chronology provides a clearer picture of Francesco’s early activity as a view painter.

Like other view painters, Francesco also painted depictions of Venetian festivities and the architectural and landscape capriccios so popular in the eighteenth century. Depictions of festivities, such as the Mardi Gras of 1758, and of events connected with the visits of foreign dignitaries are known from throughout Francesco’s career. His first capriccios, however, cannot be dated before the early 1760s on stylistic grounds. Like his first views, these capriccios are derived from those of other artists, in this case Marco Ricci (q.v.) and Luca Carlevarijs, and often adopt whole compositions or specific ruin and landscape elements from them.

After about 1770 Francesco’s chronology becomes slightly more secure, and several documented commissions of the 1780s provide secure points of reference. In the 1770s, Francesco’s brushwork became increasingly loose and fractured, and was combined with a softer, increasingly cool palette and subtle effects of changeant color to create a shimmering atmospheric veil across the surface of new smaller canvases. He also began to modify both the proportions of buildings and the perspectival recession for expressive effect. In his last years (c. 1780–1793) these developments continued, with still looser brushwork, more expressive manipulation of perspective, and renewed interest in chiaroscuro effects. During these years Francesco’s son Giacomo (1764–1835) assumed a growing role in the production of views and capriccios. After Francesco’s death, Giacomo continued to produce paintings of inferior quality, which he often sold as his father’s with false or ambiguous signatures. Numerous followers and imitators also produced paintings for sale as by “Guardi,” further complicating questions of attribution, as reflected in the following entries.

Francesco’s prolific output seems to have been purchased mainly by middle-class Venetians and English visitors of modest means. Their recorded statements show an appreciation for Francesco’s painterly brio and poetic vision, while others criticized these same qualities as poor technique and carelessness in the depiction of specific sites.

Bibliography
Binion 1976.
Succi 1993.

1939.1.113 (224)

View on the Cannaregio Canal, Venice

c. 1775–1780
Oil on canvas, 30 × 47.8 (19 ¼ × 30 ¼)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Inscriptions
On the horizontal cross member of the stretcher: “Br1096”;
on upper-horizontal cross member: “7820f.”

Technical Notes: The support is a coarse, plain-weave fabric prepared with a gritty, thinly applied dark red ground. The surface composition was painted directly (without an isolating layer) over a preexisting composition consisting of white scrollwork and flowers painted on a beige background. In x-radiographs (fig. 1) these elements appear to have been loosely executed as in a sketch and form the left end of a larger decorative panel. Losses in the underlying paint layer were filled before the surface composition was
applied. The surface paint was applied thinly, except in the whites and highlights, which show a somewhat thicker buildup of paint. Pigment analysis using polarized light microscopy found ultramarine ash, vermilion, red lake, van dyke brown, yellow ocher, charcoal black, lead white, chalk, and quartz.

The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is visible on the left and right, or the top and bottom of the first composition. The surface is abraded and small paint losses are scattered throughout. Pitting of the paint layer may be due to excessive heat during a lining or loss of large pigment particles. The underlying design shows through slightly in the sky due to abrasion and craquelure and the increased transparency of the upper paint layer, but this effect was minimized through inpainting in 1984 during the conservation treatment by Elizabeth Steele. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1994. The varnish is clear.

Provenance: Achillito Chiesa, Milan, before 1924. (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); purchased 1932 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


This painting has often been cited as a characteristic example of Francesco Guardi’s mature style of the 1770s and of his skillful use of color harmonies.

Although the painting has not been questioned in the literature of the artist, some scholars have suggested recently that the work may have been produced in the master’s workshop during his lifetime or shortly thereafter. In any case, the present condition of the painting, which has been harshly lined and has suffered surface abrasion in the past, militates against a secure attribution either in favor or against the artist’s authorship.

Brown shadows applied over the water and the underlying blue layer that shows through the brownish pavement of both quays creates the overall blue-brown effect. The pink and brown stones of the bridge set the dominant color accents, which recur in the pink, red, and brown buildings on either side of the canal and in the pink reflections on the water. Touches of yellow in the sky harmonize with yellow-brown elements in the architecture.

In this writer’s opinion, the painting lacks Francesco’s luminous, flickering treatment of light playing over the facades and water. The facades are built up with the layered application of different colors as seen in Francesco’s works, but the layers appear to lie on the surface. In their thicker and more opaque application, they only approximate the luminous translucence and flickering play of light across porous stone created by Francesco’s short, lively brushstrokes. Likewise the figures, with their tiny heads and curved bodies, do not share Francesco’s usual vigor and dash, but are more simply constructed using fewer brushstrokes. The large pigment particles in the ground and paint layers are a characteristic of many of Francesco’s autograph works, but also of paintings from his workshop.

The fragment of an earlier decorative composition found under the View on the Cannaregio Canal provides evidence, albeit inconclusive, for an attribution to Francesco’s workshop. The x-radiograph (fig. 1) shows the left end of a horizontal decoration executed in quick, loose brushwork that suggests a sketch. The fragment consists of a scrollwork frame around a central field with scalloped edges; isolated elements of a floral arrangement appear inside the frame. The scrollwork resembles that in several leather altar frontals attributed to Francesco. These consist of rich, pounced scrollwork framing floral arrangements set against gold backgrounds. In its entirety the composition under the View on the Cannaregio Canal would have measured approximately 77 x 125 to 150 cm and is close in proportion.

Provenance: Achillito Chiesa, Milan, before 1924. (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); purchased 1932 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.

Francesco Guardi, *View on the Cannaregio Canal, Venice*, 1939.1.113
and design to three altar frontals in private collections. The larger canvas from which the present piece was cut may have been a full-scale sketch for the frontal of a small house altar or perhaps for the decoration of another type of domestic furnishing. Although other artists certainly produced decorative panels, it is known that the workshop assumed by Francesco after his brother’s death continued to produce such decorations, most involving either floral patterns or vases of flowers.

The Cannaregio is a small canal running west from the Grand Canal into the lagoon between Venice and Mestre. Its most significant feature is the Bridge of the Three Arches at its west end. The Cannaregio lies outside the center of the city with its more famous monuments, and although not uncommon, is among the less frequently depicted sites in eighteenth-century view painting. In this picture the viewpoint lies east of the bridge and slightly toward the right side of the canal, so that the bridge appears to be placed diagonally across the canal. Its picturesque three-arched form becomes the focus of the painting. The relatively small, nondescript buildings lining the canal do not distract from the bridge, and, as observed above, are painted in colors that harmonize with its pink and brownish tones. As in the works representing Francesco’s later style, the perspectival recession has been exaggerated, which makes the narrow canal appear much broader than it should from this viewpoint. A painting in the Princeton University Art Museum shows the bridge from nearly the same position as the National Gallery’s picture, but with a different arrangement of gondolas in the foreground.

Notes
3. Morassi [1973], 1: 418, inserted the Matthiesen Galleries, Berlin, 1930, into the provenance at this point; he was, however, the only source to include Matthiesen and cited no documentation. Kress records list only Contini Bonacossi, from whom the Foundation regularly acquired paintings in this period.
4. Notations in the Kress records (NGA curatorial files), give the date of acquisition as 1932. Roberto Longhi’s expert opinion on the back of a Kress photograph (NGA curatorial files) is dated November 1932. Frankfurter 1932, 10, repro. 9, documents the painting in the Kress Collection by December of that year.
5. By Goering 1944, 21; Ragghianti 1935, 101; and Morassi [1973], 1: 418. Shapley 1973, 171, and 1979, 1: 236, followed NGA 1941, 93, in dating it to c. 1770. For a discussion of Francesco’s style in the 1770s and early 1780s, see 1942, 9.27 and 1939, 1.129.
6. The attribution to Francesco has been rejected by Dario Succi, who did not include the painting in his catalogue raisonné of 1993 (letter of 10 February 1993, NGA curatorial files), and Bernard Aikema (oral communication at the National Gallery on 20 March 1993). George Knox (letter of 7 February 1994, NGA curatorial files) and William Barcham (letter of 17 January 1994, NGA curatorial files) questioned the authenticity of the painting. Discussion of technical aspects with Elizabeth Walmsley and Sarah Fisher of the NGA conservation department was very helpful in preparing this entry and determining the attribution.
7. Pilo 1982, has attributed a large set of altar frontals in the Redentore, Venice, to Francesco on the basis of style and similarities to a drawing in the Museo Correr, Venice. This attribution is not universally accepted.
8. Two formerly in the Morazzone collection, Milan, measure 95 x 205 cm and have corner elements very much like those visible in figure 1. Another, in a private collection, measures 87.5 x 243.5 cm: Pilo 1983, figs. 96, 97, 100. Pilo attributed these to Francesco for stylistic reasons and found similarities with the designs in the Correr drawing (1983, 90–91). In these examples, as in the underlying NGA composition, the scrollwork extends in places beyond the enframing border.
9. Francesco himself often worked from full-scale drawn sketches (see 1939, 1.129); in this case, the artist may have provided a painted sketch for the artisans executing his design on leather or another support.
11. Paintings by Francesco are in the Frick Art Reference Library, New York, and formerly in a private collection (now lost): Morassi [1973], 1: no. 575–576; 2: figs. 547–548, respectively. Both show the right bank of the canal with the Palazzo Surian (residence of the French ambassadors in the eighteenth century) on the right and the bridge on the left. A drawing in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, shows a similar view: Morassi 1975, no. 348, fig. 348. Views of the Cannaregio by Canaletto and his followers focus on the Palazzo Surian with the Bridge of Three Arches in the distance: Constable and Links 1976, 1: fig. 287; 2: 287–289. A painting by Francesco Albotto (a student of Marieschi) takes a viewpoint similar to that in the Washington painting (but includes the Palazzo Surian on the right) and shows that the artist was fairly accurate in representing the buildings along the canal, although he did change their relative heights: exh. cat. Milan 1989, fig. 267.
12. Morassi [1973], 1: 418, identified these buildings as those of the old Jewish Ghetto, which, however, lies at the other end of the canal.
13. 43.2 x 68.6 cm. Exh. cat. Springfield 1937, no. 3, repro. A drawing formerly owned by C. J. Goldsmid of New-
This depiction of a temporary tribune erected in the Campo San Zanipolo is derived from the most popular in a series of four paintings by Francesco Guardi, which had been commissioned by the Venetian state to record Pope Pius VI’s visit of 15 to 19 May 1782. While the National Gallery’s painting has always been accepted as autograph, its relation to the larger composition can now be clarified.

The commission for the series is documented by a contract of 21 May 1782 between Francesco Guardi and Pietro Edwards, acting in his official capacity as inspector of fine arts of the Venetian republic. Edwards is known to have had a low opinion of Francesco’s work and is thought to have given him the commission because no other artist was available. Aware of Francesco’s tendency to depict sites somewhat fancifully, Edwards sought to maintain strict control over the final product: the contract stipulated that the artist base his depictions on studies of the actual sites and follow exactly Ed-

Fig. 1. X-radiograph of 1939.1.129
wards’ directions for the placement of the figures. The contract required Francesco to depict the following from among the ceremonies of the papal visit: the pope greeted by the doge at the island of San Giorgio in Alga; the te deum celebrated by the pope in Santi Giovanni e Paolo; the senate’s audience with the pope in the refectory of the Dominican monastery at Santi Giovanni e Paolo; and the papal benediction from the temporary tribune in Campo San Zanipolo, the square in front of Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

Two complete, but dispersed, painted series of all four scenes are known. The first, of larger dimensions and lighter tonality, is most likely that painted for the Venetian state. The second differs only slightly and is of smaller dimensions and somewhat darker tonality; it was probably painted by Francesco for an unidentified private patron. The benediction in Campo San Zanipolo was evidently the most popular as it was copied twice, perhaps even in Francesco’s shop. The benediction was also the only one of the series to inspire a second, independent composition, realized in the National Gallery painting and several other versions. In contrast to the larger, horizontal depiction of the actual ceremony (fig. 2), the second, vertical composition takes a viewpoint much closer to the tribune in front of the Scuola di San Marco and includes the facade of Santi Giovanni e Paolo only as a looming, shadowy presence on the right. With a sure eye for an interesting, marketable composition, Francesco exploited the pictorial possibilities inherent in the crowds of curious Venetians clambering over the temporary structure, which was the object of some interest at the time. Originally the pope was to give his blessing from the loggia of San Marco, and a decree was passed on 14 May requiring the Piazza San Marco to be cleared of its many merchants’ stalls. The merchants objected that this would severely harm business, particularly during the upcoming Feast of the Ascension, one of their busiest periods. As a result, the benediction was moved to the Campo San Zanipolo, convenient to the pope’s lodgings in the Dominican monastery attached to Santi Giovanni e Paolo, and located directly behind the Scuola di San Marco.
Francesco Guardi, Temporary Tribune in the Campo San Zanipolo, Venice, 1939.1.129
structure was erected against the facade of the scuola in time for the ceremony on 19 May. To recall the original site, the artisan commissioned to build the tribune, Antonio Codagnato, was instructed to base his design on the facade of San Marco. Francesco appears to have depicted the tribune quite faithfully, as both of his compositions show the same mosaic-encrusted niches, polychrome columns, and decorative sculptures in the main section as are seen in a contemporary but unrelated depiction of the papal benediction. The smaller vertical composition, known in several versions, shows the tribune shortly after the pope gave his blessing. The Rio dei Mendicanti at the left is still boarded over, as it had been to accommodate the crowds attending the ceremony, but the awnings over the stairs, present in both versions of Francesco’s Benediction, have been removed, or perhaps simply omitted.

The National Gallery’s painting and the other versions of the vertical composition have sometimes been considered sketches for the Benediction, but several factors argue against this. Oil sketches do not seem to have been part of Francesco’s normal working method and the evidence indicates that they were not part of his preparations for the main series of paintings for Edwards. The numerous drawings that survive for this commission suggest that, in accordance with the contract, Francesco prepared separate studies of the figures and architecture for approval by Edwards. Francesco seems to have begun by making quick on-site sketches with little architectural detail and only the vaguest indication of figures. At some point after the ceremonies but before the temporary decorations had been dismantled, Francesco would have had the opportunity to prepare his detailed drawings of the architecture, such as that of the tribune in Campo San Zanipolo. The poses and positions of the figures were then apparently worked out in separate drawings with only the barest indication of the surrounding architecture, probably based on Francesco’s own experience of the events, but perhaps also drawing on Edwards’ account. Upon approval by Edwards, Francesco combined the two types of studies in the final painting apparently without making an intermediate third drawing of the full composition. This procedure contrasts with the artist’s more usual practice of painting from a finished drawing of the entire scene that included both architecture and figures, as he did for other festivities and many of his view paintings.

As an independent work the second, vertical composition was worked up in two such preparatory drawings with both architecture and figures, now in private collections in Paris and London. These two drawings differ from each other only slightly in viewpoint, minor architectural details, and some figures. Neither corresponds exactly to any of the five painted versions of the composition, but Francesco’s paintings often depart slightly from their preparatory drawings. Although this second composition was probably worked up while Francesco was painting the initial series for Edwards or shortly thereafter, its various painted versions may have been executed at a later date.

As a group, the vertical paintings were executed with the loose touch and somewhat more pronounced chiaroscuro effects characteristic of Francesco’s view paintings of this period. In contrast the larger paintings of both the first and second series exhibit an unusual hardness of surface and bright tonality. This difference in style may reflect the fact that the paintings were intended for patrons with different tastes. Francesco’s regular Venetian clients are known to have appreciated the artistic license and painterly brio of the artist’s views and capriccios. Francesco may have invented the vertical composition at the request of one such patron or as a speculative effort to exploit his usual market; in any event the number of repetitions reflects the success of the composition. For his part, Edwards found Francesco’s manner of painting “spirited” but otherwise technically shoddy, not to mention unacceptably fanciful in the depiction of architecture. Thus, it is quite likely that in his verbal instructions for the initial set of paintings Edwards insisted on a tighter, less fanciful style that he would have found more appropriate to the paintings’ documentary function.

The National Gallery painting has been considered by all scholars to be the best among the autograph versions of the vertical composition. It is closest to the drawing in Paris. The painting in the Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, is nearly the same size and appears similar in handling, but is in fact closer to the drawing in London in the disposition of the figures and minor details of the architecture. The large version recently on the art
market has elements of both the Washington and Providence paintings, and does not seem particularly close to either of the two preparatory drawings. The painting in the Modiano collection, Milan, takes a slightly different, more distant viewpoint, includes less of the church facade on the right, and differs markedly close to either of the two preparatory drawings. These minor differences and the apparent quality of the works would suggest that all four are probably autograph; all seem to have been executed in 1782 or slightly later, but it is impossible to determine an exact chronology. A painting formerly in the Poss collection, Milan, was exhibited in 1929 and soon thereafter pronounced a copy; it resembles none of the above versions and thus may be a pastiche. Later and markedly inferior copies of the Washington and Providence paintings have appeared on the art market within the last twenty years.

The fragment of a vase of flowers under this securely attributed painting by Francesco strengthens the argument that decorative floral compositions were produced in the Guardi workshop.

Notes
1. According to NGA 1941 and Kress records, NGA curatorial files. Kane has not been further identified.
2. The contract was first published by Simonson 1912, 82. It is given in full by Shapley 1973, 173, n. 4, and 1979, 1: 239, n. 3. The pope's visit and the circumstances of the commission are discussed in full by Watson, "Guardi and the Visit," 1967, 115-128, and by Coggiola Pittioni 1915, 167-208. Morassi [1973], 1: 184, gives an incorrect date of 25 April 1782 for the contract with Edwards, which would be impossible because the final arrangements for the ceremonies were not set until after 14 May.
4. On the confusion about which of several audiences is represented, see Watson, "Guardi and the Visit," 1967, 123-125.
5. Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga, Philadelphia Museum of Art (72 x 81.5 cm); Te Deum in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, private collection, Paris (69 x 81); Audience of the Senate, sold Sotheby's Italia (Florence), 24 September 1985, no. 19, repro. (71 x 82); Benediction in Campo San Zanipolo, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (63.5 x 78.5); Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 263, 265, 267, 269; 2: figs. 292, 294, 296, 300, respectively. For the Benediction see also Bram de Klerk in Aikema and Bakker 1990, 240-238, no. 50, color repro. 256. The Philadelphia Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga appears to have a light pinkish ground.
6. Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga, Rossello collection, Milan (52 x 68); Te Deum in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Cleveland Museum of Art (52 x 67); Audience of the Senate, Cleveland Museum of Art (51.5 x 69); Benediction in Campo San Zanipolo, Beirsted collection, Upton House, London (50 x 66). Morassi [1973], 1: 262, 264, 266, 268; 2: figs. 291, 293, 295, 299, respectively.
7. Morassi [1973], 1: no. 275, 2: fig. 301, called the one in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden (53.8 x 68), workshop or a copy, and the one in the Schiff-Giorgi collection, Paris (53 x 76), a copy (1: no. 274, as did Watson, "Guardi and the Visit," 1967, 139, fig. 6). Both paintings are virtually identical to the second version in the Beirsted collection (note 6 above).
8. Schwarz 1953 speculated that the second composition was painted, perhaps for a patron or patrons, as a memento of the impressive structure. Goering 1944, 62; Morassi [1973], 1: 360; Rossi Bortolatto 1974, 131; and Byam Shaw 1977, 10, called it simply a subsequent composition.
10. Painted by Domenico Fossati and engraved by Giacomo Leonardi: Watson, "Guardi and the Visit," 1967, fig. 12. Watson (p. 131) is right to assume that Francesco would probably have made his preliminary drawings by the time Fossati and Leonardi had completed their work.
11. It is unlikely that Francesco began work before signing the contract. The tribune had to have been begun after 14 May and completed by the afternoon of 19 May. Coggiola Pittioni 1915, 190, states that it was erected in two days, but does not say exactly when.
13. Interior of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, private collection, Monza (18.5 x 20.0 cm); Morassi 1973, no. 272, fig. 273.
14. The contract was signed two days after the pope's departure, suggesting that Francesco probably did not begin work while the pope was still in Venice.
15. Private collection, Paris (32.5 x 34 cm); Morassi 1975, no. 276, fig. 278). This drawing shows only the right section of the composition; a fold at what would be the center if it showed the entire composition led Morassi and Watson, "Guardi and the Visit," 1967, 130, to suggest that it had been cropped at the left by about one-third. This drawing lacks the awnings over the stairs seen in the Oxford and Beirsted paintings, but these could have been added to the paintings as one of Edwards' corrections. The drawing is not quite as tall as the other architectural studies for the series, and this may have led Byam Shaw 1977, 10, to associate it with the vertical composition, which is, however, completely different. Detailed architectural drawings for the interior of San Zanipolo also exist in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (58 x 55 cm); Morassi 1975, no. 271, fig. 275), and for the refectory a drawing shows the interior of the monastery at Santi Giovanni e Paolo in the Royal Museum, Canterbury (45 x 60 cm; Byam Shaw 1977, 8-9, no. 3, pl. 5).
16. As in the study for the crowd in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, private collection, Milan (36.4 x 54.9 cm; Morassi 1975, no. 273, fig. 274), which is almost exactly the same width as the drawing for the architecture of the church (see note 15). The recto and verso of a sheet in the Royal Museum, Canterbury, have drawings for the procession of the pope in the refectory and the crowd at the benediction (40.4 x 60 cm; Byam Shaw 1977, 10, no. 4, pls. 6–7). The width of this drawing corresponds exactly to the width of the drawing for
the interior of the refectory and possibly to the full width of the drawing for the Campo San Zanipolo, were it not cropped.

17. The only exception is the finished drawing with both boats and architecture for Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Algia, in the Royal Museum, Canterbury, which in fact corresponds to the second version in the Rosello collection, Milan (49.6 x 73.5 cm; Byam Shaw, 1977, no. 5, pls. 3-4).

18. See, for example, the finished drawing in the Royal Museum, Canterbury (31 x 77.7 cm; Byam Shaw, 1977, no. 1, pls. 1-2), which is for the Concert in Honor of the Conti del Nord in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.

19. Private collection, Paris (24 x 27.5 cm), and E. Korner collection, London (24.7 x 29.5 cm). Morassi (1975, nos. 274, 275, and figs. 276, 277, respectively).

20. Haskell 1960, 256-256, presents the views of those known to have owned paintings by Francesco as well as Edwards’ criticisms. That Edwards may have requested a tighter touch is suggested by the contrast between the two other sets of paintings. The views of villas in the Veneto executed for the Englishman John Strange in the late 1770s exhibit the same hardness of surface as the paintings for Edwards. Yet other paintings of the same period such as those depicting the festivities for the Conti del Nord in 1782 are executed with a loose, feathery touch. Morassi [1973], i: nos. 680-683, 255-261; 2: figs. 635-642, 285-290, respectively.

21. 39 x 32.5 cm; Morassi [1973], i: no. 273; Watson, “Guardi and the Visit,” 1967, fig. 11.

22. 61.7 x 46.6 cm. Christie, Manson & Woods, 31 May 1990, lot 133, color repro., Morassi [1973], i: no. 271; 2: fig. 304.

23. 26.5 x 20.5 cm; Morassi [1973], i: no. 272; 2: fig. 303.

24. The attribution is impossible to judge from the existing photographs, and the dimensions are not known. Morassi [1973], i: no. 276; Goering 1938, 49, fig. 9, called it a copy.

25. 35.6 x 29.3 cm, Christie, Manson & Woods, 27 June 1975, lot 30, repro., and 30 November 1973, lot 45, repro.

26. 37.5 x 30.5 cm, Christie, Manson & Woods, 16 May 1969, lot 43; photograph in NGA curatorial files.
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1942.9.27 (623)

Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge, Venice

Probably c. 1780
Oil on canvas, 68.5 x 91.5 (27 x 36)
Widener Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a somewhat coarse, medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. The ground is a pinkish layer containing coarse white particles distributed throughout, but most evident in the sky. The paint was relatively thinly applied, although the whites are somewhat thicker. In many areas the top paint layer was applied over a flat violet-colored layer that shows most clearly in the buildings and some of the boats. To paint the buildings the artist first blocked in the facades using muted, often translucent tones over the violet layer, then drew in the windows and details that give them shape with black lines. The boats, docks, and figures in the right foreground were painted over the completed water.

The painting was possibly transferred before being lined and there may only be a thin layer of gauze between the fabric and the paint layers. The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is evident on all four sides. The painting is in good condition with relatively few losses. The edges have been completely inpainted. The varnish is clear. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored in 1930 by Herbert Carmer and in 1980-1981 by Ann Hoeningwald.


The Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge, Venice can be dated within the broad outlines of Francesco Guardi’s career to c. 1780. A useful comparison is provided by a group of paintings in the Gulbenkian collection, Lisbon, that can be placed prior to 1777. In comparison, the Washington painting seems somewhat later given its looser brushstrokes. It also shows stylistic affinities with the large paintings in the series depicting the festivities for Pope Pius VI in 1782, and the looser handling of details in the architecture appears closer to that in the National Gallery’s Temporary Tribune in the Campo San Zanipolo, derived from that series.

As throughout the latter part of Francesco’s career, the basic forms of the buildings are construct-
Francesco Guardi, *Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge, Venice*, 1942.9.27
Fig. 1. Francesco Guardi, *Grand Canal Showing Scalzi and San Simone Profeta Piccolo*, probably c. 1780, oil on canvas, Philadelphia Museum of Art, The John G. Johnson Collection

ed with mottled, layered blocks of translucent color; these are often unevenly applied over the ground, or as in the present work, over a flat layer of violet paint. The uneven application and translucent quality of these colors contribute to the effect of light flickering across the surfaces of the buildings. The underlying violet layer helps to establish the overall purple tonality of the picture; this tonality is echoed in the purplish effect created by painting the blue sky and water directly over the pink ground. Quickly sketched black lines define windows, doors, shutters, and the like, but with little concern for plumb lines or geometric accuracy. With their curved, elongated bodies and tiny heads, the gondoliers are characteristic of Francesco’s figures from the later 1770s onward.7

The *Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge* probably does not date much after 1780. It exhibits none of the extremely loose, tremulous brushwork, still less exacting architectural detail, and renewed interest in contrasts of light and dark characteristic of Francesco’s works from the later 1780s. This later style is clearly seen in such paintings as the *Piazza San Marco During the Feast of the Ascension* in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna,8 and the versions of the *Fire at San Marcuola* of 1789 in the Accademia, Venice, and the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.9

The Rialto Bridge was among the most commonly depicted monuments in eighteenth-century view painting; Canaletto, Michele Marieschi, and Francesco Guardi all depicted it numerous times from both the west and east. Lined with shops, this bridge stood at the center of the city’s commercial district and joined the markets located on both sides of the Grand Canal. The present view is taken from the east a good distance down the Grand Canal and just slightly toward the right bank, giving a wider view of the Riva del Vin on the left and a more oblique view of the Riva del Ferro on the right. To the left of the bridge stands the Palazzo dei Dieci
Savi, with the Palazzo dei Camerlenghi just behind; to the right, the Fondaco dei Tedeschi. The boats in the right foreground are moored directly in front of the Palazzo Dolfin-Manin, not visible here but often included in views of the Rialto Bridge.

Francesco depicted the Rialto Bridge from the east numerous times throughout his career and seems to have favored a viewpoint at about this distance down the Grand Canal. A painting in the Wallace Collection, London, of about the same date, seems to have favored a viewpoint at about this distance down the Grand Canal.

A painting in the Wallace Collection, London, of about the same date, shows a view nearly identical to that in the Washington painting, with just two buildings fewer on the left. The configuration of the boats is nearly identical in the two paintings except for the gondolas and docks painted over the water in the right foreground of the Washington painting. These elements appear to have been added as a further variation on the Wallace composition, which may have been executed first. None of the existing drawings corresponds to this particular view of the bridge.

A painting of nearly identical dimensions depicting the Grand Canal with San Simeone Piccolo and Santa Lucia, also said to come from the Ingram collection and still in the John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art (fig. 1), may have been a pendant to the Washington Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge. It dates stylistically to c. 1780 and in terms of tonality and composition it forms a logical pair with the Washington painting.

Notes
1. Widener 1900, 202, gives the provenance as “Ingram (Marsala House) Collection.” A typewritten copy of the same catalogue, dated 1908 on the binding (NGA library, Rare Book Collection), changes “Marsala” to “Matsala.” Subsequent Widener catalogues (1916, 1923, and 1931) give the provenance as Matsala House. The probable pendant (see text) is listed in the Collection of John G. Johnson 1892, 86, no. 257, as coming from “Ingram of Marsala House.” Ingram has not been identified conclusively, but would appear to be John Ingram, who is known to have collected Guardi views in Venice around 1800. On John Ingram see Haskell 1960, 271–272. In a letter of 17 September 1968 (NGA curatorial files), Haskell wrote that he was baffled by the reference to Matsala House. John Ingram is known to have resided at Staindrop Hall, County Durham; in Venice; and later in Rome.

2. The later history of John Ingram’s collection is traced by Byam Shaw 1977, 3–5. Parts of Ingram’s collection were dispersed at the end of the nineteenth century in public sales that did not include paintings. Johnson may have acquired the Washington and Philadelphia paintings directly or indirectly from Ingram’s heirs at about this time, but this cannot be documented.

3. According to a typewritten card in the Lynnewood Hall Inventories, NGA curatorial files. The painting does not appear in the 1892 Johnson catalogue cited in note 1.


5. Morassi 1973, 1: nos. 559, 277; 2: figs. 533, 307. The series can be dated to 1776 or earlier on the basis of the Piazza San Marco During the Feast of the Ascension, which shows a temporary structure erected for the merchants’ stalls that is different from the reusable structure built in 1777 by Bernardino Maccaruzzi: Mazzarotto 1980, 190–193. The structure in the Gulbenkian painting has the look of a temporary structure, but it has not been documented. Arslan 1967, 17, cited the Gulbenkian painting as a point of reference for the early to mid-1770s.

6. See 1939.1.129.

7. Arslan 1967, 17, described the latter figures in these terms and gave a list of comparisons.

8. Morassi 1973, 1: no. 279; 2: fig. 308; Rossi Bortolatto 1974, color pl. 43. Arslan 1967, 17–18, dated this painting to 1790 on the style of the women’s hats; he compared it with the same subject in the Gulbenkian collection (see note 5) to demonstrate the intervening change in style.


10. For these see Morassi 1973, 1: nos. 524–545; 2: figs. 509–520. Francesco usually depicted the same buildings on the right, from a sharper or wider angle, but often varied the extent of the left bank shown.

11. 68 × 90 cm. Morassi 1973, 1: no. 528; 2: fig. 511.

Morassi, followed by Rossi Bortolatto 1974, 114, nos. 405–406, noted the similarity and assigned both paintings to c. 1770/1780.

12. A nearly identical viewpoint (with just a half-building less on the left than the Wallace picture) is seen in paintings in the Musée des Augustins, Toulouse (62 × 92.5 cm), and the San Diego Art Museum (57 × 85 cm). The configuration of boats is quite similar in these works, but unlike that in either the Wallace Collection or Washington paintings. Morassi 1973, 1: nos. 544, 543; Rossi Bortolatto 1974, no. 413, repro., and Bordeaux 1982, fig. 3, respectively. Both are generally dated later in the 1780s. A similar view recently sold at Sotheby’s, New York, 20 May 1993, no. 127, color repro., as Francesco Guardi but in the photograph it appears to be the work of an imitator.


14. 67.3 × 91.5 cm. Morassi 1973, 1: no. 579; 2: fig. 552. See also note 1 above.
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FRANCESCO GUARDI 133
**Capriccio of a Harbor**

c. 1760/1770
Oil on canvas, 122 x 178 (48 x 70)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

**Technical Notes:** The support consists of two pieces of loosely woven plain-weave fabric joined with a vertical seam. The ground is a reddish-brown layer. The paint film is smooth and was applied in thin layers; the lighter passages show a slightly thicker buildup of paint. The ground was incorporated into the image, mainly in the foreground but also in the architecture. Dark glazes were applied over the ground to model the details of the temple, the ruins, and other elements. The architectural details were defined with calligraphic strokes of thin black paint. The sky was painted first with reserves left for the foreground, the architecture at right, and the large tower in the center. The smaller details in the distance were painted directly over the blue-white of the sky. The figures and the foreground were painted at the same time.

The tacking margins have been removed and cusping is visible only along the bottom and right edges. A rectangle measuring 26 x 67 cm was cut out of the lower-left corner of the support and reinserted; the edges of the vertical join do not match precisely. There are paint losses along the bottom edge and small areas of inpainting throughout. Overall abrasion has made the ground much more visible than intended, especially in the sky, which has taken on a dark reddish brown tonality. The dark glazes in the architecture and foreground are extensively abraded. The varnish is clear. In 1943 the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto. The most recent treatment was carried out by Mario Modestini, who removed discolored varnish and restored the painting in 1999.


**Francesco’s style of the later 1750s, when he first began painting views, is derived from the mature Canaletto. This early style is characterized by clear luminous colors, hard surfaces, and topographic accuracy, as seen in several works datable by topographic details to just after 1755, and in the signed and dated Mardi Gras in the Piazzetta of 1758.**6 The beginnings of Francesco’s darker, more dramatic style are seen in a pair of paintings in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, the Rialto Bridge and the Canal Grande at San Geremia, which retain reminiscences of the mature Canaletto.7 The pair can be dated after 1758/1759 by the partially completed church of San Geremia, thus suggesting that Francesco may actually have been working in different styles concurrently.8 Although the new style owes something to that of the young Canaletto of the 1720s, and also to the darker manners of Michele Marieschi and even of Alessandro Magnasco (q.v.), it is ultimately unique to Francesco.9

Around 1760 Francesco appears to have begun painting capriccios. His earliest known work in this genre, the Capriccio of Roman Ruins (Hans von Schoen collection, Cureglia), combines diverse elements drawn directly from Marco Ricci’s ruin capriccios.10 Succi has dated this picture to just after 1760 because it employs the same clear, luminous colors as Francesco’s view paintings of the later 1750s, and because the figures lie somewhere between those of the first views, which have well-defined contours in the manner of Canaletto, and those seen after about 1770, which are nervously drawn and painterly.11 Similarly, Succi has dated the Capriccio with Classical Ruins, formerly in the National Collection of Fine Arts, Washington, to the mid-1760s based on both stylistic and external evidence. Its pendant in the Kunsthauw Heylschôf, Worms, is derived directly from a print by Johannes Georg Hertel (active second half of the eighteenth century) published in the 1760s.12

The National Gallery’s Capriccio of a Harbor has many elements characteristic of Francesco’s dark, dramatic style of the 1760s, and can be compared with other capriccios from this decade, such as the four large landscapes with ruins in the collection of the duke of Montellano, Madrid, and the even larger Landscape with Large Trees in the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg.13 In addition to a warm tonality tending to brown, all share dramatic chiaroscuro effects; thin, fluid brushwork; large or medium-sized fore-
Francesco Guardi, Capriccio of a Harbor, 1943.4.50
ground figures; and large dimensions. The dramatic chiaroscuro in the Capriccio of a Harbor is lessened by abrasion, which has caused the ground to dominate the sky and water. The large scale is also typical of view paintings executed in the 1760s, such as the enormous Palazzo Ducale from the Sea and Bacino di San Marco toward San Giorgio Maggiore (Waddesdon Manor, Aylesbury), and the similar Palazzo Ducale seen from the Sea (Metropolitan Museum, New York), but is unusual later in Francesco’s career. Like the capriccios, these views of the 1760s are executed with long fluid strokes and have a warm dark tonality. Swirling storm clouds fill the sky, creating an overall surface pattern rather than suggesting three-dimensional form as in the paintings of Canaletto and Marieschi. Like the capriccios, Francesco’s views of the 1760s depict dark, calm seas with glassy surfaces, unbroken by the schematized waves in the manner of Canaletto, still seen in Francesco’s views of the later 1750s.

The Capriccio of a Harbor probably does not date later than about 1770 because it shows no signs of the transitional style that began around that time, when Francesco’s palette began to lighten, his brush-strokes became more tremulous, and the dramatic chiaroscuro was slowly replaced by the flickering light effects characteristic of his later style. 

The Capriccio of a Harbor is also characteristic of Francesco’s capriccios of the 1760s in that it shows him looking beyond the example of Marco Ricci, particularly to Luca Carlevaris, to create his own conception of the capriccio. The use of elements taken directly from these earlier artists is not sufficient evidence for placing the Capriccio of a Harbor in the 1730s, as some have argued. As often in the 1760s, Francesco derived his composition directly from a fantastic harbor scene by Carlevaris, in this case the Seaport with a Tower at Windsor Castle. Although he modified many of the structures, Francesco retained the strip of land and jetties in the foreground with figures engaged in harbor activities such as moving barrels, discussing merchandise, repairing boats, and the like. A fortified bridge joins the foreground to the main structures of the port, which recede diagonally from the lower right to meet the horizon of the sea at the left. As in other contemporary capriccios, Francesco drew upon Marco Ricci for individual motifs. The square guard tower appears in many capriccios by both Carlevaris and Marco Ricci, although only in those of the latter is it placed directly across a bridge. The set of columns supporting a ruined entablature comes directly from Marco Ricci, who also used it to close one side of a composition. Francesco even included the socle with a sculpture fragment, here a comically outsized foot, that Marco frequently associated with this ruin element. Finally, Francesco’s figures with their rounded forms, generalized, often vaguely classical garb, and energetic poses are more similar to those of Marco than to Carlevaris, who favored stiffer, smaller figures in carefully depicted contemporary dress.

The many known versions of the present composition attest to its popularity. Among these, the Washington painting corresponds most closely—but not exactly—to a drawing in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, making it the most likely candidate for the prime painted version. Closest to both the drawing and the Washington painting is a small canvas in the Gnuttì collection, Brescia, which also contains some elements of the Metropolitan drawing, such as the group of figures in the right foreground. Its pendant, in the same collection, is a Capriccio with Rustic Houses. Still other versions are simplified or reduced treatments of the larger Washington version. No two are identical, suggesting either autograph versions or studio pastiches, and several are paired with different compositions, none of which necessarily reflects a possible lost pendant for the present canvas. 

Notes
1. “Coast scene, with ruined buildings and bridges, boats and figures in the foreground.” The dimensions, 48 x 70 in., match the National Gallery’s painting exactly, but this general description could also apply to a lost pendant or even another version. A marginal notation in the Knoedler file copy of the catalogue gives the buyer as “Mostyn.” Graves 1918-1921, i: 385, gives the buyer as “Lawson” and lists an incorrect sale date.
2. According to the Hearn sale catalogue.
4. APC, n.s. 20 (1941-1942), no. 1130.
5. The original prospectus in the NGA curatorial files bears the Schaffer Galleries’ stamp.
6. Sotheby Parke-Bernet, New York, 11 January 1990, lot 121, color repro. For this early style see Dario Succi in Succi et al. 1987, 41-56, 57-82. Succi consistently gives the date as 1756, although each of several sale catalogues gives the correct date of 1758, which is clearly legible in photographs.
8. Sukci et al. 1987, 60, fig. 48. Sukci dated the Munich paintings to c. 1763 or 1764, based on the unfinished state of San Geremia. While the exact stages of construction are not documented, the first mass was celebrated in the church in 1760, which suggests that the dome or at least part of the nave had already been constructed. Lewis 1979, 342, n. 60. Although mass could have been celebrated in the choir, which is the only element completed in the Munich painting, it has been noted, without citation of a source, that the church was half constructed by 1759: Bassi 1962, 345. Similar observations were made in connection with a related drawing by Byam Shaw 1969, 21, 61. It is also possible that Francesco painted this view at a later date based on an old drawing.

9. See Sukci et al. 1987, 65, for a discussion of Francesco's relation to these other painters.

10. 28.5 x 44 cm. Morassi [1973], 1: no. 704; 2: fig. 662, with further literature. It is executed in tempera on parchment, a technique preferred by Marco but never again used by Francesco.


12. Sukci et al. 1987, 83–88, repro., and Sukci, Capricci, 1988, 309–310, repro. Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 702–703: 2: figs. 688, 660. The paintings measure 104 x 124 cm. The National Collection of Fine Arts painting is usually referred to as "ex-Smithsonian Institution" in the Guardi literature, even though it was first sold in 1968—most recently at Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 24 May 1991, lot 77, color repro. This was long held to be among Francesco's earliest efforts in this genre, and was dated to the 1730s solely because it depends on a composition by Marco Ricci.

13. Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 826, 877, 911, 917, 998; 2: figs. 751, 789, 807, 811, 860. The duke of Montellano's paintings measure 92 x 135 cm, the Hermitage painting 120 x 152 cm. The Capriccio of a Harbor was associated with these, and other similar capricci, by Pallucchini, "Guardi," 1965, 228, 231, who dated the whole group to 1755–1760.

14. Sukci et al. 1987, 60–86, figs. 51–53, 54; Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 390, 419, 392; 2: figs. 414, 441 and 417, respectively. The Waddesdon Manor paintings measure 284 x 424 cm, the Metropolitan painting 122 x 155 cm.

15. This transition is discussed by Dario Sukci in Sukci et al. 1987, 70–71. As few dated or documented works are known until the early 1780s (see biography), it is impossible to establish precise dates for this change in style.


17. For example, Francesco's Seaport with a Ruined Arch and Capriccio with an Arsenal, both in a private collection, Milan (Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 928, 832; 2: figs. 831, 747), and also datable to the 1760s, are based on paintings by Carlevaris of c. 1712 at Windsor Castle: Rizzi 1967, 96–97, figs. 64–66. On Francesco's reinterpretation of Carlevaris' capricci, see Sukci, Capricci, 1988, 332, figs. 4–5, and Delneri 1987, 128. A vertical version of the Seaport with a Ruined Arch is paired with a vertical version of the Capriccio of a Harbor in Turin, on which see below note 23. For other versions of the Seaport with a Ruined Arch see Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 926–931; 2: figs. 823–829. None of these is large enough to be the pendant to the National Gallery's Capriccio of a Harbor.


19. For example in the Landscape with a Bridge, National Museum, Warsaw: Scarpa Sonino 1991, no. O.86, fig. 14. See, for example, the Capriccio with Ruins and an Orator, private collection, Milan; the Capriccio with Horsemens, Castle Howard; or the View of a Port, private collection, London: Scarpa Sonino 1991, fig. 142, color pl. 42; no. O.21, fig. 77; and no. O.72, fig. 113, respectively.

20. 24.9 x 46.9 cm. Bean and Griswold 1990, 131–132, no. 114, repro.; Morassi 1975, 184, no. 611, fig. 596.


22. The quality of these paintings cannot be judged from photographs, nor can Morassi's dating of them to different points in Francesco's career.

(1) Formerly with the Galleria Lorenzelli, Bergamo, 40 x 50 cm. It lacks the columns and entablature on the right and has fewer figures and boats. It is paired with a Rustic Capriccio with Ruins of a Fort and was considered by Morassi to be an early work. Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 819 and 872; 2: fig. 746; both sold Sotheby's Italia (Florence), 24 September 1985, lot 16, repro.

(2) Private collection, Bergamo, 13 x 21 cm, photograph in NGA curatorial files. It lacks the columns, the most distant fortifications, the boats in the distance, and many figures. It is paired with a Fantastic Lagoon with a Fort and was considered by Morassi to be a late work. Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 820 and 885; 2: fig. 801 (pendant).

(3) Formerly with the Koetser Gallery, Zurich, 32 x 52 cm, sold Christie's, London, 28 June 1974, no. 82. This lacks the columns on the right, but has a more extended view of the port in the distance and a different arrangement of the quay in the foreground. In photographs it does not appear to be autograph. Morassi [1973], 1: no. 818, fig. 743.

(4) Private collection, Turin, 84 x 66 cm. This vertical composition compresses elements from the left two-thirds of the Washington composition. It is paired with a Seaport with a Ruined Arch, also based on a painting by Carlevaris. Morassi [1973], 1: nos. 821 and 931; 2: figs. 749 and 829. For the composition by Carlevaris, see above note 17.

(5) National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, 27 x 22 cm, photograph in NGA curatorial files. This vertical oval composition impacts most of the elements of the larger composition, including the columns on the right, into a vertical format: Morassi [1973], 1: 462, under no. 816 simply mentions but does not catalogue this work.

(6) Major Forbes Fraser sale, Christie's, London, 21 November 1924, no. 119, 11 ½ x 19 ½ in., photograph in Frick Art Reference Library, supply files. It has fewer ships in the distance, but more m oored along the quay, and figures in different groupings. Rather tightly painted, it does not appear to be autograph.

(7) Exhibited, Burlington Fine Arts Club, winter 1927–1928, no. 23, 11 ½ x 20 ½ in., photograph in Frick Art Reference Library, supply files. Although the basic composition is the same as in the Capriccio of a Harbor, many elements are lacking, such as the columns at left.
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Fanciful View of the
Castel Sant’ Angelo, Rome

C. 1785
Oil on canvas, 46.8 x 76.3 (18 ⅞ x 31)
Gift of Howard Sturges

Technical Notes: The plain-weave fabric was prepared with an underlying dark red layer and a second, buff-colored ground. This buff color was allowed to show through in the architecture, sky, and water. The artist began by painting the cityscape; he sketched it in first with painterly contour lines, then added blocks of color, and finally used thin lines of black and white for the details. Figures were painted over the landscape and architectural elements. The blue sky was laid in after the cityscape, but directly over the ground, and the clouds were added over the sky. The whites and lighter colors were applied quite thickly, the darks thinly. In x-radiographs it appears that the house in the center was moved downward and that the dome of the church on the left had been planned to be much taller.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but cusping suggests that the original image dimensions have been preserved. The surface is severely abraded, especially in the darks, which have also become quite transparent. This is especially evident in the glazes used for Saint Peter’s. Inpainting in the sky is concentrated near the cityscape. The varnish is somewhat matte. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored in 1956, probably by Frank Sullivan.

Provenance: (Alphonse Kann, Paris); sold 4 June 1914 to (Thomas Agnew & Sons, London, stock no. 4543); sold 27 June 1914 to Calouste Gulbenkian; returned 17 June 1915 to (Thomas Agnew & Sons, London, stock no. 4668); sold 7 July 1922 to (C. M. Agnew and Ansdell, London); sold to Howard Sturges [d. 1955], Providence, Rhode Island.


This imaginary view of the Castel Sant’ Angelo has been attributed to Francesco Guardi in the literature, and it has been recently reaffirmed by Dario Succi as unique in Guardi’s production as a view outside of Venice. The fanciful interpretation of the site, the mottled surfaces of the buildings, and the smooth, glassy treatment of the water all bear a resemblance to Francesco’s style. But the thick unmodulated areas of impasto, applied in thick patches or long, sinuous lines, are not characteristic of Francesco at any stage of his career, in the present writer’s opinion. The long, threadlike lines of thick paint are most evident in the edges of the railing that curves back from the foreground and in the detailing of Saint Peter’s. Likewise, the surfaces of the buildings are more thickly painted than in autograph works by Francesco, and the areas of different colors are larger and less modulated. The glowing golden tonality of this Fanciful View is also not altogether typical of Francesco’s views and capriccios, and could have been inspired by the example of Michele Marieschi. The figures resemble Francesco’s in pose and dress, but are painted more stiffly and with fewer brushstrokes. The possibility that this painting may be the work of an artist imitating Francesco’s style in a superficial manner and employing a rather different technique must therefore remain open.

The artist need not have gone to Rome for knowledge of the site, as the Castel Sant’ Angelo was depicted frequently in paintings, prints, and drawings, from the sixteenth into the nineteenth century. Most artists adopted essentially the same view from the opposite bank of the Tiber with Saint Peter’s in the distance, but the present view seems based on a print by Giuseppe Vasi (1710–1782) published in 1754. In creating his painted version of the site, the artist displayed Francesco’s characteristic disregard of topographical accuracy and created instead a fanciful, picturesque view. The Castel Sant’ Angelo appears taller and less broad than in actuality, and its fortifications have been expanded to close the right side of the composition. The viewpoint adopted is slightly lower and closer than that chosen by Vasi (or most other artists), causing the fort and its walls to loom larger. From this viewpoint, the empty space between the Castel Sant’ Angelo and the Vatican palace would naturally disappear, but in closing the gap, the artist transformed the palace into a group of buildings unrelated spatially or structurally to Saint Peter’s. The Vatican basilica appears, as it does in
Francesco Guardi, *Fanciful View of the Castel Sant'Angelo, Rome*, 1956.9.2
most such views, at the end of the straight, east-west section of the Tiber just before the river curves to the south.

For picturesque effect, the artist gave this straight section of the river a gentle curve and replaced the buildings lining its left (south) bank with a roadway that leads the eye gently uphill from the foreground to the Ponte Sant’Angelo. Consisting of four irregular arches (instead of three large and two small) and shorn of its balustrades and ornaments, this bridge closely resembles those of Francesco’s capriccios. The distant bridge is a completely fanciful element not found in any other views of this site, as no bridge existed there until the twentieth century. The church on the left bank is a picturesque substitution for the Palazzo Altoviti, which in Vasi’s print stands just in front of the Ponte Sant’Angelo. Inclusion of a church at this point may have been suggested by the hospital church of Santo Spirito in Sassia; in Vasi’s print this church appears just behind the Palazzo Altoviti, but is actually on the other side of the river. The octagonal tower over the crossing of Santo Spirito may have suggested the round drum of this rather odd little church with its Gothic facade.

Paintings of sites outside Venice and its immediate environs are extremely rare in Francesco’s oeuvre, and those attributed to him may ultimately prove to be the work of followers or imitators.

Notes

1. Information provided by Martha Hepworth of the Getty Provenance Index from the stock records of Agnew’s; the relationship of Agnew and Ansdell to the firm of Agnew’s is unclear; they purchased paintings from Agnew’s in the early 1920s (letter of 25 February 1992, NGA curatorial files).

2. Notation of a letter from Geoffrey Agnew of 10 August 1956, on an artist card in NGA curatorial files, records that Sturges bought the painting from Agnew’s, but gives no indication of when.

3. Accepted in the published literature (see references) and by Giuseppe Fiocco on the basis of a photograph (letter of 7 November 1956, NGA curatorial files).

4. Given the paucity of technical information on Francesco’s paintings and the fact that so many are dispersed in private collections, it is impossible to know if any of his paintings are executed on buff-colored grounds. It should be noted that this painting may appear more golden in tone because abrasion has rendered the buff-colored ground more visible. Morassi [1973], 1: 438, described the tonality as “rosy-azure” and inspired by Antonio Jolli (c. 1700–1777).

5. Morassi [1973], 1: 257, noted that uncertainty about the attribution had occasionally arisen. Bernard Aikema also questioned the attribution during a visit to the National Gallery, 20 March 1993.

6. See the extensive discussion by Krönig 1972. A supposed trip to Rome by Francesco has been disproved and cannot be cited in support of his execution of the present painting. The only evidence for such a trip is a letter on the back of a drawing in the Metropolitan Museum (Inv. no. 37.165.71; Morassi 1975, no. 551). Byam Shaw 1951, 40, n. 2, pointed out, however, that this letter has nothing to do with Francesco Guardi: it is dated from Caprarola, addressed to an unnamed ecclesiastic, and signed by one Domenico Tosti.


8. The church is not a misinterpretation of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, as stated by Shapley 1979, 1: 243, following Ross Watson (notes in NGA curatorial files). San Giovanni lies beyond the next bend downriver and is thus not visible in any view of the Castel Sant’Angelo.

9. At one time several views of Rome were wrongly attributed to Francesco, as can be seen in the photographic archives of the Frick Art Reference Library. Giuseppe Fiocco was probably referring to such works when he claimed to have found many Roman views by Francesco (letter of 7 November 1956, NGA curatorial files), an idea repeated but unconfirmed by Shapley 1979, 1: 243, n. 4.

Only one other non-Venetian view is attributed to Francesco at present, the Pra’ della Valle with the Basilica of Santa Giustina at Padua, Musée Municipal, Dijon, and it is based on a composition by Cannaletto: Morassi [1973], 1: no. 437–438, no. 684, 2: fig. 643. The attribution is Morassi’s, but appears questionable in photographs; the painting has also been attributed to Cannaletto and Bellotto.

A small group of late capriccios, representing figures in a garden before a loggia, is loosely yet recognizably based on the garden facade of the Villa Medici, which Francesco or his followers could have known from numerous prints of the villa, including those by Vasi. The principal versions are in the Accademia Carrara, Bergamo (Morassi [1973], 1: no. 752: 2: fig. 694); and the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen, which is rejected by Morassi but accepted as autograph by Rosenberg 1966, 190, no. 212, repro. Identification of the site as the Villa Medici was first recorded in old catalogues for the Rouen Museum, but rejected by Rosenberg and unacknowledged by Morassi. Comparison with contemporary prints and modern photographs clearly shows that the loggia in both is based on the garden facade of the Villa Medici; see the illustrations in Andres 1976, 2: 429–440.

References

1958 Muraro: 8, fig. 17.
1965 NGA: 64.
1967 Muraro: 161, fig. 175.
Follower of Francesco Guardi

1949.1.6 (1038)

**Rialto Bridge, Venice**

C. 1770/1800
Oil on wood, 19.1 x 30.3 (7 1/2 x 11 7/8)
Gift of R. Horace Gallatin

**Inscriptions**
On vertical cradle member, in ink, "13507"; on horizontal cradle member, in red paint, "(5346)"; in ink on panel verso, "5846" and "G. C. 788 Lun (.) 449."

**Technical Notes:** The support is a wood panel with horizontal grain. The ground is an extremely thin reddish brown layer that does not cover the wood texture and is unevenly applied, being thinnest at the edges. The paint is of fluid consistency with a granular appearance due to large and irregular pigment particles. The sky was laid in before the cityscape using a continuous layer of blue and white over the red ground with splattered dots of deep blue throughout. X-radiographs reveal areas where the artist covered over additional clouds with blue sky. The brushwork is vigorous and free and allows the ground to show in selected areas. Following the sky, the water and architecture were laid in using washes with the ground exposed to create areas of shadow; architectural details were drawn in with calligraphic strokes of black paint. The foreground figures, boats, and highlights were painted last with a full brush. The lighter valued areas are painted with a softly rounded rather than sharp-edged impasto.

The panel has been thinned to about 0.1 cm and marouflaged to a wood panel and then cradled. The painting is in excellent condition except for small areas of minor abrasion in the sky and canal. The varnish is clear. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored in 1982.

**Provenance:** (Eugene Glaenzer, Paris); purchased 1914 by (M. Knoedler & Co., London); sold 1924 by (M. Knoedler & Co., New York) to R. Horace Gallatin [1871-1948], New York.¹


*This painting* came to the National Gallery as "School of Francesco Guardi," but it was immediately designated autograph. This attribution has found only limited acceptance, and the work has been excluded from most of the literature on Francesco Guardi’s view paintings.²

Close examination of the painting shows it to be the work of a follower or imitator of Francesco. In the architecture the artist attempts to duplicate the subtle variegated surfaces of Francesco’s facades, but does so with heavy, smeary blotches of paint rather than the quick, deft strokes characteristic of the master’s hand. As a result, the colors seem to sit on the surface rather than form translucent layers that re-create the flickering of light and shadow across porous stone. Although the figures resemble Francesco’s elongated boatmen with tiny heads, and strike similarly active poses, they are mechanical and simply constructed with only a few strokes of unblended paint. As in Francesco’s paintings, large pigment particles are evident in both the ground and paint layers, suggesting that the work was produced by a contemporary.³

This view is taken from a point closer to the Rialto Bridge than the National Gallery’s Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge. It shows essentially the same buildings on the right at a more oblique angle, but on the left only the Palazzo dei Dieci Savi.⁴ None of Francesco’s known depictions of the Rialto Bridge takes exactly the same viewpoint or has the same configuration of boats.⁵
Follower of Francesco Guardi, *Rialto Bridge, Venice*, 1949.1.6
Notes
1. Glaenzer was a dealer active in Paris and New York during the 1900s and 1910s. All information from the Knoedler records, provided by Martha Hepworth of the Getty Provenance Index (letter of 25 February 1992, NGA curatorial files).

2. The attribution has been accepted by Terisio Pignati, oral communication of 29 November 1965, and by Fredericksen and Zeri 1972, 97. Morassi (1973) may have overlooked the painting due to confusion with the National Gallery’s other painting of the Rialto Bridge (1942.9.27) or because it was on extended loan at the time he was compiling his catalogue. Dario Succi, who is preparing a new catalogue raisonné of Francesco’s oeuvre, considers it “una mediocre opera di seguito o imitatore” (letter of 10 February 1993, NGA curatorial files). Bernard Aikema concurred with this opinion on a visit to the National Gallery on 20 March 1993.

3. Discussion of the painting’s technique with Catherine Metzger, Elizabeth Wainsley, and Sarah Fisher of the National Gallery conservation department was very helpful in preparing this entry and determining the attribution.

4. See 1942.9.27 for a discussion of the site and other depictions of it by Francesco.

5. A painting in a private collection, Milan, takes a similar viewpoint but with a different configuration of boats: Morassi (1973), 1: no. 535; 2: fig. 515.

References (all as Francesco Guardi)
1965 NGA: 64.
1972 Fredericksen and Zeri: 97.
1975 NGA: 166, repro.
1985 NGA: 193, repro.

1958.7.1 (1507)
The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice
c. 1770–1800
Oil on canvas, 48.2 x 83.6 (19 x 32 7/8)
Gift of Lewis Einstein

Technical Notes: The support is a moderately coarse, plain-weave fabric. The ground is a moderately thick, dull red layer that shows through most areas of the paint surface. In the buildings the paint is applied tightly and thinly, while in the figures and highlighted architectural elements it is handled somewhat more loosely and with slight impasto. In general, the paint is applied in opaque layers with almost no glazing. The black lines that define architectural details were drawn with a straightedge. Ruled diagonal lines of underpaint in the foreground may have been used to establish the perspective. The tower was formerly about 1 cm wider on each side as can be seen in x-radiographs and from the vertical brushstrokes where the sky was painted over the sides of the tower.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but there is pronounced cusping along the left and right edges of the support. Abrasion is evenly distributed throughout the sky and darker areas of the foreground. Inpainting is restricted to the extreme edges. The varnish is clear. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored in 1981 by Carol Christensen.


The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice was executed by one of the many anonymous artists who imitated the style of Francesco Guardi without matching his technical proficiency. Overall the painting lacks the lively surface and sparkling color characteristic of Francesco’s autograph works. Most tellingly, the architecture appears flat and mechanical. To render the play of light and shadow across the facades, the artist used Francesco’s distinctive technique of applying different layers of color within the outlines of the buildings, but without his feel for the subtle effects of light on different materials. In adding architectural detailing with thin lines of black, the artist worked much more stiffly than would Francesco, and the inexact renderings result from deficient skill rather than artistic license. The figures also lack the vigorous movement and sinuous outlines of those by Francesco.¹

The painting can be dated only within the broad range of c. 1770–1800. Francesco appears to have established himself as a successful view painter by 1764;² only after this time would another artist have found it profitable to imitate his manner. This work depends on Francesco’s mature style as it developed from c. 1770 and derives from paintings generally dated to that decade or later. In materials and technique it appears to be the work of a contemporary imitator, although the market for Guardesque views of Venice continued into the nineteenth century.

In the course of his career Francesco Guardi depicted the square in front of the basilica of San Marco several times.³ The present painting does not follow a specific model, but is based upon views taken from a point close to the Procuratie Nuove at the right of the square, such as that in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond.⁴ Seen from this position, the Procuratie Nuove appears taller than the Procuratie Vecchie and the Torre dell’Orologio, on the left. The Palazzo Ducale is just visible on the right between the basilica of San Marco and the Biblioteca Marciana.⁵ The pentimento around the cam-
Follower of Francesco Guardi, *The Square of Saint Mark's, Venice*, 1958.7.1
panile shows the artist consciously changing his work to look more like those of his model: in Francesco’s views of the piazza from this and other viewpoints, the campanile is consistently depicted as narrower and taller than it is in reality. The artist’s original rendering of the campanile recalls the wider, often overly squat proportions found in views of the piazza by various imitators of Francesco’s style. Like the architecture, the figure groups are not copied from a single model, but are drawn from Francesco’s various depictions of the site.

Notes
1. Similar observations were made in unsigned notations in the NGA curatorial files. Michael Levey (letter of 11 October 1964, NGA curatorial files) wrote that he considered the designation “style of Guardi” more appropriate than “imitator,” and rejected an attribution to Francesco’s son Giacomo. Shapley 1979, i: 244, noted but did not accept Pignatti’s suggestion (oral communication, 29 November 1963) of Giacomo Guardi. Fredericksen and Zeri 1972, 647, assigned the painting to the studio or school of Francesco Guardi. Darío Succi called it the work of a nineteenth-century imitator and rejected any connection with Giacomo Guardi (letter of 10 February 1993, NGA curatorial files).
2. See biography.
5. Shapley 1979, i: 244, following a suggestion by Teresio Pignatti (oral communication of 29 November 1963), identified the building to the left of the basilica as the patriarchal palace and thus dated the painting after 1807 based on an incorrect date for the palace (it was begun in the 1820s). Michael Levey correctly pointed out that these are the same insignificant houses seen in Francesco’s other views of the piazza (letter of 10 November 1964, NGA curatorial files).
6. Compare the photographs of the site found in Piazza San Marco 1970.
7. A number of these, formerly attributed to Francesco, are collected in the photographic archives of the Frick Art Reference Library, New York (Francesco Guardi, supply files). See, for example, the paintings sold from the collection of Comte Greffulhe at Sotheby’s, London, 22 July 1937, no. 63, pl. 21, and from the Dollfus collection at the Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, 20–21 May 1912, no. 80, repro.

References
1965 NGA: 64.
1972 Fredericksen and Zeri: 97.
1979 Shapley: i: 244; 2: pl. 165.
1985 NGA: 194, repro.

Gian Antonio Guardi
1699 – 1761

The reconstruction of Gian Antonio Guardi’s biography and oeuvre presents difficulties to modern historians for two reasons. First, he is not the subject of significant comment in the copious critical and biographical literature of his time. Second, his artistic personality has often been confused with that of his widely celebrated younger brother, Francesco (q.v.).

Antonio was descended from a family that was ennobled by the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand III in 1643. His forebears moved between their native Trent, then part of the empire, and Vienna, where they pursued artistic, military, and ecclesiastical careers. This family background is necessary to understand Antonio’s later patronage, which mainly originated in military and ecclesiastical circles, most often Austrian or northern Italian. Antonio kept close ties to the Trentino, his native province. Indeed, most of his major works were produced for churches in the north of Italy, on occasion at the behest of ecclesiastic members of his own family.

Antonio’s father Domenico was also a painter resident in Austria. Domenico must have had some links with painters of the Venetian school, since the Venetian artist Antonio Bellucci (1654–1727) was present at Antonio’s baptism in Vienna on 27 May 1699. Sometime before 1702 the family moved to Venice, where Domenico was registered in the painter’s guild in 1715.

Antonio’s first signed and dated painting (Saint John Nepomuk, present location unknown, ex-Cogo collection, Treviso) is of 1717, the year after his father’s death. Whether this work can be taken as a sign that Antonio, at the age of eighteen, was already a master of a workshop is under dispute. He may have trained in Vienna, where he was documented in
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1719, before returning to Venice. Another possibility is that Antonio was trained by Sebastiano Ricci, but the documentation for this is contested. In any case, the crucial period from 1719 to 1730 remains a complete blank.

From 1730 onward, however, Antonio’s activities are better known. From that year until 1746, he is documented as the avid collector Field Marshal Schuilenburg’s “pittor di casa,” charged mainly with providing copies of works by such artists as Tintoretto (1518–1594), Sebastiano Ricci (q.v.), and Piazzetta (q.v.). While working for Schuilenburg, Antonio served such other Venetian families, including the Donà and the Giovanelli (the latter family from the Guardi’s native province). In this period, he also furnished religious paintings for smaller towns in northeast Italy, such as the lunettes for the parish church in Vigo d’Anaunia. Significantly, these lunettes were commissioned by the parish priest, who was his uncle.

More often than not the compositions of Antonio’s works depend heavily on models selected from the works of eminent Venetian and foreign artists. However, Antonio’s originality, evident in documented works such as The Vision of Saint John of Matha (parish church, Pasiano di Pordenone), resides rather in his vivid, high-keyed colors and his fluid, calligraphic brushwork, which tends to dissolve forms. Francesco’s figurative work produced before Antonio’s death, on the other hand, displays firmer outlines, and a more tonal application of colors, lending greater solidity to his subjects.

Paintings securely documented as by Antonio include the copies he made for Schuilenburg (some in the Schuilenburg collection at the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, Hanover), the Saint John Nepomuk of 1717 (present location unknown), The Death of Saint Joseph (Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie Alte-Meister, Berlin), and The Vision of Saint John of Matha (parish church, Pasiano di Pordenone). Antonio’s overall responsibility for other works, such as the altarpieces for Cerete Basso, Belvedere di Aquileia, and Vigo d’Anaunia, and for the organ balustrade of the Venetian church of the Angelo Raffaele, has only recently been accepted.

The fact that Francesco’s style often closely imitates Antonio’s has complicated efforts to distinguish the work of the two brothers. Visual evidence, and documentation which may indicate that the brothers worked together, has led some scholars to speculate about a family workshop. However, other scholars forcibly discount the possibility of any collaboration between the two brothers. Unfortunately, a satisfactory historical account of the operation of the Guardi workshop, which would clarify the attributions of disputed works, such as the National Gallery of Art’s Tasso cycle (discussed below), has not yet been produced.

Antonio was elected a founding member of the Venetian academy in 1756 (he was nominated by his brother-in-law, Giovanni Battista Tiepolo [q.v.]). He died in 1761, and was all but forgotten until the early twentieth century. Now his works are generally considered among the fullest expressions of the European rococo.

**Bibliography**
Binion 1967.
Morassi 1974.
Merling in Martineau and Robison 1994.
Gian Antonio Guardi and Francesco Guardi

1964.21.1 (1931)

Carlos and Ubaldo Resisting the Enchantments of Armida’s Nymphs

1750/1755
Oil on canvas, 250.2 x 459.8 (98 1/2 x 181)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund

Technical Notes: The support is constructed of three lengths of coarse, plain-weave fabric joined horizontally. The lengths measure 92, 97, and 60 cm in width, with the widest at the top. The ground consists of a red layer with a second, overall gray layer that was used as a middle tone throughout. The composition was laid in with brown paint using a moderately narrow brush to draw outlines and with white paint using a wider brush to block out larger areas. This white paint has a low impasto visible through successive layers. The large reserves revealed in x-radiographs suggest that the composition was fairly well planned, although the reserves follow no precise outlines.

The paint was applied in layers, wet-over-dry, apparently beginning with the upper sky, then moving on to the lower sky and mountain ridges, next to the clouds, then to the figures, and finally to the still life and flowers. The drapery of the standing nymph was painted in two stages: impastoed white underpaint with an orange glaze over it. The figure of Ubaldo at left was painted with more levels of shading than other figures and in this sequence: sky, red drapery with brown shadows, yellow drapery, blue drapery, and white drapery with wet-into-wet black shadows painted on top of the flesh tones. His blue boots were painted from light to dark. The blue drapery of the seated nymph was added last and was painted from dark to light. In some areas a sharp object (perhaps a brush handle) was used to scratch lines into the paint. There are few artist’s changes: Carlo’s right arm was repositioned and the contour of the right shoulder of the standing nymph was changed by pulling a green glaze for foliage over it.

The original tacking margins are present. The two original seams are visible on the surface, as is the horizontal seam in the lining canvas. The vertical craquelure may have resulted from rolling. There are many tears, especially in the sky and in Ubaldo’s red drapery, and losses in the figure of Carlo. Extensive abrasion to the glazes throughout has made some passages illegible. Inpainting with dots and dashes is present to a large degree in the figures. The inpainting has whitened, especially in the sky. The varnish is moderately discolored. The painting was most recently treated in 1959.


1964.21.2 (1932)

Erminia and the Shepherds

1750/1755
Oil on canvas, 251.5 x 442.2 (99 x 174 1/2)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund

Technical Notes: The support is constructed of three lengths of coarse, plain-weave fabric joined horizontally with seams that slant diagonally toward the lower-right corner. At the left the upper seam is 53 cm from the top edge, at right 64 cm; the lower seam is 98 cm from the bottom at the left, but only 87 cm at the right. The ground consists of a red layer directly over the fabric support with another gray layer over it, and possibly a third, lighter gray layer. The gray layer(s) is smooth and exposed at various points in the composition.

The paint was rapidly applied using a variety of techniques and consistencies. Very thin washes were used to lay in the background, but wet-into-wet opaque passages describe figural elements. Flourishes of white and yellow impasto were used, as well as fluid dashes of black and brown, to emphasize contours and form. The background sky and landscape appear to have been laid in first, with pink and purple paint strokes worked in with the blue and white, and thicker impasto whites and yellows for the clouds. Next the mountains and buildings were applied working wet-into-wet. The broad strokes used for the sea are so thin that the striations of the brushstrokes reveal the ground beneath. The figures and still-life elements were applied last. There is greater skill and deftness in the modeling of the basket weaver, the head of the uppermost shepherd boy, the goats, and the flowers near the bottom corners than in the rest of the painting. In the figure of Erminia the handling of the paint is deft and assured, with subtleties of modeling quickly but confidently indicated. There are minor shifts in the placement of the foliage at right.

The original tacking margins are present and incorporated into the picture plane at the top and sides. The two original seams are visible on the surface, as is the horizontal seam in the lining canvas. Extensive abrasion is present throughout, especially in the thinly applied browns and greens. The abrasion has been only partially inpainted. The inpainting has whitened. The varnish is mildly discolored. Traction crackle is evident in many of the black, brown, and dark red passages. The painting was most recently treated in 1959.

Provenance: Same as 1964.21.1
These two paintings, along with six others of smaller dimensions, were discovered in a shed in Ireland with neither attributions nor any indications of their original location. Although they were soon recognized as “Guardesque,” no consensus has been reached on their attribution either to Antonio or to his younger brother Francesco. All eight represent episodes from Torquato Tasso’s courtly epic of the crusades, Jerusalem Delivered (1581), and derive from Giovanni Battista Piazzetta’s illustrations to a sumptuous 1745 edition of the poem by the Venetian publisher Gian Battista Albrizzi. Although these paintings are among the most lyrical and poetic images produced in the Guardi circle, they are highly problematic because of the unknown circumstances of their production, their very dependence on Piazzetta’s illustrations, and the inherent difficulties in distinguishing the hands of Antonio and Francesco.

Erminia and the Shepherds represents Canto 7: 1-17, in which the Saracen princess escaped from Jerusalem. She left the besieged city to tend her beloved, the Christian knight Tancred, who had fallen in battle. Disguised in the armor of the warrior-maiden Clorinda, she was mistaken by the Christians, including her lover himself, for an enemy and pursued into the woods, where she fell asleep. The next morning the sound of birds and rustic music led her to a shepherd weaving baskets and three boys singing. Amazed, she asked them how they could live at peace while surrounded by wars and strife. The shepherd’s description of the pleasures of his rustic life, and Erminia’s decision to follow it, however temporarily, have been considered an exemplary modern expression of the pastoral, and consequently it was one of the most frequently depicted episodes from the epic.

Carlo and Ubaldo Resisting the Enchantments of Armida’s Nymphs is a well-known episode (Canto 15: 55–66). Rinaldo, bewitched by Armida, was held prisoner in her castle. His friends, the knights Carlo (the figure behind the tree) and Ubaldo (the figure at left), were instructed by Godfrey of Boulogne to rescue him. They arrived at Armida’s domain, the “Fortunate Isles,” having eluded several dangers. This scene depicts the last such temptation, as two of Armida’s nymphs attempt to seduce the knights and sway them from their duty.

Although only part of a larger cycle, these two paintings are logical pendants and must have been conceived to be complementary. Both depict peripateia—a sudden change of circumstance—in which the protagonist must choose between duty and pleasure. And both scenes are set in marvelous landscapes that amplify the moral message—for both the pastoral rusticity of the Erminia and the locus amoenus of the nymphs’ grove are meant to be irresistible to us as well. In addition, the two paintings have identical dimensions.

Although the National Gallery’s paintings derive from Piazzetta’s illustrations to the Jerusalem, they depart in many respects from their models (figs. 1–2). Most significant is the change effected from the vertical format of the Piazzetta illustrations to a horizontal one. This widened format not only opens the composition, but draws attention to the inventive landscape and still-life elements. Also, Erminia’s horse is not derived from Piazzetta’s illustration, but from Giambattista Tiepolo’s Saint James of Campostella (Szépmüvészeti Múzeum, Budapest). Another difference is the addition of the townscape on the lower left of the Carlo and Ubaldo representing the besieged city of Jerusalem and its ruined temple, about to be restored to its original glory by the victorious Crusaders. Thus, these paintings are examples of the Guardi’s creative and judicious re-use of their pictorial sources, rather than slavish imitation.

A dependence on sources by other artists rather than creating original compositions is characteristic of the figure paintings of both Antonio and Francesco over the course of their careers. Here, however, the dependence on Piazzetta’s illustrations, while not unusual in the larger context of the Guardi oeuvre, greatly complicates any attempt to understand the original disposition and number of paintings in the cycle.

Because the Piazzetta illustrations number twenty, it is logical to ask whether the Guardi’s Tasso cycle contained the same number of works, or only the eight paintings known today. The other paintings also found in Ireland, which doubtless belong to the same series, are Sophronia Offers Her Life to the Saracen King in Order to Save the Christians (Ferens Art Gallery, Kingston upon Hull), Single Combat Be-

Scholars who hold that the original series contained other paintings have attempted to connect these paintings with fourteen works described by Fiocco in 1923 as having decorated an unspecified villa near Este. Fiocco illustrated only one of these paintings (which he attributed to Antonio): Soliman and Ismenus Entering Jerusalem (present location unknown). Like the ex-Bantry paintings, it also derives from a Piazzetta illustration. Since the Soliman and Ismenus Entering Jerusalem was published by Fiocco without measurements, scholars have usually conjectured that it was a small work. Because Fiocco mentioned fourteen paintings and eight on Tassesque themes are extant, scholars have attempted to explain the discrepancy through the conjecture that six additional paintings were overdoors, now lost. Despite the manifest impossibility that the eight paintings known to have been in Ireland at least since the early nineteenth century could be considered part of a series of fourteen extant in the Veneto in 1923, scholars have persisted in connecting the two cycles. However, previously unconsidered
Gian Antonio and Francesco Guardi, Carlo and Ubaldo Resisting the Enchantments of Armida’s Nymphs, 1964.21.1
evidence provided by an archival photograph demonstrates conclusively that the Soliman and Ismenus was in fact much larger, and thus unsuitable for an overdoor. Furthermore, size provides the most plausible argument that the original cycle contained only the eight paintings known today. Given the combined measurements of the extant canvases, the addition of still others on the same scale would have resulted in a series too large for any but the grandest room.

Thus, of the extant paintings by the Guardi on subjects from Tasso, only the eight ex-Bantry paintings can be considered to stem from the same series. However, if the series comprised only the eight extant canvases, it is still difficult to explain why these episodes were specifically chosen from the twenty available subjects illustrated by Piazzetta, as they have only a limited narrative coherence. Indeed, fresco decorations or other cycles of subjects from Tasso usually concentrate on the episodes involving the loves of Rinaldo and Armida, as in the renowned room at the Villa Valmarana, decorated by Giovanni Battista Tiepolo in 1757 or the earlier cycle (c. 1742–1747) for an unknown patron (Art Institute of Chicago and National Gallery, London). Compared with Tiepolo's cycle, remarkable for its concise narrative exposition, the episodes for the Guardi cycle seem to have been chosen purely for visual appeal. In any case, in contrast to other artists' approaches to Tasso's text, such as Tiepolo's emphasis on its amorous and Bernardo Castello (1557–1629) on its bellicose elements, the Guardi successfully convey the tone of Tasso's descriptions, whether pastoral and rustic or exotic.

Without a provenance, one can only speculate on the kind of room they decorated, and whether their original disposition in this room would have followed the narrative closely, episode by episode, or whether, as seems equally possible, the motivation may have been to emphasize those scenes with the greatest visual and emotional appeal. Unfortunately, barring the discovery of further documentary evidence or other paintings indubitably from the same series, arguments regarding the number, original location, or original disposition of the cycle remain conjectural.

More problematic still is the attribution of these works, which have been variously described as by Antonio or Francesco alone; Antonio working as the head of a workshop, in which Francesco’s hand may or may not be discerned as one among many subordinates; or a collaboration, in which some individual paintings are due to each brother working as equal partners. These attributions are to some extent predetermined by the positions scholars have taken on the question of whether a Guardi workshop existed and, if so, the roles of Antonio and his brother in it.

Documentary evidence that would answer these questions with certainty is almost completely lacking, but a more secure foundation for modern connoisseurship of the Guardis’ works is provided by Mahon. He argued that attributions should be made on the basis of visual evidence rather than preconceptions about the shapes of the brothers’ careers. According to Mahon, the hallmarks of Antonio’s style in the larger corpus of attributed works, such as the Cerete Basso and Belvedere d’Aquileia altarpieces, and the organ balustrade depicting the story of Tobias (Angelo Raffaele, Venice), are defined by flickering brushstrokes that dissolve forms and a bright, high-keyed palette. By contrast, Francesco’s oeuvre, exemplified in such documented works as the Roncegno altarpiece and the two allegories of Faith and Charity (Ringling Museum, Sarasota), is characterized by heavy outlines, solid brushwork, and the construction of figures through chiaroscuro rather than surface effects.

On the basis of such differences Mahon attributed the National Gallery’s paintings, along with the two horizontal paintings in Venice and Copenhagen, to Antonio, and the remaining four to Francesco. Mahon’s view that the brothers worked side by side, but independently, in this cycle is borne out by the stylistic evidence from the other large-scale decorative cycles such as the stories from Roman history (Bogstad Manor, Oslo), which present evidence of two autonomous personalities working closely but separately.

Close visual analysis of paintings from the cycle has revealed that the situation is more complex. Indeed, although the other, smaller paintings seem to be distinctly by one or the other master working alone or with assistants, the National Gallery’s paintings indicate collaboration between the brothers and assistants, most likely because of their large size.

Mahon was thus correct when he later noted a diversity in the facture of the two major figures in Erminia and the Shepherds. While the Erminia is a bravura figure, composed of many translucent layers
of different pigments, the shepherd is composed solely of strongly shadowed planes of solid color. This disparity in construction is not merely a device to differentiate the masculine and feminine figures, but rather the result of different stylistic personalities. This is most evident in the coarse outlines of the shepherd’s contours, laid down in thick brushstrokes. The shepherd’s head, too, shows construction in a limited palette, with vigorous brushstrokes that follow the same direction. For Erminia, however, contours are elided, transitions are softened, and brushstrokes freely compose autonomous pattern as much as they construct form. Her face is enlivened by scattered highlights applied purely for surface value rather than modeling. These methods point to the different artistic personalities of Antonio and Francesco as they have been set forth by Mahon, and it is agreed that Mahon was correct in attributing the shepherd to Francesco, and Erminia to Antonio.

However, Ubaldo, in the other work, is not (as one would expect given its position and equal prominence) by the same hand as that of Erminia, that is Antonio. Ubaldo’s anatomy and draperies have as much solidity as those of the shepherd, but are much less complex chromatically than Erminia’s. The contours of his arms and features are delineated with greater certainty than those of Erminia. The figure of Ubaldo is thus here attributed to Francesco.

The minor figures in both paintings are executed with varying degrees of competence and do not demonstrate the purposefulness of either Antonio’s Erminia or Francesco’s Ubaldo and shepherd. Even though these minor figures, particularly the nymphs in Carlo and Ubaldo, are those most ravaged by time and present problems of condition that impede a firm attribution, their facture points to anonymous workshop hands rather than to either master. Particularly telling is the figure of the middle boy in the central grouping of the Erminia, who was rendered with very thin layers of paint that is characteristic of these figures as a whole. However, he also presents the most significant pentimento in both canvases. His shirt, which originally extended up to his collarbone, has been pulled back. The revised shirt collar has been dashed in with a brio characteristic of the impasto of Antonio, and the change as a whole is an instructive example of how a master would have corrected an assistant in a workshop.

The differences between the landscapes of the two paintings also reflect the different approaches of the brothers. That of the Erminia is fairly uniform in character and is most similar to early capriccios by Francesco. As with his figures (i.e., the shepherd and Ubaldo), the brush constructs solid forms with purpose and definition, while operating within an overall painterly matrix. The same is not true of the landscape in the Carlo and Ubaldo, which is strongly reminiscent of Antonio’s backgrounds to the stories of Tobias (Venice, Angelo Raffaele). Thus, the brothers divided responsibility for the landscapes as well as the figures.

A less straightforward matter is the attribution of the flowers that appear in both paintings. Autonomous flower pieces exist that are attributed by some scholars to either Francesco or Antonio on stylistic grounds. Further evidence that such works were produced in the Guardi workshop is provided by x-radiographs of other paintings by Francesco or his followers. However, the flowers in both of the Tasso paintings present considerable differences from the autonomous Guardesque still lifes; these have usually been given to Francesco rather than to Antonio. The difference is most evident in the flowers at the lower left of the Carlo and Ubaldo. Because these flowers evince the dissolution of form, they, along with the landscape behind, should more likely be attributed to Antonio.

The National Gallery of Art’s Tasso paintings thus present the hands of both Antonio and Francesco, as well as of unspecified workshop assistants. Antonio was responsible for the flowers, the landscape at the lower left of the Carlo and Ubaldo, and the figure of Erminia, while Francesco was responsible for the landscape in the Erminia and for the figures of Ubaldo and the shepherd. Other figures and some details seem to be the product of one or more workshop assistants. Of the extant paintings from these series, the Washington paintings are the only ones that present the characteristics of collaboration. However, the most surprising feature of these two works is not only that they show collaboration in a single painting, but that the relation of the two brothers’ hands is not consistent, and it is thus impossible to say that the one master who is responsible for the cycle is either Antonio or Francesco.

This observation is difficult to reconcile with any of the current views on the operation of the Guardi workshop. In recent years the opinion that Antonio was the head of a large family workshop, which Francesco took over only after his elder brother’s work...
death in 1761, has come under attack from a variety of authors.\(^9\) Most recently it has been argued (most forcefully by Montecuccoli) that the brothers never worked in association.\(^5\) However, it is the view of the present writer that the collaboration of the two brothers (if not the existence of the workshop itself) has not yet been disproved with any certainty.\(^3\) Indeed, solid documentary evidence does demonstrate their occasional collaboration.\(^2\) Although the legal and economic details of Antonio and Francesco’s collaboration remain unknown, the National Gallery’s paintings constitute important proof that the brothers did work together. Such a collaboration does not necessarily imply that Francesco was subordinate to Antonio—indeed, it seems that the brothers worked as equal partners in this and similar large-scale decorative enterprises, while pursuing independent commissions.\(^3\)

The Tasso cycle cannot be dated precisely, except for the termini post quem provided by the publication of Albrizzi’s Tasso edition in 1745 and the shipment to London of the Tiepolo Saint James Altar in 1750.\(^3\) The figures in the National Gallery of Art’s Tasso paintings demonstrate the characteristics, such as extreme dissolution of form, similar to those in works by Antonio securely dated after 1750, like the altarpieces in Pasiano di Pordenone (1750)\(^3\) and Cerete Basso (c. 1754).\(^6\) The landscape in the Carlo and Ubaldo is also most similar to those on the organ parapet of the Angelo Raffaele, usually dated on stylistic grounds to the same period of 1750/1755.\(^7\) Unfortunately, no figure paintings by Francesco from this period are securely dated. Thus, a cautious dating of the series to the beginning of the 1750s is warranted.

**Notes**

1. The discovery of the series of Tasso paintings, of which this and the following are part, is variously recounted in the early literature (see references). Only Morassi 1960, 247; Shapley 1979, 1: 232; and a few contemporary news accounts, for example, Giornale del Mattino, 30 October 1959, mention the “Dublin dealer.” The rest report that Carritt discovered them in “the shed of an old house in Ireland.”

There is no evidence which of the Bantry residences originally housed the paintings, or when and where they were acquired. An unsubstantiated, and unlikely, rumor that the paintings were once at Versailles is variously reported in the NGA curatorial files. Watson, “Guardi and England,” 1967, 212, speculated that the earl of Bantry may have acquired the paintings as works by François Boucher (1703–1770).

2. On the centrality of this episode to the notion of the pastoral see Lee 1967, 36–57.

3. On the popularity of this episode see Lee 1967. For many other examples of the same subject see Buzzoni 1985, especially nos. 80, 82, 84, 85, 88, 91, 93, 94, 96, 102, 105, 106.

4. The soldiers are warned of the temptations of this fountain also in Canto 14: 74–75. This episode is little illustrated by seventeenth-century artists, although it was one of those illustrated by Castello in his edition: see Buzzoni 1985, 215. The best known painting of a subject from this part of the epic is Poussin’s Companions of Rinaldo (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), though Poussin chose the episode where Carlo and Ubaldo confront Armida’s dragon, rather than the temptation of the rescuers by the nymphs.

5. Ubaldo’s attribute is the golden wand with which he chased away the serpent (Canto 15: 49).

6. That the landscapes are intended in their style as well as their subject matter to incite marvel can be inferred by later comments on Francesco’s style: Haskell 1960, 256–276.


9. There are four possible sources for the National Gallery’s paintings: (1) the so-called first edition, in which each plate is separately dedicated; (2) the “second edition,” in which the dedications are replaced by the relevant stanza from the poem; (3) a set of preparatory drawings in Turin (published by Maxwell-White and Sewter 1969, 59–65, figs. 125, 127–146); (4) another set of drawings in the Hermitage, partially published in exh. cat. Venice 1964, nos. 52–59. The relationship between the drawings and the various editions has been the subject of much debate by scholars (as in note 8), and the matter cannot be settled here.

In the case of the Erminia the differences between the drawings and the published plates mainly consist of variations in the number and position of the farm animals at left. While the Turin drawing (Maxwell-White and Sewter 1969, fig. 132) follows the plate of the first edition, in the Saint Petersburg drawing (exh. cat. Venice 1964, 57) Erminia’s horse is lacking. In the second edition (Morassi 1966, fig. 4), the engraver has added a very prominent donkey at left, and Erminia’s horse raises his left rather than right leg. The artist responsible for the National Gallery painting has followed his own inclination with respect to the animals, for the work shows an entirely different configuration of them. Additionally, the boy in the farmhouse window appears in none of the drawings or prints associated with the Piazzetta enterprise.

The poses of the nymphs in the Carlo and Ubaldo demonstrate most clearly the artist’s dependence on the plates of the published first edition. In the Turin drawing (Maxwell-White and Sewter 1969, fig. 140), for example, the nymph on the right looks upward, while in the second edition there are three nymphs (Morassi 1966, fig. 7). In both the first edition and the Saint Petersburg drawing (unpublished photograph) there are only two nymphs, but the angle of the head
of the standing nymph in the National Gallery of Art's painting is closer to that of the first edition.

Thus, in both cases the National Gallery of Art's paintings depend on the illustrations to the first edition, rather than to any of the other possible sources.

10. This was noticed by Shapley 1979, 1: 232. It is significant that Piazzetta's greatest innovations did not lie in these areas of artistic endeavor.

11. Because of its orientation, it is most likely that Erminia's horse derives directly from Tiepolo's painting and not the reproductive engraving by Giandomenico: Succi, I Tiepolo, 1988, no. 73. The painting has been variously dated (most usually to Tiepolo's Spanish period, c. 1760s). However, Pérez Sánchez 1977, 75–86, published documents that convincingly dated the picture before 1750, when it was delivered to the Spanish Embassy in London.

12. The Guardis' sensitivity as interpreters of the spirit of Tasso's poetry (especially evident when compared with the sometimes clumsy execution of the Piazzetta plates) is noted especially in Buzzoni 1985, 357–360, no. 114.

13. On Antonio's career as a copyist see most recently Binon 1990 and Pedrocco and Montecuccoli 1992, especially 25–42. The Guardis' father Domenico, as Federico Montecuccoli has now shown, was also primarily active as a copyist (Pedrocco and Montecuccoli 1992, 14–24).

14. Morassi [1973], 2: fig. 84.
15. Morassi [1973], 2: fig. 81.
17. Morassi [1973], 2: fig. 86. However, Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978, 90, interpreted the subject of this painting differently as "Alphardo Shows the Arms of Sveno to Godfrey" (Canto 8: 50–56). While he acknowledges that the painting does indeed depend on the Piazzetta illustration to Canto 1, Knox made this argument primarily so that in his reconstruction of the cycle the paintings follow the order of Tasso's narrative. However, it is difficult to see this interpretation as being motivated, especially since there is no evidence for how the paintings hung. Further, there is no difference between the painting and the engraving, and Knox did not explain the presence of the angel Gabriel, who inspires Godfrey with his divine purpose in Canto 1: 11–19.

18. Morassi [1973], 2: fig. 87. It is possible that this painting is no longer in the Neville Orgel collection. According to a typescript distributed in conjunction with a focus exhibition at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (The Guardi: Tancred Baptizing the Dying Clorinda, 1988, 2), this painting is now in the Stern Collection.

According to Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978, 90–91, while this does illustrate the episode from Canto 18: 26–34, Guardi has relied on the Piazzetta illustration to Canto 13, which depicts Tancred in the enchanted wood. Knox was probably correct to believe that the two scenes were mistakenly transposed in the Albrizzi volume.

19. Morassi [1973], 2: fig. 85. Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978, 90, pointed out that of the extant paintings only one this does not depend on any of Piazzetta's illustrations.
20. Fiocco 1923, 64, no. 7.
21. In the collection of Dottore Guido Alverà, Venice, according to Fiocco 1923. According to the compiler of I Guardi 1964, 16, this work was in the collection of Beatrice Elia, Rome. The painting is conveniently reproduced in Morassi [1973], 2: 88, who saw it on the Milanese art market (Morassi [1973], 1: 90).

22. It is most significant that Fiocco 1923, 64, included the Soliman and Ismenus among the very few works he attributed to Antonio in 1923, since it was his passionate belief that Francesco was responsible for most of the Guardesque figure paintings. Fiocco probably attributed this work to Antonio on the basis of the mention of six overdoors by Antonio in the Casa Gaifami in Brescia: Chizzola and Carboni 1760, 151. This source also probably provided some of the material for the later misinterpretation that the Soliman and Ismenus was an overdoor. In any case, the evidence suggests that there was thus another, separate entire cycle of twenty paintings by the Guardi on subjects from Tasso (see below, note 27).

Another cycle of paintings deriving from the Albrizzi-Piazzetta Tasso is by Egidio dall'Olio: Bordignon-Favero 1958, 224–227.

23. However, evidence provided by two unpublished photographs probably taken in the 1920s allows one to ascribe at least approximate measurements of 180×235 cm for the Soliman and Ismenus (Aiman: Fiorentini 1781 and 1781 bis). These measurements are considerably different from the other paintings in the ex-Bantry series, which are all approximately 255 cm in height.

25. See above, note 23.

26. However, it is not at all certain that the paintings were made for a villa in the Veneto (as argued by Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978), especially given the Guardis' numerous foreign connections, and the presence of such decorative works in cities as far away as Brescia: Chizzola and Carboni 1760, 151.

27. There were thus at least three separate Tasso cycles by the Guardi: (1) the Este cycle, which included the Alvera painting (though this was by no means an overdoor); (2) the six paintings in Ca' Gaifami in Brescia mentioned in Chizzola-Carboni's guidebook in 1760 (see note 22); and (3) the eight existing ex-Bantry paintings, which should now be considered without question to stem from an entirely separate series, the original number of which is unknown, as is its original patron.

Additionally, two paintings from an unknown provenance were sold at Christie's, London, 16 May 1975 (no. 54: Rinaldo before Armida; and Erminia finds Argante Dead and Tancred Wounded, 25½×34 in. [64.8×86.4]). They can hardly be said to constitute a cycle. Unfortunately, efforts to locate the paintings or photographs of them were unsuccessful.

28. For the opinion that the paintings were disposed in a sequence roughly following the narrative see Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978, 89–95. But see above, note 17, for the view of the present writer that Knox misidentified the subject of the Pasadera painting.

29. For the Valmarana cycle see Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978, 49–88, and Buzzoni 1985, 345–355; for the other see Barcham 1992, 82.
31. The only attempt at a hypothetical reconstruction is Knox, "The Tasso Cycles," 1978, 89–95, which is not accepted here on the basis of evidence discussed in the text.
32. See References, below, for a resume of opinions.
33. Thus, Fiocco 1923, followed by Pallucchini 1960 and
1961, sustained the authorship of all figure paintings of high quality to Francesco. Muraro, "Guardi," 1960, who believed that Antonio was a jealous taskmaster over Francesco, thus assigned the Tasso cycle primarily to the elder brother. A recent resume of the controversy is provided by Pedrocchi and Montecuccoli 1992, 69–73.

The main discussions of this difficulty are by Binion 1967 and Pedrocchi and Montecuccoli 1992.


36. For these works see, respectively, the reproductions in Morassi 1974, 2: figs. 77, 70, 12–22.

37. Reproduced in Morassi [1971], 2: figs. 226, 229, 230, respectively.


39. On this cycle see Mahon 1967, 89. The present writer had the opportunity to examine these paintings on site at Bogstad Manor and agrees with Mahon’s division of hands.

40. The present writer has seen all of the extant paintings but Sofronia (Kingston-upon-Hull) and the Rinaldo and the Nymphs (present location unknown). While the Pasadena and Copenhagen canvases seem to be Antonio’s alone, the Venice painting bears all the hallmarks of Francesco’s style. The Montreal work seems to be by a workshop assistant rather than by the hand of either master. Denis Mahon has agreed with this more specific division of hands (visit to the National Gallery of Art in Spring 1992).

41. Mahon (visit to the National Gallery of Art sometime after 1967) orally suggested that the figure of the shepherd at the left of the Erminia is by Francesco. He was thus the first to reconsider the possibility that the two brothers collaborated on single canvases (in contrast to his opinion in Mahon 1967, 92, n. 78). Mahon’s opinion was followed by Pigazzi 1980, 333.

42. However, it is not possible to identify this hand with any certainty, although it has become usual to identify Nicolò as having provided some assistance to his brother. He was called “esimio pittore di camera” (Morassi [1973], i: 39–41; Pedrocchi and Montecuccoli 1992, 59–60).

43. Mahon 1967, 109, attributed the landscapes in both paintings to Antonio. He recently gave his verbal assent to the more specific attribution of the landscapes set forth here (visit to the National Gallery of Art, Spring 1992).

44. For example, the Capriccio in the Cini collection (Morassi [1973], i: no. 834; 2: fig. 763).

45. Examples of the autonomous still lifes are those in the collection of Stanley Moss, New York (formerly Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), for which see Zeri and Gardner 1973, 33–34.

An example of the tendency in recent years to deattribute these paintings is provided by the entry in La natura morta in Italia 1989, 1: 343–348. However, see the very convincing presentation of evidence (offered by both drawings and stylistic comparisons) for the attribution of these paintings to Francesco in Pilo 1983.

46. Such as NGA 1939.1.129 and 1939.1.113.

47. Although they are also considerably different in character from the prominent flowers in those figure paintings that are now usually accepted as by Francesco (see especially Pilo 1983, figs. 8, 13).


49. This was the view taken by Muraro, “Guardi,” 1960.


51. That the brothers did operate independently on some occasions does not detract from the possibility that they collaborated. This is the commonsense view espoused by Binion 1967, 105: “A more natural inference would be that the Guardi workshop was an association of equal partners, who, according to circumstances, worked separately or in collaboration.”

52. Such as the famous will of Count Giovanelli, which refers to copies made by the “brothers Guardi” (Morassi [1973], 1: 515).

53. See Francesco’s letters to Cordellina of 1750, reproduced in Morassi [1973], 1: 517.

54. See above, note 11.

55. Payment to Guardi in that year: Morassi [1973], 1: 517.


References
(attributions are for series as a whole)

1959 Frohlich-Bume: 7 (Francesco).

1959 Muraro: 252, n. 14 (as Antonio and workshop).


1960 Morassi: 247-256, figs. 5–6 (Antonio, assisted by Francesco and Nicolò).


1961 Pallucchini: 134, 140; figs. 356–357 (Francesco and Antonio).

1961 Pallucchini: 81–83, figs. 5–6 (Ideated by Antonio, but executed by Francesco).

1964 Martini: 114, 274, n. 259, fig. 262 (Antonio).

1964 Pigazzi, “Guardi”: 60 (Antonio).

1965 Heinemann: 240 (Workshop).


1965 Zampetti: 89–97, figs. 17, 21 (Antonio).

1966 Hannegan: 251 (Workshop of Antonio).

1966 Levey: 113–114, fig. 69 (Antonio). 

1966 Pigazzi: 45 (Antonio).


1972 Fredericksen and Zeri: 98 (Antonio).

Giovanni Francesco Barbieri, called Guercino
1591 – 1666

Guercino's precocious genius was recognized by the Bolognese canon Padre Antonio Mirandola, who became his earliest protector and obtained the artist's first Bolognese commission in 1613. From that period on Guercino's reputation was secure. He was patronized by the papal legate to Ferrara, Cardinal Jacopo Serra; the Bolognese cardinal Alessandro Ludovisi; and Ferdinando Gonzaga, the duke of Mantua. Between 1617 and 1621 Guercino’s religious commissions for these patrons were among the most forward-looking paintings of the decade. Bold, naturalistic figures close to the picture plane demanded response from the audience. Light flickered on the otherwise dark surface, illuminating and animating forms. Landscapes and religious pictures from this period also emphasize everyday events, an indication that the artist was influenced by the early works of Annibale Carracci (q.v.). Following the example of the Carracci, Guercino opened an academy of the nude in Cento in 1616.

In 1618, on Padre Mirandola’s recommendation, Guercino prepared a volume of anatomical drawings for beginning painters. He took this volume to Venice, where he was able to see the works of the Venetian artists whose painterly style had influenced his development through the paintings of Scarsellino and Lodovico Carracci. Guercino’s masterpiece, the 

In 1620, Guercino's religious commissions included the 

The death of Gregory XV brought an end to Guercino's Roman career and the artist returned to Cento; he remained there until 1642, when he
moved to Bologna following Guido Reni’s death. During these years Guercino’s style evolved from the exuberance of the teens into a calm, classicizing manner. Deep, saturated colors give way to a lighter tonality, and figures become more static and are set back from the picture plane. Scholars have been divided in their assessment and cause of the painter’s later style. Although Guercino would have known about the artistic theories of Monsignor Giovanni Battista Agucchi, who favored the classicizing manners of Annibale Carracci’s Roman period and of Domenichino (1581–1641), there is no indication that Guercino adhered to these theories. It seems more likely that he lightened his palette and calmed his animated style in a natural maturation process. In addition, in the late 1620s Italian taste was beginning to favor a lighter tonality in Italian paintings in general. Guercino’s works of the second half of this decade retain the dramatic early style while foreshadowing the later classicizing one. The frescoes in the cupola of the Piacenza cathedral (1626–1627) demonstrate the influences of Raphael’s balanced compositions combined with the vestiges of Guercino’s early earthy, oversized figures. By 1630, however, the artist began to emulate the ideal beauty of Guido Reni (1575–1642) and the emotional affetti of Domenichino. He so completely turned to Reni’s manner that the latter accused him of stealing his style. Many of Guercino’s mature paintings exhibit a dependence on Reni, but expunge his ethereal form for his own down-to-earth naturalism.

Guercino’s change of style did not lessen demand for his works. Among other requests, he was asked to become official painter to the courts of England (1626) and France (1629 and 1639). By the 1650s, however, his patronage became less frequent and more localized. As the artist’s health declined, his style became more flaccid and studio participation in his works increased. In spite of this, he continued painting until his death in 1666, producing some canvases of great beauty and originality.

Guercino was of a pragmatic nature. In 1629 he began an account book (Libro dei Conti), which he kept until his death. From the account book and surviving letters published by Count Carlo Cesare Malvasia, his first biographer, it is evident that the artist charged his clients by the number of figures within each painting rather than by the significance of the composition. He traveled little and was devoted to his family. After his death his nephews continued his shop and produced weak imitations of his style. Guercino’s influence was not far-reaching, probably because his style was so singular and he did not have a real school to carry it on. His paintings were widely collected, but his reputation was based primarily on his large graphic output. Collectors appreciated the immediacy and vivacity of his drawings, in which landscape and genre were treated equally with religious and mythological subjects.
The attribution of this painting to Guercino has never been questioned since its appearance on the art market in 1955. The thick application of paint in rich, saturated colors, the use of dark contrasting shadows, the repeated highlights on the hands and face, as well as the bleeding contours of the forms reveal Guercino’s painterly technique. Mahon identified the sitter as the Sienese Cardinal Francesco Cennini (Sarteano 1566–Rome 1645), pope legate at Ferrara from 1623 until 1627; he also connected the picture with one mentioned by Malvasia as having been painted in 1625. Arguments for the identification of the sitter as Cennini are convincing. The similarity of the features in Guercino’s painting with those of the portrait sculpture by Giovanni Francesco de’ Rossi (active 1640–1677) on Cennini’s memorial in San Marcello, Rome (fig. 1), suggest they depict the same man. Cennini sports the neatly trimmed goatee favored by his contemporaries, including both his benefactor Pope Paul V Borghese, who had elevated him to the cardinalate in 1621, and Pope Urban VIII Barberini, who sent Cennini to Ferrara as papal legate in 1623. The sagging but still strong facial muscles and the gray beard and hair indicate the sitter might be in his late fifties: Cennini was fifty-nine in 1625. The proximity of Guercino’s home in Cento, under the rule of Ferrara, would suggest that the artist traveled to Ferrara to complete the commission.

Although Guercino’s painting has been interpreted as the reflection of a strong, stern personality, the cardinal was portrayed by one contemporary Ferrarese chronicler as being somewhat weak and inefficient. This, however, seems to have been the only negative comment about Cennini, who in all other accounts was portrayed as an intellectual and cultivated man of high moral standards. Cennini took Holy Orders in 1591; he soon became archpriest at Chiusi and the vicar general of the diocese. After some years he went to Rome. There his talent was recognized by the Borghese; he soon became auditor to Cardinal Scipione Borghese and entered the inner circles of the family. In 1612 he became bishop of Amelia. During this period he was indispensable to the Borghese, supervising their correspondence and representing them in various affairs. On 17 July 1618 he became the apostolic nunzio in Spain at the court of Philip III, where he served with distinction. Consequently, as one of his last acts, Pope Paul V raised Cennini to the cardinalate on 11 January 1621.

With the ascension of the Bolognese Alessandro Ludovisi to the papal throne in February 1621, Cennini’s role in church affairs practically ceased due to his association with the Borghese, but it rose again after Urban VIII Barberini was elected in 1623. In fact, in the conclave that elected Urban VIII, Cennini’s name was brought forward repeatedly, but he missed rising to the papacy due to his intimacy with both the Borghese and the Spanish. Urban VIII, who on 2 October 1623 awarded Cennini the bishopric of Ferrara and on 20 November made him papal legate to Ferrara, said that he had voted for Cennini in the conclave and assumed he would be the next pope. Although the rule of Ferrara posed no difficulties for the cardinal, his great accomplishment during Urban VIII’s reign was to convince the aged and childless duke of Urbino to leave his duchy to the Holy See upon his death, thus thwarting the hopes of both the grand duke of Tuscany and the emperor. Cennini returned to Rome in 1627 where he lived until 1641, when he was transferred to the episcopal see of Sabina and then to Porto just before his death in 1645.

Among the hundreds of paintings by Guercino mentioned by Malvasia and listed in Guercino’s account book, only seven portraits are recorded. Several others have since come to light. Except for his drawn caricatures, portraiture was rare for Guercino; in fact, figures in his mythological and religious paintings seem to be recruited more from his imagination than from life. Although Guercino may have preferred more challenging compositional assignments, his portraits accurately represent the features and attitudes of his sitters, indicating his mastery of the medium. The Portrait of Cardinal Francesco Cennini fits comfortably among the painter’s other portraits and stylistically within the mid-1620s, where Malvasia dated it. The saturated colors, emphasis on the tactility of rich fabrics, and the planar disposition of the figure are aspects of Guercino’s style evident during the mid and late twenties.

Mahon has noted the difference in composition and color between the National Gallery portrait and Guercino’s portrait of Pope Gregory XV (Malibu, John Paul Getty Museum), painted in 1622, and suggested that the differences were the result of the artist’s change from a darker, freer style to one more
controlled and formal.\textsuperscript{14} While \textit{Pope Gregory XV} is painted in dark colors made darker by black shadows and portrays a man who casually interrupts his reading to regard the viewer from a three-quarter angle, \textit{Cardinal Francesco Cennini} is painted in clear tones without dark shadows and represents the sitter posed as if receiving visitors to a formal audience. The differences between the two portraits may be due not just to the artist’s general lightening of his palette and classicizing of forms, but to the requirements of his sitters. Possibly the Ludovisi preferred Guercino’s darker, more dynamic style: after all, it was in this style that the artist painted when he worked for the Ludovisi in Bologna and this style must have been the reason he was called to Rome.\textsuperscript{15} On the other hand, Cennini\textsuperscript{16} may have wished to be remembered more severely in his role of papal legate. In addition, Guercino’s dramatic style did not seem to appeal to many patrons in the 1620s. A letter of 1623 from an intermediary to a potential patron noted that Guercino painted rather darkly; the correspondent preferred Guido Reni’s work.\textsuperscript{17} Guercino himself told the writer Scannelli that he had changed his style due to the wishes of his patrons.\textsuperscript{18}

Guercino’s turn toward more classicizing compositions may have been due also to the influence of High Renaissance painting, and especially that of Raphael, which he likely studied during his two-year stay in Rome from 1621 to 1623. In the following years, in the mid-1620s, the artist painted his only tondo, in obvious imitation of Raphael, and his only oval, with a mythological theme like those known in Renaissance Rome.\textsuperscript{19} Guercino’s \textit{Venus at Her Toilet} (1622–1623), for Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi, relies on Titian’s (c. 1488–1576) painting of the \textit{Adoration of Venus} in the patron’s collection,\textsuperscript{20} and his frescoes in the Duomo at Piacenza of 1626–1627 recall High Renaissance models.\textsuperscript{21} His portraits of \textit{Pope Gregory XV} and of \textit{Cardinal Francesco Cennini} also return to the Renaissance prototypes of Raphael and Titian. \textit{Pope Gregory XV} relies on the well-known portrait type of the figure interrupted at work. As in Raphael’s \textit{Pope Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de’Medici and Luigi de’Rossi} (1518, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence), the pope is presented at a table set at an angle. Titian’s \textit{Portrait of Pope Paul III} (1543, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples) and Raphael’s \textit{Julius II} (c. 1512, National Gallery, London) represent the other type of portrait favored by popes and cardinals, with the sitter seated at an angle against a neutral background of fabric or drapery, at times with a glimpse at one side into the distance. Most seated ecclesiastical portraits, both half-length and full length, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including those of Domenichino and Guido Reni, followed these simple formulas. Guercino’s \textit{Cennini}, although part of this second group, is one of the few representations of a seated ecclesiastic who faces the viewer frontally instead of from an angle. More formalized, but no less human than the \textit{Gregory XV}, this portrait, in its frontality, directly engages the viewer with an authority that depends on the hieratic and stabilizing triangular composition unique to Guercino’s oeuvre and to baroque ecclesiastical portraiture.

\textbf{Notes}

1. Charles Beddington of the Old Master Picture Department at Christie’s checked their records and found no earlier provenance for the painting; he suggested that, as Maynard was a frequenter of the London sale rooms, he may have purchased the picture at Sotheby’s (letter of 2 January 1991 in NGA curatorial files). No reference to the painting appears in sales indexes prior to 1954.


3. Inferred from the expert opinion of Denis Mahon for David Koetser dated 18 February 1955 (NGA curatorial files).


5. Cennini was born on 21 November 1566 and died 20 October 1645. For his biography see Moroni 1840–1861, 11: 78–79; Bandini 1942, 37–50 and 93–116; and G. De Caro in \textit{DBI} 23: 569–577 (with full bibliography).

6. Letter to David Koetser cited in note 3 above. Mal-
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vasia 1841, 2:261: "Fece il ritratto del Car. d Cennini Legato di Ferrara."

7. See Zucker 1967, fig. 3.
8. See the portraits of these popes by Gian Lorenzo Bernini, reproduced in Wittkower 1965, pls. 8 and 36–39.

In Spain Cennini exhibited his diplomatic skills by trying to maintain peace between the Holy See and Spain and prevent war in Italy. In this capacity he maneuvered the cardinalate for the duke of Lerma and the “grandato di Spagna” for the pope’s nephew Marcantonio Borghese.

10. Besides Cennini’s portrait, Guercino is recorded as having painted Cardinal Bernardino Spada, Galleria Spada, Rome (Salerno 1988, 226, no. 132, repro.; recorded by Malvasia 1841, 2: 163 and in the Libro dei Conti for 31 May 1633); Francesco I d’Este and Maria Farnese, duke and duchess of Modena, lost but known through copies (Salerno 1988, 240–241, nos. 149–150, repro.; recorded by Malvasia 1841, 2: 263 and in the Libro dei Conti for 20 January 1644); Cardinal Donghi, lost (recorded in the Libro dei Conti for 24 February 1644 and 10 May 1644); Lorenzo Dondini’s brother, lost (recorded in the Libro dei Conti as having been retouched 7 January 1631); and Ercole Aldrovandi, lost (noted by Malvasia 1841, 2:265 as a gift to the Aldrovandi family in 1642).

11. These include a miniature portrait of Giulio Gaggliardi, signed and dated on the reverse 1617, Uffizi, Florence; the portrait of Gregory XV, c. 1622–1623, J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu; and the portrait of a lawyer, probably Francesco Righetti, datable to c. 1626–1628, Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth (Salerno 1988, 112, no. 29; 173, no. 91; 212–213, no. 120 bis, all repro.). The portrait of an old man or philosopher (Pinacoteca Estense, Modena; Salerno 1988, 406, no. 348, repro.) has been dated by Mahon c. 1623–1624 (Mahon 1991, 174, no. 59, repro.). A portrait of Fra’ Bonaventura Bisi appeared at Sotheby’s, London, 9 December 1992, lot 44, color repro. There are two examples of a so-called self-portrait (Richard L. Feigen & Co., New York: Mahon 1991, 180, no. 62, repro., and Paris, Louvre: Salerno 1988, fig. 2) that appear to be copies of a lost original of c. 1630.

In addition to these portraits of humans, Guercino painted at least two animal portraits for Count Filippo Aldrovandi. The portrait of a dog once in Palazzo Aldrovandi is now in the Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena, and can be dated c. 1625 (Salerno 1988, 186, no. 104, repro.). In 1631 Guercino painted a lost portrait of the horse “Bel ladonna,” which had been given to Pope Gregory XV by the emperor on account of its great beauty and was subsequently purchased by Aldrovandi (Malvasia 1841, 2: 262; Libro dei Conti for 24 April 1631).

12. These include, for example, the Semitamis, c. 1624, Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; the Portrait of a Dog, c. 1625, Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena; and the Holy Family and Saint John the Baptist and an Angel, 1624, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland (Salerno 1988, 184, no. 102; 186, no. 104; and 182, no. 100, all repro.).
13. See, for example, the Semitamis, c. 1624, Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; the Portrait of a Dog, c. 1625, Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena; and the Holy Family and Saint John the Baptist and an Angel, 1624, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland (Salerno 1988, 184, no. 102; 186, no. 104; and 182, no. 100, all repro.).
14. Mahon 1981, pl. 2. See Denis Mahon in exh. cat. Bologna 1986; and Mahon 1991, no. 64 (Italian ed.); no. 37 (German ed.); and no. 29 (English ed.).
15. Guercino painted the following works for Alessandro Ludovisi in Bologna: Let and his Daughters, Monastery of San Lorenzo, El Escorial; Return of the Prodigal Son, Galleria Sabauda, Turin; Susanna and the Elders, Prado, Madrid; and Saint Peter Resuscitates Tabitha, Palazzo Pitti, Florence (Malvasia 1841, 2: 258; Salerno 1988, 114–115, nos. 32–33, and 124, no. 45, all repro.).
16. Cennini may have known Guercino through his benefactors the Borghese. In 1622 Guercino had painted the ceiling of the church of San Crisogono, Rome, for Cardinal Scipione Borghese (now Lancaster House, London; Salerno 1988, 169, no. 86, repro.).
17. Published by Franklin 1991, 448.
19. The tondo is the Holy Family with Saint John the Baptist and an Angel, 1624, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland; the oval is the Venus, Mars, Cupid, and Time, c. 1624–1626, National Trust, Dunham Massey, Cheshire (Salerno 1988, 182, no. 100; and 191, no. 109, both repro.). Both were probably painted for the Lancellotti.
20. Goethe Academy, Renaissance, California; Salerno 1988, 177, no. 93, repro.
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1986.17.1

Ammon and Tamar

1649–1650

Oil on canvas, 133 × 158.5 (48 1/2 × 62 1/2)

Patrons’ Permanent Fund

Technical Notes: The support is a heavily and coarsely woven twill fabric. The ground is dark and thick with large white particles; its fine pebbly surface shows through the thinly applied paint layer. X-radiographs reveal a large dense area of ground extending in a triangular shape from the upper-right corner; on the left it extends down to the level of Ammon’s shoulders. It bears no relation to the composition. The paint appears to be more thinly and spontaneously applied than in the pendant. No artist’s changes have been detected.

The tacking margins have been opened and incorporated into the present picture surface. There is a large tear at the right of Ammon’s head and another between Tamar’s right shoulder and Ammon’s left elbow. Scattered losses have been retouched throughout. Extensive abrasion is located in the background drapery, at the bottom of Ammon’s blue drapery, and in the flesh tones. The sinking-in of the green background curtain has altered the contrast with the
foreground figures. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored by Michael Swicklik in 1986.

Provenance: Commissioned by Aurelio Zaneletti [or Zanoletti] of Reggio in 1649.\(^1\) (Samuel Woodburn, 1820–1823).\(^2\) Charles Stewart, 3d marquess of Londonderry [1778–1854], London, by 1833;\(^3\) by descent to Alexander Charles Robert Vane-Tempest-Stewart, 9th marquess [b. 1937], Wynyard Park.\(^4\)


1986.17.2

Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife

1649
Oil on canvas, 123.2 x 158 (48 3/4 x 62 1/4)
Patrons’ Permanent Fund

Technical Notes: The support is a coarsely and heavily woven twill fabric. The ground is dark and thick with large white particles; its fine pebbly surface shows through the thin paint layer, which was broadly and quickly applied. X-radiographs reveal slight changes in the sheets around the woman’s legs.

The tacking margins have been opened and incorporated into the present picture surface. Scattered paint losses have been inpainted throughout. Extensive abrasion is located in the background drapery, in the blue coat, and in the flesh tones. The paint used for the background has altered, changing the contrast between background and foreground. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored by Michael Swicklik in 1986.

Provenance: same as 1986.17.1


The subjects and style of the present paintings accord with those produced by Guercino for Aurelio Zaneletti, a collector from Reggio Emilia, in 1649–1650. On 10 March 1649 the artist’s account book records a down payment of twenty-two scudi by Zaneletti for a “quadro con due mezze figure.”\(^5\) On 25 August of the same year Guercino recorded that he had received the final payment from Zaneletti of 150 scudi for the finished painting of a “fuga di Gioseppa.”\(^6\) It appears that the Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife was already finished before 2 August 1649 when Guercino mentioned it in a letter.\(^7\) An entry in the account book of 26 March 1650 records another payment of 150 scudi from Zaneletti for a painting of Amnon and Tamar.\(^8\)

Between the dates of the two entries concerning paintings for Zaneletti appears another entry of 28 January 1650 for an Amnon and Tamar for Girolamo Bavoso (or Bavosi). Included in the entry on Bavoso is also the payment for a picture of Apollo and Daphne.\(^9\) According to Malvasia, Guercino had painted both the Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife and the Amnon and Tamar for Zaneletti, but the latter was sold to Bavoso, who sent it to Venice along with the painting of Apollo and Daphne.\(^10\) Following Malvasia, scholars have assumed that the National Gallery Ammon was the second one of this subject made for Zaneletti to replace the one taken by Bavoso. In support of this supposition, there is the indication in Guercino’s entry for Zaneletti’s final payment that the artist was at work not just on the Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife but also on an Amnon and Tamar. Guercino had mistakenly called the picture the “fuga di Gioseppa e tamar,” in spite of the fact that the down payment of 10 March 1649 was for a single painting of two half-figures.\(^11\) In addition, the nearly identical sizes, the placement of the similarly proportioned three-quarter-length figures against corresponding backgrounds, and the analogous compositions and colors of the two paintings in the National Gallery leave little doubt that these pictures were conceived from the beginning as a pair.

The issue of the three paintings executed so closely in time is compounded by the recent appearance on the art market of an Amnon and Tamar considered by some to be the painting sold to Bavoso.\(^12\) However, the lack of concern for the structure of the pillows behind the figures and their vapid expressions suggest that this painting is by a hand other than Guercino’s. In addition, the careless definition of the drapery, which follows fold for fold the National Gallery Amnon and Tamar, and the misunderstood shadows, which lie on the surface, imply that this
Guercino, Amnon and Tamar, 1986.17.1
Guercino, Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife, 1986.17.2
canvas succeeds rather than precedes the Washington painting. Like the copy of *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife* in the Ringling Museum, Sarasota, this Amnon could easily have issued from Guercino’s shop. The popularity of the images would have spawned imitations for the market. Consequently, the Bavoso version should still be considered lost.¹³

As Guercino noted in his account book, the iconographic source for these paintings is the Old Testament. The often depicted story of Joseph and Potiphar’s wife is related in Genesis 39–40. Joseph became a slave in the household of the Egyptian Potiphar, one of Pharaoh’s officers. As a trusted servant he became head of the staff and oversaw Potiphar’s properties. His beauty, however, attracted Potiphar’s wife, who day after day begged him to lie with her. On one such day, as depicted in this painting (Genesis 39: 11–12), she grabbed his cloak as he fled from her. Her false accusations of his attempted seduction caused Potiphar to cast Joseph into prison, where his adventures continued, eventually bringing him fortune and success. The much rarer subject of the pendant is told in 2 Kings 13. Amnon was in love with and desired his half-sister Tamar. With the help of a friend, Amnon invented a ruse to lure Tamar to his bed. Telling his father, King David, that he was ill, he asked only for his sister Tamar to minister to him. She came to him and prepared him a meal, but he refused to eat with anyone else in the house. When they were alone he asked her to lie with him. After her refusal he raped her, and then despoiled her as much as he had loved her and drove her away; it is this portion of the story that is depicted in Guercino’s painting (2 Kings 13: 15–16, 18). Tamar, feeling the rejection as more serious than the rape, wore ashes and hid in the house of her brother Absalom, who, in revenge, subsequently had Amnon killed for his perfidious act.

Guercino was one of many artists to illustrate the subject of Joseph and Potiphar’s wife, which was represented often in Italian painting in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. His portrayal of the rarely depicted story of Amnon and Tamar, however, was unusual.¹⁴ In the late 1620s Guercino himself had already made several drawings of Joseph’s story, but although his account book notes a painting executed for the duke of Modena in 1631, of which a workshop copy may represent the composition, no painting by Guercino’s hand of the subject survives from that period.¹⁵ An earlier version by the artist, probably from the late 1620s, of the unusual subject of Amnon and Tamar, now in the Galleria Estense, Modena, does survive.¹⁶ Yet, in no other instance in his oeuvre or in that of any other artist of the seventeenth century is the combination of these subjects known, although the contrasts of seduction/rejection, love/hate, and virtue/vice make them a natural match. As Artioli and Monducci observed, the first painting (Joseph) suggests the reward for chastity victorious, whereas the second (Tamar) represents the ruin brought on by chastity defeated.¹⁷ Eighteenth-century painters and patrons seem to have appreciated the duality and contrasts of these subjects. The Roman Francesco Trevisani (1656–1746) included them in a set of four Old Testament subjects, perhaps influenced by Guercino’s example.¹⁸ An Amnon and Tamar by Sebastiano Ricci and a Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife by Luca Giordano (q.v.) were paired in an eighteenth-century Venetian collection.²⁰

The comparison and contrast of the two couples near the beds heighten the underlying iconographic connection between the paintings. If *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife* were placed at left, as seems plausible visually, the woman begins the movement across the two canvases, which continues in a zigzag pattern until Tamar closes the action at the right in the Amnon and Tamar. The violent energy of Joseph as he pulls away from his assailant is reiterated in the activity of Amnon’s drapery as he thrusts his sister from the room. The contrast of the virtuous and vicious is also apparent. Potiphar’s wife’s naked pose is open and shameless as she pulls the cloak from the modestly clad Joseph, while the violent gesture of the nude Amnon contrasts with Tamar’s attempt at modesty and her quiet sign of recrimination against him. Stone has remarked on the more static classical poses of these two figures and their divergence from the extreme motion evoked by the other struggling couple.²¹ Tamar harks back to statues of the Venus Pudica, whereas Amnon recalls the Apollo Belvedere.²² The elaborate coiffure of Potiphar’s wife, often associated with images of Venus at her toilet in preparation for receiving Mars, contrasts with the loose flowing hair of Tamar, a style identified with images of chaste female saints, especially those of the repentant Mary Magdalene. Although some of the colors have suffered damage, it is apparent too that the blues of Joseph’s and Amnon’s robes and the roses of the pillows at left and of Tamar’s drapery at
right were meant as connecting links between the pictures. An early study, in reverse, for the *Amnon and Tamar*, also in the National Gallery of Art (fig. 1), suggests that Guercino once considered the action of the paintings to move from right to left and for the violent movement to occur in the *Amnon and Tamar*.

Stylistically, the paintings correspond to those by Guercino of the 1640s. The clear colors bathed in an overall light and the thinly applied paint that creates a crispness of drapery folds and precision of contours occur in other documented works of these years.

When choosing the composition of *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife*, Guercino kept close to the text, as had previous artists. His half-length figures correspond to those in a painting by Giovanni Battista Caracciolo (c. 1570–1637) (Art Market) of c. 1630 and to his own earlier composition for the duke of Modena, probably that known through the drawings and a painted copy mentioned above. Guercino broke with his previous depictions in which both participants are clothed. He portrayed Potiphar’s wife in a more direct manner in which, although she tugs at Joseph’s drapery, her nudity is the focus of her action. It is possible that this representation of the woman, conflated with that of Tamar, influenced a work by Mattia Preti (1613–1699) (formerly Colnaghi, London), in which the almost completely un clothed woman covers her breasts while grasping at the robe of the fleeing Joseph.

Guercino’s *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife* must have been more popular than the *Amnon and Tamar* to judge from the number of copies recorded, and, certainly, the artist Sir Thomas Lawrence expressed his own appreciation, preferring it to its companion. The few surviving copies appear to have issued from Guercino’s shop; copies recorded in nineteenth-century sources have not been identified.

Notes
1. See discussion in text.
2. That the dealer Samuel Woodburn purchased the painting and its companion in Italy and transported them to England is suggested by a series of letters from his good friend Sir Thomas Lawrence, published in Williams 1831; this reference was provided by Burton Fredericksen of the Getty Provenance Index (letter of 8 February 1988, NGA curatorial files). On 29 June 1820, Lawrence asked Samuel Woodburn, then on the Continent, probably in Italy, “What will you sell the Potiphar’s Wife for, unaccompanied by the other picture? Suppose you were to make up your mind to this, Lord D. likes the other best. There’s a good chance of your selling the Potiphar’s Wife to the M…” (Williams 1831, 2: 280). Writing to Woodburn in Rome on 17 December 1822, Lawrence records the arrival at Calais of “the Guercinos” (Williams 1831, 2: 281). In letters to Woodburn in Paris of early 1823 and of 8 March 1823, Lawrence says how much he likes “the Guercinos,” especially the *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife* (Williams 1831, 2: 294, 413). “The M” may be Lawrence’s good friend and patron, Charles Stewart, who,
however, succeeded to the marquesate of Londonderry only in 1822. Although Stewart owned the paintings by 1833 (see note 3), there is no record that he purchased them from Woodburn.

3. Passavant 1836, 178, mentions the paintings in the Londonderry collection, misidentifying the Amnon and Tamar as "Tarquin and Lucretia."


5. This payment is one of the last recorded in the account book by Guercino’s brother Paolo Antonio before his death. The book was begun in 1629 and kept until the artist’s death: "Dal Sig. Aurelio Zaneletti si è ricevuto doble sei d’Italia p[er] il quadro della fuga di Giuseppe e tamar [sic]. Fano. Scudi 150." This is one of the first entries in Guercino’s hand after his brother’s death. See also Malvasia 1841, 2:330. Denis Mahon (1991, 318) suggested that the mistaken addition of Tamar was due to Guercino’s inexperience in handling the account book. He stated that the mistake in recording 150 scudi instead of 120 scudi may have been due to the transfer of 30 scudi as a down payment for the Amnon and Tamar. The addition of “tamar” in the title would indicate that Guercino was already at work or about to work on the pendant.

6. Libro dei Conti: "Dal Sig. Aurelio Zaneletti da Reggio si è ricevuto ducatoni Z lire 600 p[er] il quadro della fuga di Giuseppe e tamar [sic]. Fano. Scudi 150." This letter is published in Mahon 1968, 188. The painting for Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife was transferred to the Cassa di Risparmio, Cesena, portrays the encounter when Amnon has told his servants to leave, seen in the right background exiting the room, and makes his first advances toward Tamar as she serves him his food: Neumann 1967, 192–193, no. 45, repro. A painting by Alessandro Tiarini in the Cassa di Risparmio, Cesena, portrays the encounter during the rape: Mazza 1991, 147–149, no. 23, repro. This half-length painting of the 1620s may well have been known to Zaneletti. Another painting of the subject in Atlanta is probably Venetian, mid-seventeenth century: Zafran 1984, 58–59, repro.

13. Artioli and Monducci 1982, 108, suggested that the first painting bought by Bavoso cost less than the second (143 scudi in comparison with 150 scudi) because the second was more highly finished. Perhaps the lesser price was a discount since Bavoso had taken the more expensive Apollo and Daphne (lost), originally made for Antonio Barberini (but not delivered due to the war), off his hands.

14. For a partial list of these subjects in Italian art see Pigler 1974, 1: 80–81 and 157. The story of Amnon and Tamar was represented by Lorenzo Lotto as an intersis design among many other stories at Santa Maria Maggiore, Bergamo: Chiodi 1962, pls. 26–27. A painting attributed to Lucio Massari (1569–1633) (but which from the photograph appears to be no earlier than mid-seventeenth century) represents a more unusual episode, that is, at the moment when Amnon has told his servants to leave, seen in the right background exiting the room, and makes his first advances toward Tamar as she serves him his food: Neumann 1967, 192–193, no. 45, repro. A painting by Pietro Parisi is that of Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife, in the Galleria Nazionale, Parma. See also Malvasia 1988, 334, no. 263, and Stone, Catalogo, 1991, 255, no. 247.
chasing away the woman rather than attempting his own escape. Stone identified the Joseph and Potiphar's Wife of the Estense inventories (see note 11 above) with the composition of the painting on the art market, Florence. Both works are reproduced in Stone, Master Draftsman, 1991, figs. 29a and 29d.

17. Pigler 1974, 1: 157, cited a pairing of these subjects in two drawings by Carlo Cignani in the nineteenth-century collection of Pagnoni Dijonval. However, only the Joseph and Potiphar's Wife is titled of the "deux dessins" in the collection; see Bénard 1810, 36, no. 642. There is a painting of Joseph and Potiphar's Wife by Cignani in Copenhagen; its full-length composition suggests no influence of Guercino's painting of the same subject.

18. Artioli and Monducci 1982, 108. Whether the paintings can be read as "literary" (intertextual) meditations on the nature of violent sexual passion," as suggested by Willette 1989, 97-98, is open to question. Guercino noted that the stories were based on the "Sacred Scriptures," and since we know nothing about the patron's literary interests we cannot extend the interpretation of the scriptures by means of contemporary Italian literature. Alter 1991, 114-117 and 164-168, explained the natural connection between the subjects.

19. The other subjects are Susanna and the Elders and Bathsheba at her bath. Like the stories of Joseph and Potiphar's Wife and Amnon and Tamar, these subjects also suggest the contrasts of virtue and vice, the ruin brought on by the loss of chastity, as well as the punishment for those who reject chastity. Trevisani's paintings of 1709 were commissioned by the Graf von Schönborn and are still at Schloß Weissenstein, Pommersfelden. The full-length figurative compositions recall the types of Guercino: DiFederico 1977, nos. 46-49, pls. 38-41.

20. The collection of Alessandro and Zuanne Duodo, inventoried on 8 March 1728: Moretti 1978, 115. Without the sizes of the paintings one cannot be sure whether the works were painted as a pair, whether the Ricci was painted to complement the Giordano, or whether the collectors later put them together.


22. For comparisons see Bober and Rubinstein 1986, nos. 18 and 28. The aquiline features and elegantly slim torso of Amnon seen in profile suggest that Guercino was thinking of the Apollo Belvedere. Stone, Master Draftsman, 1991, 74-75, remarked on the Venus Pudica pose.


24. See, for instance, the newly emerged Phrygian Sibyl with a Putto of 1647, in a private collection, England: Guercino Drawings in Great Britain, 52-53, no. 24, repro. See also The Marriage of the Virgin of 1649, in the Cassa di Risparmio, Fano (Salerno 1988, 330, no. 298), or the Saint Margaret of Cortona of 1648 in the Pinacoteca Vaticana (Salerno 1988, no. 253), and, especially the Cleopatra, Gallerie d'arte del Comune (Palazzo Rosso), Genoa (Salerno 1988, no. 252).


26. Previous representations of the subject varied as to whether Potiphar's wife was shown clothed or nude. Lanfranco's painting in the Galleria Borghese portrays the nude woman pulling at the clothed Joseph: Bernini 1982, pl. 25. A painting by Simone Cantarini (q.v.) with half-length figures, in Dresden, probably dates to the 1630s: Manigotti 1975, 156, fig. 92. Cantarini portrayed the protagonists clothed, and may well have been influenced by Guercino's lost painting for the duke of Modena (see above, note 12).

27. Photograph in NGA curatorial files. The painting has been dated c. 1655-1661. Several of Pretti's works of the 1650s show Guercino's influence. His biographer De' Domencini 1742, 3: 318, called him a disciple of Guercino. Although he did not study with Guercino he probably made a trip to northern Italy in the 1640s, where he came under Guercino's influence.


Several copies of Joseph and Potiphar's Wife are known or recorded: John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota (SN 124). Oil on canvas, 120.8 x 161.5 cm: Tomory 1976, 171, no. 192, repro. In the Sir J. E. Johnson-Ferguson Collection, England, in 1927 (Witt Photo Library; Denis Mahon in Tomory). Exhibited in Berlin, 1925, from Collection of Richard Sutterheim, 138 x 168 cm (Witt Photo Library).

A Joseph and Potiphar's Wife by Guercino is mentioned repeatedly in England during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; any number of these may refer to either of the above. Sale of a Gentleman at Walsh, Clayton, London, 18 April 1777: Graves 1918-1921, 1: 384. The painting sold in the Meredith sale of 1783 to Sir Joshua Reynolds was subsequently sold at Christie's, London, on 12 March 1794 to Edward Coxe, then to Caleb Whitefood on 23 April 1807, then to Norton on 5 May 1810: Graves 1918-1921, 1: 385; Redford 1888, 1: 53-54, 99, 108; Letter from Burton Fredericksen of 8 January 1988 (NGA curatorial files). A painting or paintings of the same subject were exhibited at the British Institution in 1828 by Mrs. Phipps and again in 1841 by George Vivian: Graves 1813-1815, 1: 456. In the 1860s a copy was in the Schloß at Sagen: Parthey 1863-1864, 1: 65. Prior to 1758, Nicholas Cochin saw a Joseph and Potiphar's Wife--"demifigures de grandeur naturelle"--in the studio of the painter/dealer Ignazio Hugford (Ackford): Voyage d'Italie (Paris, 1758), 2: 85. In 1711 a Guercino Joseph and Potiphar's Wife was listed in the postmortem inventory of Luis de la Cerda, Duque de Medinaceli, former ambassador to the Holy See and viceroy of Naples: Lleó Cañal 1989, 111, 113.

29. In a letter of 8 March 1823: "I must in a former letter have informed you how much I like the Guercinos, particularly the Joseph and Potiphar. The artist has fairly turned the tables on poor Joseph, and left him almost without excuse, or exceedingly elevated his virtue. I acknowledge that Rembrandt leaves him a free agent. It was possible, very possible, to have resisted Mrs. Potiphar of the mill [i.e., of Rembrandt], but not of Cento" (Williams 1831, 2: 294). However, in an earlier letter, Lawrence noted that if the paintings were sold separately, a "Lord D." might have bought (what we assume was) the Amnon and Tamar because he preferred it to the Joseph and Potiphar's Wife (Williams 1831, 2: 280). See note 2 for the circumstances of this correspondence.
Pietro Longhi
1702 – 1785

PIETRO LONGHI was born in Venice, the son of Alessandro Falca, a silversmith. He studied drawing and modeling with his father, and for his initial training as a painter he was apprenticed to Antonio Balestra (1666–1740) until the end of 1718. In the 1720s and 1730s Longhi received a number of public commissions for large-scale religious pictures in Venice, which remain mostly untraced. An altarpiece of 1732 in the parish church of San Pellegrino reveals the strong influence of Balestra.

Longhi’s frescoes completed in 1734 depicting the Fall of the Giants above the principal staircase in the Sagredo, Venice, reveal his limited talent for history painting on a large scale. He never seriously essayed traditional subject painting thereafter, and his production shifted dramatically toward genre paintings of contemporary life. His earliest identifiable genre works consist of pastoral motifs and peasant interiors on small canvases that appear to date from the mid-1730s. In their handling, subject matter, and naturalistic detail these works owe a debt to north Italian and Bolognese lowlife and rustic painting, particularly the work of Giuseppe Maria Crespi (q.v.), in whose studio Longhi is said to have studied, although the date of a visit to Bologna and activities there are not documented. Whether he actually studied with Crespi is doubtful.

Longhi’s development as a painter in the 1730s remains unclear, but a concert scene dated 1741 in the Galleria dell’Accademia, Venice, shows his inventive approach to genre painting already fully developed. In his Abecedario pittorico of 1753, Pietro Orlandi lauded Longhi’s “new and individual style of painting conversation pieces, games, ridotti, masquerades, parlors, all on a small scale and with such veracity and color that at a glance it was easy to recognize the places and people portrayed.” For such paintings he adopted the simple format of a shallow, windowless stage, and he restricted his compositions to relatively few figures in restrained poses. His soft, delicate brushwork is reminiscent of Jacopo Amigoni (1682–1752), and his palette reveals the influence of the pastels of Rosalba Carriera (1675–1757).

In addition to his Venetian contemporaries and the realists of Bergamo, Brescia, and Bologna, several other sources influenced Longhi’s development. First noted by Mariette in the eighteenth century, Longhi’s rapport with contemporary French painting has long been observed, and engravings of and after Lancret (1690–1743), Mercier (1689–1760), Pater (1695–1736), de Troy (1679–1752), and Watteau (1684–1721) are cited among the models for his genre style. Other writers have sought sources for his art in seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish painting, which was to be seen in Venice at the period. Contemporary references to Longhi as the creator of “speaking caricatures” has led inevitably to the comparison of his genre paintings with the graphic work of Hogarth (1697–1764), readily available in Venetian print shops by 1740, although Longhi’s conversation pieces lacked the same satirical intention.

Longhi’s great pictorial sensibility, delicate sense of humor, and selective and careful depictions of contemporary Venetian life brought him immediate success. In 1750 he was praised in a eulogistic sonnet by the playwright Carlo Goldoni (1707–1793) for “his brush which seeks the truth.” However, his work has none of the bite of Goldoni’s realistic comedies, with which it is often described as a visual parallel, and he appeared content to reflect faithfully the paternalis-
tic element in Venetian aristocratic society. Longhi’s felicitous rendering of Venetian patrician society, and he is recorded as working for the Emo, Grimani, Pisani, Querini, Rezzonico, and Sagredo families. A clue to the contemporary reception of his work is given by a Venetian journalist, Gaspare Gozzi, who admired Longhi because “he portrays in his canvases what he sees with his own eyes,” in contrast to the history painters who paint “figures dressed in ancient fashion and characters of fancy.”

Between 1740 and the mid-1750s Longhi’s iconographic repertory focused primarily on conversation pieces; thereafter he widened his practice to include out-of-doors subjects like hunting parties and portraits. The outstanding works of Longhi’s career are seven paintings of the sacraments made in the early 1750s for the Querini family (Galleria Querini Stampalia, Venice). Longhi occasionally painted more than one version of his own compositions, but more often his works were duplicated by pupils and followers. He developed his compositions with painstaking care, and he produced numerous drawings for the figures and other details in his paintings.

In 1737 Longhi was elected to the Frangia, the Venetian guild of painters, in which he remained active until 1773. He was a founding member of the local academy of painters in 1756, instructor for its life classes until 1780, and a director from 1763 to 1766 of a private academy founded by the Pisani family. Longhi’s son, Alessandro (1733–1813), was also a painter and is best known for his portraits. Longhi died on 8 May 1785 in the house in the quarter of San Rocco where he had lived since 1740.
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1939.1.63 (174)

The Faint

C. 1744
Oil on canvas, 50 × 61.7 (19 3/8 × 24 1/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a fine, plain-weave fabric. A light-yellow ground of average thickness covers the entire support. X-radiographs show a finely striated ground and a brush-applied ground. The painting was applied in thin layers blended wet-into-wet in short, finely textured strokes. There is no significant impasto, but the paint has a slightly lower, stiffer structure in the highlights, which are formed by small strokes of slightly upraised paint. A thin, semitransparent brown glaze was employed to define the contours of the hands and the fingers, as well as the details of the features. Infrared reflectography and x-radiography revealed no underdrawing or artist’s changes.

The tacking margins have been removed, but prominent cusping is evident along all but the bottom edge. The varnish, although only slightly discolored, has altered the picture’s tonal relationships along the bottom edge and throughout the composition. The canvas was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto about 1932. The inpainting was adjusted by Mario Restivo in 1955.

Provenance: Prince Alberto Giovanelli, Venice, until c. 1930. (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome); purchased 1931 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York. ²


1939.1.64 (175)

The Game of the Cooking Pot

C. 1744
Oil on canvas, 49.9 × 61.7 (19 3/8 × 24 1/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a fine, plain-weave fabric. A buff-colored ground containing lead white appears to have been applied with a brush. The composition was evidently drawn on the ground before painting; a single line, at the base of the wall beside the curtained doorway, is visible under infrared reflectography. A red-brown imprimatura was scumbled over the areas to be covered by the background, leaving reserve areas for the figures. The paint layer was applied quickly overall, blending at the overlapping edges. The paint application was relatively thin with
Pietro Longhi, *The Faint*, 1939.1.63
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Pietro Longhi, *The Game of the Cooking Pot*, 1939.1.64
The painting sequence began with the tablecloth and floor, proceeded to the woman in the center and then the surrounding figures, and finally to the wallcovering, which was scumbled over the warm underlayer. Several changes in the composition are visible through infrared reflectography. The index finger of the central woman’s left hand originally pointed to the blindfolded youth at the right, and her female companion also coyly indicated him with her right hand. Several adjustments were made in the angle of the stick carried by the youth. The figure of a woman in the doorway at right was covered by the green curtain. Microscopic examination reveals that this figure, who wears a russet skirt and appears to lift her petticoats and creep up stealthily behind the man, was brought to a high degree of completion before being painted out by the artist. This figure is presently visible to the naked eye beneath the curtain because of an increase in the transparency of paint over time.

The painting was relined by Stephen Pichetto in 1932. The tacking margins have been removed, but strong cuspings along all edges indicates that the painting has retained its original dimensions. Discoloration of the surface coatings has obscured the original paint surface. Minor losses occur throughout, the most prominent of which is in the neck of the woman in pale yellow. The canvas was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto about 1932. The inpainting was adjusted by Mario Modestini in 1955.

Provenance: Same as 1939.1.63.


The Faint and The Game of the Cooking Pot are fine examples of the “small pictures of everyday life such as conversations and entertainments; . . . scenes of love and jealousy” that Longhi created for a distinguished circle of patrician families in eighteenth-century Venice. The paintings reveal the exquisite color harmonies and delicate handling of the brush common to his works around 1744–1745, and share with them a similar dramatic content and means of presentation. The setting of each is a shallow, windowless stage, evidently the salone of a well-to-do Venetian household, which Longhi has observed with a particularly sharp eye. The room in which The Faint is set probably records an actual contemporary interior with its silk damask wallcovering and rococo mantelpiece with fluted and carved moldings, putto, mirror, and vase that Longhi had used a few years earlier in a painting in the Louvre.

As in most of Longhi’s conversation pieces, in the National Gallery’s pictures it is difficult to define exactly what the artist is saying, if anything. Despite numerous attempts at interpretation, no consensus has been reached about their meaning. Even the titles that would have been given at the time they were painted are uncertain. The central figure in each is a woman, around whom the other protagonists in the domestic drama are defined. What role these figures play, and how they relate to the respective subjects of each painting is unclear. The Faint depicts a woman receiving the attention of her companions after fainting while playing cards. Although she is given smelling salts and a pillow, her half-opened, upturned eyes have suggested to some scholars that her illness is feigned, and the painting has often been titled the “simulated faint.” Especially unclear is the role of the man in the peruke dressed as a nobleman who advances toward the intimate gathering: for some, he is the cause of the lady’s fainting spell; for others, he is an unwelcome intruder. Moreover, it is uncertain whether such details as the overturned chinoseire gaming table, playing cards and markers spilled on the floor, and the gentleman’s tricorn hat and lady’s wrap upon the settee held explicit meanings that would have been obvious in eighteenth-century Venice but are lost upon modern observers.

The setting of the companion painting is also a well-appointed contemporary domestic interior in which several fashionably dressed figures participate in a game of pentola, or cooking pot. In this game a blindfolded youth attempts to strike and break an overturned earthenware pot and win the prize underneath. Like the interrupted game of cards in The Faint, the parlor game depicted here is also the occasion for an intimate social gathering, as the table set with ring-biscuits (Venetian bugzol) and wine suggests. The identity of the participants and their social class is uncertain. The seated youth in a green dressing gown, for example, appears to be a Venetian lady’s escort comparable to a figure in a painting of 1745, The Visit, in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. But whether he is a cavaliere servente, providing the lady company, performing small chores, and accompanying her on outings, or a cicisbeo, more strictly a lover, is ambiguous. And there remains the identity of the other figures and their relationship to one another. The significance of the landscape above the table, painted in the manner of Marco Ricci (q.v.)
The first scholar to analyze the content of the National Gallery's paintings was Roberto Longhi, who identified *The Faint* as a scene from Goldoni's *La Finta ammalata* (1751), in which Rosaura, whose condition is described by the title, is surrounded by her friend Beatrice, her suitor Lelio, a young doctor, and her father Pantalone. The painting, however, was created several years before the first performance of Goldoni's play, and it appears more probable that Goldoni, who loved paintings by Longhi and his follower Andrea Pastò, derived inspiration from the painter.\textsuperscript{10}

Pignatti observed in Longhi's career a tendency toward the production of "serial works," several paintings in a series illustrating a single, general theme. Among these thematic groupings, which include peasant life, the education of noble young ladies, hunting scenes, and the seven sacraments, the Washington pictures appear to belong to a series illustrating "family life" and fall into a hypothetical group of works from the early 1740s, which includes the *Married Couple's Breakfast* and *Blindman's Buff* (Royal Collection, Windsor Castle), and the *Wet Nurse* and *Doctor's Visit* (Ca' Rezzonico, Venice).\textsuperscript{11}

This context does not clarify the essential ambiguity of the paintings nor does it provide an interpretation of the precise content of Longhi's subject matter. The mysterious relationship between the figures and the ambiguity of their actions remain as elusive as ever.\textsuperscript{12} Spike, noting that the relation between the boudoir scene and game of blindman's buff in the pair at Windsor is a kind of statement about the playful wiles of lovemaking, suggested that the same association exists between the present pair.\textsuperscript{13} If the paintings are about love, and they appear to be, as the presence of the statue of a cupid on the mantel suggests, the scene of fainting could also allude to the theme of the doctor's visit, or the sick lady, common in Dutch seventeenth-century painting, where the patient is always a young woman apparently suffering from lovesickness, erotic melancholy, or pregnancy.\textsuperscript{14} By contrast, here Longhi is reticent and ambiguous in his treatment of the theme of the sick lady, if indeed that was what he depicted.\textsuperscript{15}

In spite of the difficulty of Longhi's chronology—few paintings are dated or datable, and after about 1740 his style did not change significantly—the National Gallery's paintings can be dated convincingly to about 1744. They relate closely to the exceptionally fine pair of paintings, *Married Couple's Breakfast* and *Blind Man's Buff*, at Windsor, signed and dated 1744.\textsuperscript{16} These are among the artist's earliest extant examples of a faintly *galant* theme in a patrician setting, and together with the Washington pair belong to the artist's first efforts in a mode that for all practical purposes he invented and that brought him considerable contemporary fame. The National Gallery's paintings share with the pair at Windsor a similar careful brushwork; a palette of soft pastel shades of pink, green, yellow; and delicately drawn, diminutive figures. Like the Windsor paintings, *The Faint* and *The Game of the Cooking Pot* frequently have been singled out for their outstanding quality and praised as among the finest of Longhi's genre paintings.\textsuperscript{17}

A pair of replicas of the National Gallery's paintings, said to be autograph and of a later date, and with which they have been frequently confused in the literature, are in the Palazzo Leoni Montanari, Vicenza.\textsuperscript{18}

A studio version of *The Faint* was sold from the collection of Mrs. George Dexter, Boston, at Sotheby Parke-Bernet, New York, 13 March 1957, no. 56.

\textbf{Notes}

1. According to a typed note from the Kress Records, NGA curatorial files.
2. According to a typed note from the Kress Records, NGA curatorial files, and Shapley 1979, i: 268.
4. Pignatti 1969, 83, pl. 44.
5. The suggestion that the lady is "artfully fainting at a game of chance" was first advanced in exh. cat. New York 1938, no. 23.
7. For a detail, see Mariuz, Pavanello, and Romanelli 1993, fig. 4.
8. Alleau 1964, s.v. "casse-pot."
10. Bacchelli and Longhi 1953, 128. Sohn 1982, 258, has pointed out the peculiarities of the interpretation and the fact that the painting predates the first performance of Goldoni's play by nearly a decade.
11. Pignatti 1969, 22, pls. 57, 62, 64, 66. His suggestion that Longhi's predilection for painting thematically related series derived from the fashion created by Hogarth's print cycles, several of which were published before Longhi's conversion to genre subjects and available in Venice in the form of engravings, has been questioned by Paulson 1975, 108. For
the latter, the differences in intention between the two artists are considerable, and he suggested a more reasonable approach to Longhi’s works as variations on a theme that are more likely to have been inspired in conception by Giuseppe Maria Crespi’s series of the Life of the Female Singer.


13. Spike 1986, 197. William L. Barcham (letter 27 September 1993, NGA curatorial files) has observed the correspondences between the two works in size and in the number and disposition of the figures: a seated, fainting, and “undressed” female corresponding to one that is standing, alert, and fully dressed. Two figures attend to the heroine in each instance; a young male protects her in one painting, and in the other, he attempts to break the pot (a fairly obvious allusion); two older men watch, comment, and participate, but from the sides; moreover, in one scene the gathering has been spoiled, overturned, but in the other is just about to start (the table is untouched). Although uncertain how to interpret these contrasts precisely in terms of an amorous theme, Barcham has suggested that Longhi clearly intended “reference to some kind of theme, before and after, or negative versus positive.”


15. Longhi treated explicitly the subject of the sick lady in a painting in the Ca’ Rezzonico, Venice, in which the pose and gesture of the central figure corresponds to the woman in The Faint (Pignatti 1969, 91, pl. 66; Sohm 1982, 269).


17. Frankfurter 1938, 24: “His two delightful genre scenes from the Kress Collection have often been referred to as the high point of his entire output. So far are they superior to the average picture attributed to him that they seem to be the work of some super-Longhi who had a special affinity with Chardin, though they probably are no more than the master in an entirely autograph phase.”

18. Sgarbi 1982, 22, 25, nos. 4, 5, repro.; Pignatti 1969, 85, pls. 211, 212, as c. 1760. The paintings were acquired in the nineteenth century by Giuseppe Salom in the Palazzo Corner Spinelli, Venice, and shown for many years in the Villa Mansi di Segromigno, near Lucca; in 1981 the group was purchased at auction by the Banca Cattolica del Veneto.
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Alessandro Magnasco
1667 – 1749

Alessandro Magnasco was born in Genoa to the moderately successful painter Stefano (c. 1635–c. 1672). After his father died, Alessandro was sent to Milan to learn commerce. Instead, Alessandro induced his Milanese patron to cover the expenses of an apprenticeship with the esteemed painter Filippo Abbiati (1640–1715), probably around 1680. By the 1690s Magnasco had completed his training and established himself as a portrait painter.

By 1695, the date of his first signed work, Meeting of Quakers, Magnasco was painting scenes from contemporary life. His subjects and lively, almost burlesque, figures set in lush landscapes, lavish or spare interiors, or classical ruins, owe much to the prints of Jacques Callot (1592–1635) and Stefano Della Bella (1610–1664), especially those with picaresque themes. Magnasco began creating scenes that defy easy classification as either history paintings or genre.

Magnasco also collaborated with painters of landscapes and ruins, as indicated by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century inventories that include his works and specify joint attributions. Throughout his career in Milan and Florence (1690s–c. 1735) Magnasco worked with the landscapist Giovanni Francesco Peruzzini (1650/1655–1720/1725), from Ancona, as well as Crescenzio Onofri (1632–1698) and Marco Ricci (q.v.), among others. He also collaborated with Clemente Spera (late seventeenth century–c. 1730), a specialist in architectural ruins.

Magnasco’s artistic formation seems to depend on Lombard traditions, particularly those exemplified by his teacher, Abbiati. Alessandro also appears to have assimilated the compositional and coloristic idiosyncrasies of Valerio Castello (1624–1659) and Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione (1609–1664). The means by which Magnasco actually came to know their works is contested. Although Magnasco maintained contact with Genoa, there is no firm evidence that he traveled there prior to his return around 1735. Whatever the case, Lissandrino (as Magnasco was known) quickly adopted a more summary, *alla prima* technique in which he built up colors using washes and glazes, as well as his signature scumbling, impasto, and bravura brushwork. Magnasco’s first biographer, Pellegrino Antonio Orlandi, writing in 1719, praised the artist not only for his inventive subjects, but also for his ability to suggest a monumentality with small-scale figures, executed with a quick, assured “touch.” He exploited this “pittura di tocco” to brilliant effect, enlivening his already dynamic and torsioned figures with bold contrasts of light and shadow.

Magnasco received important commissions in Milan from Giovanni Francesco Arese (who owned at least twenty-two of Magnasco’s paintings) and other prominent families. The Milanese enjoyed his unusual subjects, which highlighted contemporary social concerns. Included among these were scenes of catechism, monastic life, ceremonies of Jewish and Protestant sects, brigands or beggars, the treatment of prisoners, and rituals of witches and devils.

In the first decade of the eighteenth century Magnasco moved to Florence, where he established close ties with Grand Prince Ferdinando and his court, from whom he received many commissions, including the *Hunting Scene* (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford). When Magnasco returned to Milan around 1709, his success continued with requests from the Austrian governor Gerolamo di Colloredo (r. 1719–1725) for a series of paintings concerning religious life among the Catholics and Jews.

Returning to Genoa around 1735, however, Magnasco found that the concerns of cultivated Milanese aristocrats and the Florentine court, those who sympathized with the religious reformers and novelists, were not shared by patrons in his native city. During the last decade and a half of his life (1735–1749), Magnasco’s style—which, according to Ratti, was condemned as “worthless” and “ridiculous”—and subject matter were not well received in Genoa. Nonetheless, Magnasco continued to paint (perhaps for Lombard clients) until an advanced age and conversed with students and amateurs even when he was no longer able to wield his brushes. Although Magnasco had collaborators and assistants, there were few real students who carried on his stylistic or iconographic innovations after his death. Among the artists identified as followers of Magnasco are Ciccio Napoletano and Coppa Milanese, about whom little is known.
1943.4.27 (528)

The Baptism of Christ

c. 1740
Oil on canvas, 117.5 x 146.7 (46 1/4 x 57 3/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. It was prepared with a grayish white ground, over which was applied a reddish brown imprimatura. A thin layer of dark brown paint was used to lay in the lower landscape, and then the figures and other elements were roughed in over it using unblended strokes of white paint. After the figures were completed, thick swaths of paint were applied with random strokes in the landscape area. Finally, impastoed highlights and details were added. The reddish brown imprimatura shows through in the sky and landscape, where it serves as a middle tone.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but cusp is present along all four edges. There are losses and abrasion throughout. The yellowed varnish is generally thick but thinner in lighter passages. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1940. Most recently, discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored by Mario Modestini in 1960.


1943.4.31 (532)

Christ at the Sea of Galilee

c. 1740
Oil on canvas, 118.1 x 146.7 (46 1/2 x 57 3/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. It was prepared with a grayish white ground, over which was applied a reddish brown imprimatura. A thin layer of dark brown paint was used to lay in the lower landscape, and the figures and other elements were roughed in over it using unblended strokes of lead white paint. After the figures were completed, thick swaths of paint were applied with random strokes in the landscape area. Finally, impastoed highlights and details were added. The reddish brown imprimatura shows through in the sky and landscape, where it serves as a middle tone.

There are significant losses and abrasion throughout. The largest loss is to the right of Christ, encompassing most of his left side and all of his arm. The yellowed varnish is generally thick but thinner in lighter passages. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1940. Most recently, discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored by Mario Modestini in 1960.

These paintings have been identified as pendants since at least the 1920s, when the Baptism was exhibited in Paris. The attributions have similarly been unchallenged, and Suida catalogued the paintings in the Kress collection, dating them to about 1730. Although Geiger initially accepted Suida’s dating, he later moved the pair to Magnasco’s last Genoese period, between 1735 and 1749. Geiger also suggested, without documentary evidence, that Magnasco, known principally for his figures, also painted the seascapes. Most recently, Franchini Guelfi has dated the pair to around 1740; furthermore, she has accepted Geiger’s attribution of both the figures and the seascapes to Magnasco.9

Results of a recent examination of the paintings, however, challenge Geiger’s theory about Magnasco’s role in executing all parts of the compositions. Both paintings have severe abrasion, and Christ at the Sea of Galilee has suffered additional damage through paint loss. Thus, the landscapes, so admired for their boldness and verve, must be reevaluated in light of the extensive inpainting that now diminishes the quality of the original brushwork. In addition, the handling of the figures and the landscapes in both pictures is not, as had previously been stated, identical. In the Baptism, the figures show a greater understanding of anatomy than those in Christ at the Sea of Galilee. In the latter, the figures are completely engulfed by billowing draperies that are created
with long, fluid and unmodulated strokes more akin to Magnasco’s bozzetti than to his finished works.10 Superficially, the landscapes share many similar features: broken, leafy trees that curve inward, framing the figures and the bodies of water; mountainous passages in the center of the painting; and undulating waves that break violently on the shores and embankments. But these elements are generally more accurately and subtly rendered in the Baptism than in its companion.11

The perceived differences in the treatment of individual elements relate to a much larger issue concerning the attribution of these or any landscapes to Magnasco. According to the eighteenth-century biographer Carlo Giuseppe Ratti, Magnasco was known throughout his career as a figure painter; landscapes and other backgrounds were done by collaborators, including Perugini (Peruzzini) and Clemente Spera.12 Further, Magnasco is known to have provided quickly rendered figures, macchiette, for many painters—either painted or drawn—some of which he sent to artists in other cities (such as Carlo Antonio Tavella [1668–1738] in Genoa). In fact, there are only a handful of paintings in which the landscapes can be attributed to Magnasco alone, as in the Trattenimento in un giardino d’Albaro (Palazzo Bianco, Genoa), for example.13 As a document of the Saluzzo family, their entourage, and the landscape around their villa, however, the picture is distinct from the clearly imaginary backgrounds found in most of Magnasco’s narrative paintings.

In his monograph on Magnasco, Geiger rejected Ratti’s definition of the artist as a figure painter and credited him with the late landscapes.14 According to Geiger, the tempestuous waters of these paintings could only have resulted from Magnasco’s return to the Ligurian coast where he had been born.15 The accuracy of this somewhat romantic notion has never been examined critically, and the National Gallery’s pictures have been accepted as Magnasco, without assistants or collaborators, by Franchini Guelfi. In fact, Franchini Guelfi has pointed to the Baptism and Christ at the Sea of Galilee as quintessential examples of Magnasco’s late style, which she characterized as the highest accomplishment of decorative landscape16 and as the pinnacle of pictorial freedom.17 Based on the lessons he learned during four decades of collaboration with Peruzzini and others, she contends, Magnasco developed his own, much more summary manner of landscape painting. Franchini Guelfi describes this style as a “’genericness’ that borders on abstraction.”18

Despite these contentions, no compelling new evidence supports the attribution of the seascapes to Magnasco. Magnasco’s known drawings comprise primarily studies for figural poses and groupings, and it is difficult to imagine how Magnasco integrated them into complete landscape compositions. Moreover, no pure landscape drawings have ever been attributed to him. Ratti explained that Magnasco’s figural drawings (macchiette) were executed as quickly as his paintings, with a few touches of chalk and soot (filiggine).19 Several preliminary sketches of this type have been identified for the figures in the present paintings. In a study for Saint John the Baptist and Christ (private collection), the poses of the two figures kneeling on rocks are established, but their expressions are left indeterminate. Another study for the same two figures (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; fig. 1) provides more details for the age, dress, and emotional responses of the two protagonists.20 For Christ at the Sea of Galilee, there is at

Fig. 1. Alessandro Magnasco, Baptism of Christ, c. 1740, drawing, Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, Inv. 38188
Alessandro Magnasco, *The Baptism of Christ*, 1943.4.27
Alessandro Magnasco, *Christ at the Sea of Galilee, 1943-4-31*
least one preliminary drawing (Ashmolean, Oxford), in which the figures of Christ and Saint Peter are reversed and placed much closer to each other. Here Magnasco also indicates, summarily, the boat containing the apostles and the waves that break against the shore. In both cases, the drawings could easily have served as maquettes for the finished paintings, but they argue against Magnasco’s hand in any of the preliminary studies that have as yet been identified as by Magnasco.

The authorship of the seascapes is further complicated by unresolved issues of the routes through which the landscape styles of Salvator Rosa (1615–1673), Antonio Tempesta (1555–1630), and the Roman school passed to Magnasco and his contemporaries. Florence undoubtedly played a central role in that transmission, since Magnasco and the Ricci were all there in the first decade of the eighteenth century. Of the possible sources that could have been imitated or assimilated by Magnasco, Geiger, Biavati, and Franchini Guelfi point to Pietro Mulier (c. 1637–1701) or Peruzzini. The Tempest (private collection), Saint Anthony Preaching to the Fish (private collection), Saint Augustine Encountering the Christ Child on the Beach (Palazzo Bianco, Genoa), and the Galley Slaves Embarking from the Port of Genoa (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Bordeaux) all share common elements of composition and treatment with those in the National Gallery paintings. The similarities include rocks, bundles, and anchors in the foreground, as well as the general pattern of waves, especially those breaking against the rocky coast.

Mahoney challenges the assumption of Magnasco’s use of apparently “real” landscapes, as, for example, in the Hartford Hunting Scene, the background of which he attributes to another artist, possibly Marco Ricci. That Magnasco’s backgrounds were painted by one or more collaborators, as in the case of the Rocky Landscape with Monks (now private collection), executed by four artists in Florence around 1706–1707, should not diminish the integrity of the work. Furthermore, such collaborations were commonplace, even prized, during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Before it is possible to reevaluate Magnasco’s personal contribution to the history of landscape painting in general and to the National Gallery seascapes in particular, we need to understand his working methods and the role that his collaborators, students, and/or shop played in the production of paintings, especially the late works. At this time, while there may not be clinching evidence to dismiss the traditional dating and attribution of Christ on the Sea of Galilee and The Baptism of Christ, there is nonetheless sufficient cause to reassess them.

The subjects derive from well-known passages in the New Testament: the Baptism comes from John 1:32–33; and Christ at the Sea of Galilee comes from John 21:1–8. Magnasco, though, appears to conflate the narration in John with the story of Christ and Saint Peter walking on the water found in Matthew 14:22–33. Whereas John describes Christ standing on the shore and includes the miraculous draught of fishes, as in the National Gallery’s painting, Matthew details the raging sea and Peter’s apprehension about walking on the water. John records the event as one of Christ’s appearances to the apostles after the Resurrection; hence, if John is the only source for Magnasco’s narrative, it must represent a vision.

Many interpretations of Magnasco’s personality and his oeuvre have been put forward during this century, fostered by the exhibitions and studies of Geiger. Geiger expanded the limited view of Magnasco—as simply a good artisan who painted low subjects—to encompass larger social realities: the Inquisition and the transformations within and outside the Catholic church, cabal and romance, and the wars of Spanish succession.

Geiger’s readings countered earlier suggestions that the landscapes of the Baptism and Christ at the Sea of Galilee lend a cynical or pessimistic note to the biblical narratives. Evans stated that the agitated waters reflect Magnasco’s “disillusionment with the church” and that Peter’s belief in Christ is challenged by the “turbulent corporeal matter of this world.” This romanticized view of Magnasco seems antithetical to current revisionist readings of the artist and his enlightened patrons. In recent decades, Franchini Guelfi has attempted to provide the intellectual and artistic underpinnings for Magnasco’s unique style. Whereas the landscape and architectural backgrounds painted by Magnasco’s collaborators tend toward the decorative or the capriccio, she argues, his subjects are most often serious histories or social commentary. In this way Franchini Guelfi sees Magnasco as a painter of the pre-Enlightenment (and not a proto-Romantic).
While Franchini Guelfi has not yet extended her alternative reading of subjects related to issues of church reform or social commentary to more traditional biblical subjects, it is clear that she believes Magnasco’s critique of the church, however satirical, derives from an innate optimism, and not a resignation. Since we do not know the clients for whom these pendants were intended, nor do we have direct information regarding Magnasco’s personal theology, questions of precise meaning, like those of date and attribution, must remain open.

Notes

1. According to a note on the back of a photograph, NGA photographic archives.
5. Geiger 1949, 153.
6. According to Geiger 1949, 152–153. Only the Baptism was exhibited; Christ on the Sea of Galilee was supposedly then in the Contini collection, Rome.
7. NGA 1941, 119, nos. 528 and 532.
8. Geiger 1945, 88, accepted Suida’s dates uncritically; Geiger 1949, 152–153, stated that the paintings must belong to the artist’s latest period.
9. Franchini Guelfi 1977, 132–134, first dated the National Gallery pendants around 1740–1745, but has since (1991, 24) revised her opinion as explained in the text. In both cases she insisted on the high quality and the pictorial freedom that she found in the landscapes as indications of Magnasco’s authorship.
10. Comparisons can be made with the Bacchanal and Vagrants in a Landscape in the John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota, both oil on paper laid down on panel: Tomory 1976, cats. 52, 53, fig. 53. Perhaps an even more relevant comparison is Christ Saving Saint Peter from the Waves, formerly New York, Heimann Collection, now in the Seattle Art Museum: Geiger 1949, 122, pl. 233, who also mentioned an identical painting in the Ponziano Loverini collection, Bergamo.
11. X-radiographs and examination under ultraviolet light and with the stereomicroscope provide much information about their current condition and the amount of original paint that remains. As noted in the technical examination above, Julie Caverne detected a change in brush between various parts of the background in Christ at the Sea of Galilee. She also mentioned that the figures are painted with “random” strokes while the background is more blended. Whereas these observations do not preclude the possibility that the same artist (Magnasco?) switched brushes as he moved from one area of the composition to the next, they do allow for speculation concerning collaboration.
12. Ratti and Soprani 1769, 2: 155–162, especially 157, 158–159. It should be mentioned, however, that Ratti does not provide detailed information regarding Magnasco’s workshop methods, particularly after the artist’s return to Genoa. Neither does Ratti provide specific titles or the subjects of paintings that were produced during the final Genoese period. This lacuna, coupled with the lack of securely dated works, renders the years from 1711 to 1749 a contested field.
14. Previous, the landscapes with raging seas tended to be attributed to Pietro Mulier (Il Tempesta), or to Sebastiano Ricci (Geiger 1949, 42).
20. The most complete entry on this well-known drawing can be found in Grigoriva and Kantor-Goukouska 1984, no. 59, repro. A variant (Francesco Puccio Prefumo collection, Genoa) of the Hermitage’s drawing, executed in pen and ink with wash, was published by Morassi 1949, no. 119, fig. 133.
21. Both of these studies are reproduced in Franchini Guelfi 1977, figs. 150, 152, respectively. She also related (p. 137) the Ashmolean drawing to a similar study by Paolo Gerolamo Piola (Gabinetto dei disegni e delle stampe del Comune, Palazzo Rosso, Genoa). See also Parker 1972, 2: 514, no. 1023, fig. CCX.
25. The most exceptional of the versions of the subject is that in the Palazzo Bianco, Genoa: Marcellaro 1969, 344–345, with references to other versions.
26. Franchini Guelfi 1991, 102–103, repro. In this case, Franchini Guelfi insisted that the background of the Embarkation and its pendant, The Arrival and Interrogation of the Prisoners, are entirely by the hand of Magnasco. The seascape in the Embarkation, which she dates to 1745 (that is, close to Christ at the Sea of Galilee and The Baptism of Christ), is strikingly different in execution from that in either of the National Gallery’s paintings.
27. Michael Mahoney in Cadogan 1991, 171–172. Could this, he queried, be an example of the artificial tensions in Magnasco’s paintings identified already by Magalotti in 1703 (letter to Orazio Felice Della Seta): “...il vero di esse [the figures] serve a fare spiccar meggiomente il niente vero del paese e dell’aria”? (Excerpts from the letter are reprinted in Franchini Guelfi 1991, 5. It was published in full by Gregori 1964, 28.) Mahoney’s argument accommodates the traditional interpretation of the landscape and interior backgrounds of Magnasco’s paintings as scenicographic frames to the action.
28. For, as in a theatrical production, the designers of sets, lights, and costumes contribute to the overall effect. Franchini Guelfi 1977, 78, fig. 65. The reverse of the picture is inscribed: “Il Paese dei Bianchi di Livorno/ Le figure di Alessandro Bagnaschi [sic] di Genova/ Le Erbe Salvatiche di Niccola Wan Oubrachen/ L’Acqua e i Sassi di Marco Ricci Veneziano.”
29. One of the recurrent problems in the literature is that attributions and opinions continue to be made on the basis of photographs, which obscure details and handling and camouflage the state of conservation. Another is that, unlike his paintings for Florentine and Milanese patrons, no one has yet discovered documentation in letters, biographies, account books, or legal contracts that specify the extent of Magnasco's direct contribution to the late Genoese works. Despite Biavati's own warning (1976, 41), she herself had to rely on photographs in cases where the comparative works she discussed were in distant or closed collections.


31. These opinions were first expressed by Evans 1947, 42. See also the comments by Mark Zucker in his typescript entry for the Baptism and Christ at the Sea of Galilee of 4 January 1967 (NGA curatorial files).

32. Franchini Guelfi contended that Magnasco invented his own subject matter, which falls between a chronicle of modern life and the more established conventions of genre painting. See, most recently, the discussion in Franchini Guelfi 1991, 25-35, and her catalogue entries in Gavazza and Rotondi Terminiello 1992, especially 214-218.

Franchini Guelfi's larger enterprise concerns the reconstruction of the social and cultural milieu in which Magnasco's pictures were created. See the more extended discussion in the entry regarding The Choristers.
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The Choristers

c. 1740/1745
Oil on canvas, 68 x 54.5 (26 3/4 x 21 1/2)
Gift of Emily Floyd Gardiner

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. It was prepared with a white ground of medium thickness and a rust brown imprimatura, which is visible under the thin glazes of the background. The paint layers range from thin washes and scumbles in the background to thick impasto in the white highlights, especially those along the edges of the musical manuscript. The paint was applied without much medium and has a dry appearance, especially in the white highlights. It has a more fluid consistency in the dark shadows. The figures were created with several thin paint layers, over which a network of dabs of thicker paint was applied. X-radiographs reveal that reserves were left for the figures and the chairs, and that small changes were made in the figures. The collar and right hand of the second choirmaster were slightly altered, as were the leg and foot of the figure at far right, whose mouth was changed from open to closed.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but slight cusping is present around all sides. Abrasion and extensive losses, corresponding to the weave of the original support, are present in the paint layer throughout. The losses have been inpainted, especially in the background and around the figures. The varnish is slightly yellowed. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Russell Quandt in 1965.

Provenance: John Rolfe, who brought it to America from England before 1825, by descent to Emily Floyd Gardiner.

The attribution of The Choristers to Magnasco has not been disputed. The quality of the paint handling, the surety of touch, and the evidence of pentimenti in the composition all point to Magnasco's authorship.

The subject of The Choristers seems self-evident: a musical party in which four singers and two choirmasters gather around a large manuscript to rehearse. Several features, however, require further explanation. First, the two choirmasters, who are dressed according to contemporary practices as "maestri di cappella," are identical in features and in costume. Second, the "choir" combines three lay singers and a single cleric, who is seated at the table before the lectern. Third, the setting merges sacred and secular activities as well as indoor and outdoor space. Many of these features can be understood, if not explained, by relating the painting to others by Magnasco that concern monastic life and music-making.

There are six men, three of whom are laymen actively engaged in singing, while the maestro beats time with a rolled paper (music?). Another maestro, dressed identically to the conductor and bearing identical features, peers over the music, but does not seem to participate. Two of the men have parallel types in the Organist and His Pupils (formerly Sambon Collection, Paris): the cleric at the table and the lay singer immediately behind him. A fourth layman, also turbaned, sits opposite the singers and apparently watches their rehearsal, since he cannot see the music from his vantage. The curved wood furnishings in the room are also very similar to those in the Organist, though the table supporting the mu-
sic lectern is lower in the National Gallery’s picture. A violoncello sits unused in the left foreground of The Choristers in a position that recalls the invitations made to the spectator to participate in the music-making common since Caravaggio’s genre scenes in the early seventeenth century.

The setting of the painting suggests a music room that opens out onto an arced portico. Magnasco incorporated similar arcades in several other paintings, especially those representing monastic or liturgical interiors, such as the Novitiate Brothers in the Monastery’s Library (private collection, Venice). Although the arcades in The Choristers do conform to a style typical of Milanese ecclesiastical architecture, the abbreviated view of the foreground architecture makes it difficult to determine whether the building is a secular dwelling or monastery. Moreover, the combination of lay and clerical musicians precludes easy interpretation. It is rather by comparison with Magnasco’s other concert scenes, all dated late in his career (c. 1740–1745), that one comes to accept this setting as most likely a church or monastery. These include the Concerto di monache (private collection), the Parlatorio delle monache (Brass collection, Venice), and La cioccolata (private collection).

The association of The Choristers with the Parlatorio and La cioccolata may be more significant, as they share not only settings and props, but also nearly the same dimensions. The slight differences in dimensions between these two paintings and The Choristers are negligible and may be explained by the fact that the tacking margins were cut down when the latter was relined. Franchini Guelfi recently, and convincingly, proposed that the Parlatorio and La cioccolata were pendants. To this series should now be added the National Gallery’s painting. Although the protagonists of La cioccolata and the Parlatorio are nuns, Magnasco probably intended to contrast life in convents with that in monasteries. In addition, the furnishings in all the paintings are similar: curved wooden chairs, stools, and tables. Most telling, however, is the violoncello, which Magnasco isolated in the right foreground of La cioccolata and showed leaning against a stool in the left foreground of The Choristers. The mirror image is further emphasized by the position of the seated, angled figures: the nun sipping chocolate in the former and the lay musician listening to the singing in the latter.

Franchini Guelfi proposed that the paintings in this series embody part of a larger commentary on the monastic orders. On the one hand, Magnasco painted countless fraterie in which the piety, “poverty, prayer, and penance,” as well as the manual labors of religious orders, especially the Capuchin monks and the Franciscan sisters, are celebrated. On the other hand, he portrayed the excesses of the convents and monasteries in which the members lived extravagantly and immodestly. The Parlatorio and La cioccolata belong to the latter category. In the first, the nuns interact excitedly with the clerics and lay visitors to the cloister, exchanging letters, pleasantries, and idle conversation. In La cioccolata, an elegantly dressed nun sits in an elaborate and expensively decorated chamber while another adjusts her wimple and two servants make her bed. The action and the figures in The Choristers are less easily categorized. Although Magnasco combines lay singers—in dressing gowns and without wigs—and clerics, it is not immediately apparent what they are singing and why they are grouped together.

The music manuscript on the lectern is of a size and type that suggest it was intended for liturgical ceremony, where the singers read their parts from a single copy. Since Magnasco deliberately obscured the text and the notation, however, it is not easy to discern what they are singing. Whereas the large strings used to mark and hold open the leaves of the manuscript resemble those found in psalters and choirbooks, monastic and lay choirs rarely performed together as they do here. Furthermore, the singers appear to be very animated, almost indecorously so. They are singing full-voiced from a manuscript that seems to have a single vocal line, which might indicate plain chant sung in unison, and not declamatory or operatic singing.

At the time that Magnasco was in Milan (between the 168os and 1735), an important reform of liturgical music took place: the polyphonic music that was popular at the beginning of the seventeenth century ceded to a more expressive style with fewer voices and a simplified musical line over a continuo. The presence of the violoncello, a continuo instrument, in The Choristers might allude to contemporary musical practice, though no one here accompanies the singers.

Any reading of The Choristers is limited by problems of identifying figures and the artist’s intentions. Thus far Franchini Guelfi has provided the most convincing and useful interpretation of Magnasco’s genre pictures as a response to contempo-
rary social and religious concerns. She contends that Magnasco invented his own subject matter, which falls between a chronicle of modern life and the more established conventions of genre, for a learned and sympathetic clientele. These patrons, particularly the Arese, Gerolamo di Colloredo (who commissioned a Synagogue, Refectory of Capuchin Monks, Capuchins in Their Library, and Catechism, all Stiftsgalerie, Seitenstetten), and their circle in Milan, were very learned, though antiacademic, in their taste. Like Magnasco, they, too, supported ecclesiastical and social change and were especially attuned to the satire and cultural commentary that the Genoese painter brought to the medium, as they were currently reading, writing, and translating reformist texts. The Milanese in particular appreciated Magnasco’s irony, morality, and his own special form of realism, which were always under the control of a “severe judgment,” one that undercut the outward preciousity of their decorative settings and bravura style.

Notes
1. According to a memorandum from H. Lester Cooke to Charles Parkhurst 3 April 1972, NGA curatorial files.
3. See, for example, Pietro Paolini’s Concerto in the Louvre, where the conductor uses a rolled sheet of music to beat time.
4. Reproduced in Geiger 1949, pl. 160; Pospisil 1944, no. 102, lists this painting in the collection of “Dott Ing. B, Paris.” Similar observations regarding these correspondences were made by Shapley 1979, 1: 295–296. She also correctly pointed out that the man seated at the table is not playing an organ. Franca Trinchieri Canizz suggested that he may be keeping time by tapping on the wooden surface (oral communication, August 1992).
5. This painting is not included as part of the series of pendants discussed below for reason of its dimensions (48 × 28 cm), which diverge too much from the other paintings.
8. The Parlatorio measures 72 × 56 cm, and La cioccolata 73 × 57 cm.
9. Franchini Guelfi 1991, 98, nos. 41 a, b. Here she also links the Parlatorio to the Concerto di monache (Franchini Guelfi 1991, 35, fig. 14) (private collection), which though of a horizontal format, shares an identical fountain and many of the same figures. Due to its horizontal format, the Concerto is not included in the series. It may also be possible that the latter painting was made differently to conform to a specific architectural space. As in the other two paintings, Magnasco includes a violoncello in the Concerto, though in this case it is being played by a nun.
10. See below.
12. Beyond Franchini Guelfi’s insightful comments, much can be learned from contemporary descriptions of the behavior of the nuns. In 1758 Grosley wrote that during concerts of sacred music “les religieuses toutes gentilles donnes, alloient et venoient à deux grilles qui séparent l’autel, y faisoient la conversation et y distribuaient des re-frâchissemens à des chevaliers et à des abbés qui tous, l’éventail à la main, étoient en cercle à l’une et à l’autre grille...” Grosley, Nouveaux mémoires sur l’Italie et les Italiens (London, 1764), vol. 3, as quoted in Molmenti 1926–1928, 3: 276.
13. When Magnasco portrayed the bad examples, he typically generalized the religious order of the monks or nuns portrayed. Obviously, even in the enlightened and critical circles for which his paintings must have been intended, Magnasco sidestepped the thorny issue of condemning specific monastic or conventual orders. Franchini Guelfi 1991, 98, suggested that Magnasco invented the nuns’ habits in La cioccolata, the Parlatorio, Concerto di monache, and Monache che fanno musica e ricamano (Geiger 1949, pl. 425). See also Franchini Guelfi 1977, 250, n. 76, in which she provided bibliography on the monastic orders.
14. Although it is difficult to read the music, a single melodic line is all that seems to be indicated. The lectern compares well with those shown in prints by Jan Sadeler the Elder (1550–1600), such as David Playing the Harp Before Saul, an etching and engraving after Joos van Winghe (1594–1603). Reproduced in exh. cat. New York 1993, 14, cat. 30. The musical manuscript in this example is clearly marked as a four-part motet.
15. Much of this information depends on conversations with Franca Trinchieri Caniz in August 1992. I was further assisted by my colleagues Beth Bullard and Blake Wilson at Dickinson College.
16. For information concerning the musical arts in Milan, see the article by Mariangela Donà in The New Grove Dictionary 1980, 12: 290–300. It is worth noting that Milan was the center for the production of violins and violoncelli in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
17. It should be noted that there is another version of the Catechism in a private collection (reproduced by Fausta Franchini Guelfi in Gavazza and Rotondi Terminelli 1992, 216, cat. 117), which bears the same approximate dimensions (70 × 57 cm) as the three pendants linked in this entry. There are some problems related to the date (c. 1730), the figural scale vis-à-vis the architectural space, and the lack of references to music, especially the violoncello. At the same time this painting, as other versions of the Catechism, provides clues regarding the identity of some of the figures in The Choristers. For example, the type identified here as the maestro di cappella, seen twice in the National Gallery’s picture, appears no less than three times in Catechism, in each case with a differently colored cloak. Three clerics dressed in black and with caps similar to that belonging to the seated singer.
in *The Choristers* also instruct the children in their catechism. The cleric standing in the pulpit in the middle-ground of the *Catechism* bears the most striking facial resemblance. Finally, the layman in the far left foreground shares many similarities in dress and facial type with the lay singer at far left in *The Choristers*. Could Magnasco have intended for these types to be recognized from painting to painting?

Though she did not make the parallel to the other monastic series under discussion here, Franchini Guelfi did relate the *Catechism* to Magnasco’s other themes of church reform, and most emphatically to the schools of Christian doctrine of the lower classes. Many of the writers and/or patrons on the subject from Carlo Borromeo to Ludovico Antonio Muratori (whose works were published by Geronimo di Colloredo, one of Magnasco’s most important patrons) were Milanese. The mix of the lay and clergy in both paintings might illuminate a larger issue in Magnasco’s militant Catholicism. Still, much remains to be explained. For the bibliography of reform writings central to Magnasco’s iconography, see, most recently, Fausta Franchini Guelfi in Gavazza and Rotondi Terminiello 1992, 216–218.


19. Franchini Guelfi 1977, 216. For the interpretation of Magnasco’s subject matter see also Syamken 1965.
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**Giovanni Paolo Panini**

1691–1765

The most celebrated and popular view painter in eighteenth-century Rome, Giovanni (Gian) Paolo Panini was born 17 June 1691 in Piacenza. Although he had prepared as a youth for a career in the church, he studied perspective and architectural painting in his native city and had received some architectural training by the time of his arrival in Rome in November 1711. By then recognized as an independent painter of landscapes and architectural and perspective views, Panini attended the drawing academy of the figure painter Benedetto Luti (1666–1724) until about 1717–1718. The formative influences upon his style were the classical ruin paintings of Giovanni Ghisolfi (1623–1683), the landscapes of Jan Frans Van Bloemen (1662–1749) and Andrea Locatelli (1695–1741), and the topographical views of Gaspar Van Wittel (1653–1736).

In his early years Panini established himself principally as a fresco decorator of the villas and palaces of the Roman ecclesiastical intelligentsia and aristocracy. These decorations included work at Villa Patrizi outside the Porta Pia (1718–1725, destroyed 1849), Palazzo de Carolis (1720), Palazzo Albani alle Quattro Fontane (1721–1724), Seminario Romano (1721–1722), Palazzo del Quirinale (1721–1724), Palazzo Patrizi at San Luigi dei Francesi (1722), Biblioteca dei Cistercensi at Santa Croce in Gerusalemme (1724), and Palazzo Alberoni (1725–1726).

In 1718 Panini was elected to the Congregazione dei Virtuosi al Pantheon and in 1719 to the Accademia di San Luca in Rome; in 1754 and 1755 he served as the academy’s president, or principe. Panini’s associations with the French in Rome advanced his career significantly, particularly after 1724 when he married the sister-in-law of Nicolas Vleughels, director of the Académie de France at Rome. Panini taught perspective there and in 1732 was received as a member of the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in Paris, an honor accorded few Roman artists. Patronized by Cardinal Melchior de Polignac, Louis XV’s chargé d’affaires in Rome from 1724 to 1732, and by the Duc de Choiseul, French ambassador to Benedict XIV, he influenced younger French painters like Claude-Joseph Vernet (1714–1789), Hubert Robert (1733–1808), and Jean-Nicolas Servandoni (1695–1766), who traveled to Rome to complete their education.

Although Panini worked as an architect, designing Cardinal Valenti’s villa and the chapel in Santa Maria della Scala (1728), and produced fireworks, festival apparatuses, and other ephemeral architectural decorations (and painted magnificent records of them), in the last thirty years of his life he specialized in painting the views of Rome that secured his lasting reputation. These were of two main types, *vedute prese da i luoghi* (carefully and accurately rendered views of actual places) and *vedute ideate* (imaginary views and combinations of particular buildings...
and monuments). His views of ancient and modern Rome encompassed practically everything worth noting in the eighteenth-century guidebooks to the Eternal City. These paintings were not idealized or symbolic representations of Rome’s past and present grandeur, but accurate and objective portrayals of the most famous, most picturesque, or most memorable sights of the city. In the 1740s and 1750s Panini produced numerous views of ancient and contemporary Rome to meet the growing demand created by foreign visitors to the city on the Grand Tour. The popularity of his paintings among the British, in particular, is confirmed by the large number of paintings (and many replicas and copies) with a British provenance.

In addition to the view paintings for which he is best known, Panini produced religious and historical scenes, records of contemporary historical events, real and imaginary architectural pieces, and fantasy views of Roman ruins. The best of these show him to have been a skillful and facile painter of figures whose supple brush could give individuality, vitality, and movement to his scenes. The tremendous size of Panini’s oeuvre, the number of extant versions of certain compositions, and the mechanized and routine handling characterizing many of these canvases confirm that he relied upon an extensive workshop to produce reproductions of his more popular compositions. Panini’s son Francesco served as his principal studio assistant and after the artist’s death in Rome on 21 October 1765 supplied drawings after his compositions to engravers.

### Technical Notes
The support is a fine, plain-weave fabric. The ground is a reddish terracotta-colored layer that contains large aggregates of translucent white pigments. It is exposed in the spandrels of the arched top. In the top third of the composition a warm gray-brown layer was applied over the ground, in the bottom third, under the floor, there is a cooler, lighter gray layer over the ground. In the ceiling the red tone of the ground remains visible as highlights; in the floor it remains visible at the edges of the figures to set them off and soften the transition from the dark clothing to the lighter floor. The gray underlayer is similarly used as shadowing around the eyes of the figures.

Using a straightedge, lines were incised into the gray-brown layer as guides for the placement of the coffers in the ceiling; similar lines were also used to place the floor tiles and set the perspective. A stylus was used to define the contour of the coffered ceiling. Only the letters in the inscription seem to have been incised into the wet paint freehand. The composition appears to have been sketched in before the lines were incised and the paint applied: the incised floor lines stop precisely at the edges of some of the figure groups. This careful planning seems to have eliminated the need for significant alteration in the painting process. Artist’s changes are limited to the sculptures in the niches and to the position of the font to the left of the doorway. Several figures, however, such as the monk in a white cowl at left center, were painted over the floor designs, revealing that some changes were made late in the development of the composition.

The paint was applied using small brushes and fluid, brushmarked strokes, generally wet-into-wet and in opaque tones, for the basic color and forms of both architecture and figures. Precise architectural details were painted over the general forms of the building, probably with the use of a straightedge and compass. The figures are more broadly painted than the architecture, with details, shadows, and highlights quickly sketched over the opaque basic tone that gives them general form and modeling. Often the brush was held so that one side was more heavily loaded than the other, creating strokes and highlights in one application. The rich, varied textures of marble and stone were suggested by stippling and by dragging the dry brush through wet paint.

Although most of the tacking margins have been removed, remnants of the unpainted fabric are present and the painted image appears to retain its original dimensions. The black costumes are abraded and there are minor losses at the edges of the painting. The painting was relined by Stephen Fichetto about 1930. Removal of overpaint and discolored varnish during treatment by Ann Hoenigswald in 1992 has revealed the original design of the composition, an arched top within the rectangular canvas. The unpainted spandrels were painted out to the edges after 1925, possibly in 1930. Scientific analysis identified modern pigments in these areas.

### Provenance
The Dowager Countess of Norfolk; (Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 20 November 1925, no. 69); bought by (William Sabin, London); sold presumably by him to (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome); purchased 1927 by Samuel H. Kress, New York.

### Exhibited
Venice 1929, 32, no. 12. Cambridge, Fogg Art Museum

### Technical Notes
The support is a fine, plain-weave fabric. The ground is a reddish terracotta-colored layer that contains large aggregates of translucent white pigments. It is exposed in the spandrels of the arched top. In the top third of the composition a warm gray-brown layer was applied over the ground, in the bottom third, under the floor, there is a cooler, lighter gray layer over the ground. In the ceiling the red tone of the ground remains visible as highlights; in the floor it remains visible at the edges of the figures to set them off and soften the transition from the dark clothing to the lighter floor. The gray underlayer is similarly used as shadowing around the eyes of the figures.

Using a straightedge, lines were incised into the gray-brown layer as guides for the placement of the coffers in the ceiling; similar lines were also used to place the floor tiles and set the perspective. A stylus was used to define the contour of the coffered ceiling. Only the letters in the inscription seem to have been incised into the wet paint freehand. The composition appears to have been sketched in before the lines were incised and the paint applied: the incised floor lines stop precisely at the edges of some of the figure groups. This careful planning seems to have eliminated the need for significant alteration in the painting process. Artist’s changes are limited to the sculptures in the niches and to the position of the font to the left of the doorway. Several figures, however, such as the monk in a white cowl at left center, were painted over the floor designs, revealing that some changes were made late in the development of the composition.¹

The paint was applied using small brushes and fluid, brushmarked strokes, generally wet-into-wet and in opaque tones, for the basic color and forms of both architecture and figures. Precise architectural details were painted over the general forms of the building, probably with the use of a straightedge and compass. The figures are more broadly painted than the architecture, with details, shadows, and highlights quickly sketched over the opaque basic tone that gives them general form and modeling. Often the brush was held so that one side was more heavily loaded than the other, creating strokes and highlights in one application. The rich, varied textures of marble and stone were suggested by stippling and by dragging the dry brush through wet paint.

Although most of the tacking margins have been removed, remnants of the unpainted fabric are present and the painted image appears to retain its original dimensions. The black costumes are abraded and there are minor losses at the edges of the painting. The painting was relined by Stephen Fichetto about 1930. Removal of overpaint and discolored varnish during treatment by Ann Hoenigswald in 1992 has revealed the original design of the composition, an arched top within the rectangular canvas. The unpainted spandrels were painted out to the edges after 1925, possibly in 1930. Scientific analysis identified modern pigments in these areas.

### Provenance
The Dowager Countess of Norfolk; (Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 20 November 1925, no. 69); bought by (William Sabin, London); sold presumably by him to (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome); purchased 1927 by Samuel H. Kress, New York.

### Exhibited
Venice 1929, 32, no. 12. Cambridge, Fogg Art Museum
Nearly all of Panini’s views of the interior of the Pantheon were painted between 1730 and 1735, the period when the artist seized the commercial possibilities of small, topographically interesting paintings highlighting the sights of Rome for visiting tourists. The existence of several autograph versions of this particular subject indicates the interest that the Pantheon, one of the most impressive and admired antique monuments in eighteenth-century Rome, held for both the artist and his patrons. The rotunda was originally part of the Baths of Agrippa but was rebuilt early in the second century by Hadrian and dedicated to the seven major gods worshiped by the Romans. In 609 the building was consecrated by Pope Boniface IV as a Christian church and mausoleum, Sancta Maria ad Martyres, and thereafter was periodically altered and renovated, in particular during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Panini painted his views of the interior of the Pantheon from one of two hypothetical vantage points: one from a position near the center of the apse at the south end of the building behind the two fluted Corinthian columns; the other, adopted in the National Gallery’s painting, from a position in front of and slightly to the east of one of the columns. The viewpoint of each is from the main altar to the right of the central axis, looking north toward the entrance, through which can be seen the columns of the porch and, beyond, the fountain and obelisk in the Piazza della Rotunda. Approximately three-quarters of the vast interior of the building, proclaimed by Pope Urban VIII “the most celebrated edifice in the whole world,” is encompassed: the floor paved in squares, and circles in squares, of colored granite, marble, and porphyry; the great niches, symmetrically arranged around the interior walls between the floor level and the cornice, each screened by a pair of colored marble columns and flanked by temple fronts or aediculae containing marble statues; the band of marble and porphyry veneer decorating the attic story between the inscribed collar and the coffers of the dome; and the swirling geometry of the dome itself and its oculus.

In order to capture the immensity of the rotunda in a single convincing view and emphasize its most memorable architectural features, Panini has skillfully adjusted the optical perspective and altered the proportions of the actual building. The height of the dome is exaggerated, the oculus enlarged, and the pavement steeply foreshortened to provide an illusion of greater depth and volume. (The spatial recession is emphasized by the careful arrangement of the figures on the left to accentuate the foreshortening into depth, whereas those on the right are disposed horizontally across the foreground.) Even the disk of light that falls through the oculus and moves through the northern half of the building as the day progresses—indicating that the time of day represented is approximately three o’clock in the afternoon—has been enlarged in accordance with Panini’s artistic intentions. The National Gallery’s painting is apparently unique for having been originally conceived with an arched design that emphasizes the vertiginous interior of the Pantheon. Around 1926 the composition was altered to a rectangular shape and the coffered ceiling extended to the spandrels. Panini evidently preferred the composition with the arched top, because this is the format he chose for the views of the interior of the Pantheon shown in the imaginary picture galleries with views of ancient Rome painted in 1757 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) and 1758 (Musée du Louvre, Paris).

Panini has also manipulated the pictorial and sculptural decoration of the interior of the Pantheon as it existed in the early 1730s to create a more harmonious and scenographic composition. Although he often took great care to record accurately the individual monuments and buildings depicted in his vedute esatte, in his views of the Pantheon he rearranged the sculptures (and altered their gestures and poses) in the tabernacles around the interior and eliminated the paintings that were located there. Lorenzo Ottone’s (1648–1736) statue of Saint Anne and the Virgin, made about 1713–1715 for the niche just visible at the extreme left of the painting, is shown in the adjacent aedicula immediately to the right; likewise, Bernardino Cametti’s (1669–1736) statue of Saint Anastasius and Francesco Modenati’s (c. 1680–after 1724) of Saint Rasius, produced in 1725–1727 for the right and left flanks of Alessandro Specchi’s (1668–1729) high altar at the south end of the building (and thus out of sight in the present view), are shown in the pier niches at the left and right of the entrance of the Pantheon. Only Vincenzo Felici’s (doc. 1667–1701) statue of Saint Agatha in
Giovanni Paolo Panini, *Interior of the Pantheon, Rome*, 1939.1.24
Fig. 1. Giovanni Paolo Panini, *Interior of the Pantheon, 1734*, oil on canvas, Collection of Asbjorn R. Lunde [photo: Scott Bowron Photography, NY]

The tabernacle at the extreme right of the composition is shown in the painting in its eighteenth-century location. In this and other early versions of the interior of the Pantheon Panini also appears to have eliminated the portrait busts installed in the small oval niches flanking each of the altars, although they are clearly visible in a version in Cleveland dated 1747 and in one other painting of about the same date.

The prototype for the National Gallery’s version of the subject is a painting (fig. 1) signed and dated 1734 in the collection of Asbjorn R. Lunde, New York. The brushwork, coloring, and handling of the figures are comparable in each, and there can be little doubt that the two works were painted at approximately the same time. The principal differences are the result of discrete variations in the viewpoints of each painting—in the Washington painting Panini established the view slightly to the

left, so that the obelisk and fountain in the Piazza della Rotunda are visible through the portal and portico—and the subtle manipulation of the proportions of the interior to increase the appearance of volume and exaggerate the size of the dome in the New York painting.

The greatest differences among Panini’s various views of the Pantheon are the disposition of the figures—clerics, ladies of fashion, beggars, British *milordi*—which animate the interior of each. The variety of figures Panini painted into his compositions relieves what otherwise would have been unenlivened architectural records. For the staffage, the artist depended upon a large repertory of human types and figures which he created around 1730 and which he and his workshop assistants continued to exploit over the next thirty years. The principal sources for these models are a sketchbook in the British Museum and a group of figure drawings formerly in the collection of the Roman sculptor Vincenzo Pacetti (1746–1820) and now in Berlin. Arisi identified among the latter preparatory drawings for the man in the central foreground, wearing a dark mantle over a white tunic; the woman in black at the right edge of the painting carrying a rosary; and the gentleman kneeling with a book in his hand, his tricorn hat held under his arm, in the middle distance at the left. Each was employed first in a painting of 1730, now in the Louvre, Paris, commemorating the visit of Cardinal Melchior Polignac to Saint Peter’s. Presumably at this time the drawings were made that served as sources for figures in numerous subsequent paintings.

**Notes**

1. X-radiographs confirm Panini’s practice of changing his preliminary design by the addition of figures and adjustments to the trabeation. See also Cleveland Museum of Art 1982, 383, for a discussion, based on x-radiographs of that museum’s 1747 version of the subject, of similar compositional changes made after the initial layout was established.
2. The 1925 sale catalogue (see provenance) refers to the painting as having an arched top.
4. APC, n.s. 5 (1925–1926), 29, no. 618.
5. Shapley 1973, 122, and 1979, i: 350. The painting was the first non-Renaissance Italian painting acquired by Kress (Bowron, “Kress,” 1994, 43, fig. 2).
7. British visitors in particular flocked to see the build-
ing on their Grand Tour, encouraged by earlier tourists like the diarist John Evelyn, who believed that "in a word, 'tis of all the Roman Antiquities the most worthy [of] notice": Diary of John Evelyn, 2: 372.


9. For examples of views with the foreground columns, which include several signed paintings from 1730 to 1735, see Arisi 1986, 340–341, 349, nos. 218–220, 236–237. The earliest view of the Pantheon interior without the columns is a painting signed and dated 1734 in the collection of Asbjorn R. Lunde, New York, canvas, 122 × 98 cm (Arisi 1986, 341, no. 221, color pi. 109). Other autograph versions include paintings in the Lady Christie collection, South Devon, canvas, 88.9 × 82.6 cm; Cleveland Museum of Art, signed and dated 1747, canvas 122 × 97.8 cm (Wixom 1975, 263–268, fig. 1; Arisi 1986, 419, no. 374); Walpole Gallery, London, canvas 109 × 96 cm (exh. cat. London 1995, 78–79, no. 29). The authenticity of paintings formerly in the collections, respectively, of Mrs. Heywood Johnstone, Bignor Park, Pulborough, sold Christie’s, London, 20 February 1925, lot 77, canvas, 190.9 × 151.6 cm, and the marquess of Bath, Longleat, sold Sotheby’s, London, 12 December 1990, lot 34, canvas, 125 × 100 cm, cannot be confirmed. Numerous studio repetitions and copies exist; see especially that at Squerries Court, Westerham, Kent, by a painter named Spencer thought to be responsible for many of the copies after Panini made in London in the eighteenth century: exh. cat. London 1960, no. 170. After 1747, Panini’s only representations of the interior of the Pantheon appear among the small framed scenes on the left wall in the various versions of the interior of an imaginary gallery with views of ancient Rome (Arisi 1986, nos. 470, 474, 499, repro. 464, 467, 477).

10. MacDonald 1976, 94, citing the inscription placed above the entrance doors in 1632 by Pope Urban VIII: PAN-NIÆ AEDIFICIIVM TOTO TERRARVM ORBE/CELEBERRIMVM.

11. Martin Lindsay has demonstrated by a careful analysis of the Cleveland painting how Panini enlarged the apparent size of the oculus and employed scattered vanishing points to achieve a convincing illusion of reality in his views of the interior of the Pantheon (Wixom 1975, 267–268, fig. 8). MacDonald 1976, 74–75, has charted the path of the light through the building at the summer solstice.

12. The painting is described in the Christie’s sale of 20 November 1925, no. 69, as having an arched top.


14. For the disposition of the altarpieces in the mid-eighteenth century, see Titi 1763, 2: 360–363. For Ottone, see Enggass 1972, 322–323, fig. 13, and for Carretti and Modarati, see Marder 1980, 35, figs. 48, 49. Panini has altered the gestures and poses of each of the statues slightly to invest them with greater vigor.

15. For the versions at Cleveland and formerly at Longleat, see note 9. The dates at which the numerous busts in the Pantheon were actually installed in the niches around the interior are uncertain; see Martinelli and Pietrangeli 1955, 5–7 and passim, with earlier bibliography. In the catalogue of the Selinore Collection (Italian Paintings and Drawings 1959, 1: 90; 2: pl. 90), a drawing attributed to Gian Paolo Panini, and now at the Courtauld Institute of Art Galleries, has been linked to the National Gallery painting; in fact, it relates to one of the later versions, which shows the portrait busts installed in the niches.

16. Arisi 1986, 341, no. 221, color pl. 109. Shapley 1973, 122, did not know the existence of this painting and, for reasons that are not apparent, assigned a date “about 1740” to the National Gallery’s version.


18. They are, respectively, KdZ 17583, KdZ 52298, and KdZ 52302 (Arisi 1986, 373, no. 283). Arisi 1986, 331, no. 200. Several figures in the Interior of the Pantheon appear in a variety of compositions by Panini, and it is evident that Panini and his assistants drew upon a large stock of red- and black-chalk figure drawings to serve as models. For example, the pair of women each carrying a muff in the left foreground appear again in versions of the painting from 1735 at Haddo House and from 1747 in the Cleveland Museum of Art (Arisi 1986, nos. 237 and 374). The woman kneeling in the right foreground, turning her head toward the spectator, occurs in several paintings by Panini. Numerous additional examples can be cited.
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1968.13.2 (2350)

Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome

C. 1754
Oil on canvas, 154.5 × 197 (60 ⅜ × 77 ⅞ in)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund

Inscriptions
Around the collar of the cupola: [CAJEIROMV TV ES PETRVS ET SVPER HANC PETRAM AEIFICABO ECCLESIAM MEAM ET TIBI DABO CLAVES REGNI]. On the ceiling of the nave the arms of Pope Paul V, encircled by the inscription: PAVLVS • V • PONT • MAX • A • MDCXV. The sarcophagus above the first doorway at the right is inscribed: INNOCENT. XIII./ PONT. MAX. The upper relief roundel on the first pier at the left is inscribed S GELASIVUS. On the second pier, the inscription on the lower roundel, S. SIXTUS, is faintly
**Technical Notes:** The support is a single-thread, plain-weave fabric of medium weight. Guidelines indicating the principal architectural forms were lightly incised into the thick, pinkish red ground before the application of paint. Many of the incised lines in the floor were not followed in the final painted design, although the fact that other incisions and painted details of the floor stop precisely at the figure groups indicates that a preliminary sketch of some sort was employed. The paint was smoothly and fluidly applied with quite small brushes for the figures and the architectural details. The basic forms were applied as a smoothly blended and modeled lower layer over which the highlights, shadows, and finer details were added, often with unblended, precise strokes, and with the aid of a straightedge for the architectural details. The overlying detailing of certain figures was applied so summarily that they appear unfinished; the old man with the walking stick at lower left and the man in the bright blue cape in the far left distance are examples.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but curving on all four edges suggests that the composition retains its intended dimensions. The painting was probably lined just prior to its acquisition in 1968 and has not been treated since. There is severe abrasion in a narrow band extending along the bottom edge, scattered losses, and moderate abrasion of the figures and the architecture. The varnish is clear.


**Exhibited:** London, British Institution, 1858, no. 79 (shown with its pendant, The Exterior of Saint Peter’s, no. 65, both lent by William, 2d earl of Lonsdale). Washington, National Gallery of Art, 1969, In Memoria, Ailsa Mellon Bruce, no catalogue.

**Panini’s Earliest View of the Interior of Saint Peter’s, now in the Louvre,** signed and dated 1730, shows Cardinal Melchior de Polignac visiting the basilica. One of several paintings commissioned in 1729 by the cardinal, French ambassador to the Holy See from 1724 to 1732, on the occasion of the birth of the dauphin, son of Louis XIV, it immediately became one of the painter’s most popular compositions. Over the next thirty years Panini produced at least six indisputably autograph versions in various sizes, often paired with complementary or related views; many more repetitions of the composition were produced in his studio. In most of these, including the National Gallery’s version, the view looks west toward the tribune and high altar from an elevated position above the nave near the entrance, and encompasses the right and left aisles of the basilica.

Bernini’s (1598–1680) colossal bronze baldacchino over the grave of Saint Peter is visible in the crossing, and through it may be seen, as the climax to the progression from the nave to the altar in the apse of the church, the Cathedra Petri, also designed by Bernini.

Panini recorded with unusual precision the architectural modifications made to the interior of Saint Peter’s, particularly those made following the election of Pope Benedict XIV in 1740, and careful comparison of the numerous versions of the subject permits their arrangement into several chronological periods. The earliest group includes the views painted between 1730 and 1742, when Pietro Bracci’s (1700–1773) tomb of Clementina Sobieski, wife of the “Old Pretender,” James III of England, was unveiled above the first doorway in the left-hand aisle in December of that year. A second group includes the paintings dating between 1746, when a statue of Innocent XII and allegorical figures of Charity and Justice by Filippo della Valle (1697–1768) were placed upon the pope’s tomb above the second doorway in the right-hand aisle, and 1750, when gonfalonies were hung from the ceiling of the basilica, evidently on the occasion of the Holy Year of that date. A further group of paintings includes the views painted between 1750 and 1754, the date of the installation in the niches of the main nave of the statues of Saint Theresa and Saint Vincent de Paul by della Valle and Bracci, respectively, on the order of Benedict XIV. The final composition in the sequence, which shows the statues in their niches, is a painting signed and dated 1755, now in the Niedersächsisches Landesgalerie, Hanover.

The National Gallery’s version can be dated on the basis of a signed and dated 1754 companion view of the square of Saint Peter’s, now in Berlin (fig. 1), from which the interior view was separated in 1887. The brushwork and the handling, as well as the treatment of the figures, leave no doubt that both canvases were painted by the same hand. Panini employed a large workshop, and from the late 1740s his
Giovanni Paolo Panini, *Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome*, 1968.13.2
paintings often reveal the activity of more than one hand, particularly in works with multiple figures. Judging on quality alone, it appears that Panini himself always participated in the production of signed and dated works, and that his patrons accepted these as autograph, the evidence of studio collaboration notwithstanding. Evidence of the different hands at work in Panini’s numerous views of Roman monuments, ancient and modern, is conspicuously revealed by a comparison of the Interior of Saint Peter’s with the National Gallery’s Interior of the Pantheon (1939.1.24), a work that is wholly autograph.

The Berlin and Washington paintings, despite differences in the recorded measurements, appear to be the pair that belonged to Etienne-François de Choiseul-Stainville (1719–1785), duc de Choiseul and duc d’Amboise, included in a posthumous sale in 1787. Louis XIV’s principal minister for more than a decade, Choiseul was appointed envoy extraordinary to Rome at the end of 1753. His chief diplomatic task was to achieve a resolution of the religious troubles in France between the Gallican church, the Jansenists, and the parliament. The success of his mission was realized when Pope Benedict XIV complied with the French government and issued an encyclical to the French bishops on 16 October 1756 establishing the principles by which the sacraments could be administered to those opposed to the bull Unigenitus dei Filius of 1713.

The 1787 Choiseul sale catalogue recorded the subject of the Berlin painting as “l’entrée cérémoniale de M. le Duc de Choiseul lors de son ambassade à Rome.” The minister arrived in Rome on 4 November 1754 and met with Benedict XIV and his representatives shortly thereafter. Evidently it is this visit to the Vatican that is depicted in the Berlin painting. The pomp and magnificence of Choiseul’s later visits to the Vatican—the official ingresso on 28
March 1756 and the public audience with the pope on 4 April 1756—in which the minister embarked from his residence in the Palazzo Cesarini in a procession of more than two hundred carriages, is the subject of a larger painting (duke of Sutherland, Mertoun) commissioned from Panini by Choiseul two years later. This was accompanied by an *Interior of Saint Peter's* (Boston Athenaeum) and two other paintings that summarize Choiseul’s activities in Rome both as a diplomat and as a collector and connaisseur of ancient and modern art: *Interior of a Gallery with Views of Ancient Rome* (Staatsgalerie Stuttgart) and *Interior of a Gallery with Views of Modern Rome* (Boston Athenaeum). Choiseul, one of the most significant collectors in eighteenth-century France, owned nearly a dozen works by Panini, among which the Washington and Berlin paintings were probably the first acquired.

The National Gallery painting is described in the Choiseul sale catalogue merely as “l’intérieur de Saint-Pierre de Rome” and, in spite of the presence of a richly dressed cleric wearing the Saint-Esprit, does not appear to relate directly to the subject of the Berlin painting. Indeed, Panini’s views of modern Rome were frequently paired in complementary relationships, but they are seldom explicitly related by narrative. In the Louvre *Interior of Saint Peter’s* and a few of the early repetitions, Cardinal de Polignac’s features, dress, and decorations are recognizable, but as Levey has observed, no particular significance appears to attach to the scene. With the success of this composition, Panini’s subsequent versions include a cardinal, but in the later versions and certainly after the death of Polignac in 1742, the figure is generalized as a type, not a specific portrait.

The sources for several of the figures in the Washington painting are found in an album of Panini’s drawings now preserved in the British Museum. They include black-chalk sketches for two of the clerics standing in the left foreground before the nave pier; a sketch for the central figure in a group of three gentlemen standing in the foreground, right of center, before the second nave pier and facing the spectator; and sketches for two of the ladies in the group in the aisle at the extreme right. Among the Panini drawings preserved in the Pacetti collection in Berlin are sketches for the gentleman kneeling before the altar in the first chapel on the left and for the monk dressed in a white cowl standing in the center of the composition and looking upward. Several of these figures appear in Panini’s *Interior of the Pantheon* in the National Gallery and were derived from figures first used in the view of the interior of Saint Peter’s in the Musée du Louvre, Paris.

A crudely painted copy of the National Gallery painting is in the Ca’ Rezzonico, Venice.

Notes
1. The inscription actually reads INNOCENTII XII.
2. Catalogue de M. Le Duc de Ch*** 1787, no. 101bis: “J. P. Panini: Deux Tableaux de la plus richie composition: l’un représente l’intérieur de Saint-Pierre de Rome pris dans son point de vue le plus favorable & le plus heureux pour les effets de lumière; il effet orné de figures distribuées avec art: le second Tableau offre la vue entière de la place Saint Pierre & toute la face de ce temple fameux. Cet Artiste savant ne pouvoit choisir un lieu plus magnifique & plus spacieux pour y représenter l’entrée cérémoniale de M. le Duc de Choiseul lors de son ambassade à Rome….Hauteur 5 pieds 3 pouces, largeur 6 pieds 10 pouces. T. Ils ont fait partie de la Collection de M. le Duc de Choiseul.”
3. The painting and its pendant were not among the twenty-five oils by Panini sold 5 August 1809 in Paris following Robert’s death (Gabillot 1895, 257–259, nos. 9–24; 249–250; 226–227; 253, nos. 275–277). In the 18 August 1821 inventory of the paintings and drawings in Madame Robert’s estate, the paintings were described as follows: “275. Deux très riches compositions par J. P. Panini, représentant l’une l’intérieur de l’église de Saint-Pierre, l’autre l’entrée de M. de Choiseul à Rome. Ces deux tableaux sont de la plus belle manière du maitre, sans cadres. Prisés ensemble, 2,500 fr.” (Gabillot 1895, 253).
5. The painting, together with its pendant in the Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbezirk, Berlin, was removed from 14 and 15 Carlton House Terrace, London, not the Lowther seat, Lowther Castle, Westmorland. The pictures were described in the sale catalogue, no. 911, as: “P. Panini: A view of the exterior of St. Peter’s at Rome, with a state procession of foreign Ambassadors, 60 x 76 inches,” and bought by “Fairfax-Murray”; no. 912, as “P. Panini: Interior of St. Peter’s at Rome with numerous figures—the companion, 60 x 76 inches,” bought by Davis.
record ownership by the Sackville Gallery (Shapley 1979, i: 353, n. 9).


11. The gonfalons, which bear images of the Virgin and Child, saints Philip Neri, Theresa, and others, are first shown in an interior of Saint Peter’s in the Detroit Institute of Arts, signed and dated 1750 (Arisi 1986, 434, no. 407, repro.), and thereafter in all subsequent versions of the subject. These gonfalons, usually painted on silk rather than woven, were created expressly for specific occasions such as canonizations and Holy Year celebrations. According to Fabrizio Mancinelli, Ispettore per l’Arte bizantina, medievale e moderna dei Musei, Monumenti e Gallerie Pontificie, Vatican (letter of 16 May 1992, NGA curatorial files), there are no examples extant in the Vatican collections.


13. Oil on canvas, 156.2 × 197 cm, signed and dated at lower left: I. P. PANINI/ R 1754. The Berlin and Washington paintings remained together until the earl of Lonsdale sale, Christie’s, 18 June 1887; the Berlin painting was subsequently sold at Christie’s, 19 November 1920, no. 29; entered a French private collection; and was with Galerie Heim, Paris, from whom acquired in 1980 by the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. See Schleier 1985, 390–392, color repro. 391; Arisi 1986, 450–451, no. 445, repro. 451.


15. For a painting by Pompeo Baroni of Benedict XIV presenting the encyclical Ex Omnibus to Choiseul, see Clark 1985, 269, pl. 185.


17. Arisi 1986, 464–466, nos. 470–473. The four paintings were sold at Paris, 18 December 1786, nos. 1 and 2.


22. Wunder 1962, 11–14, figs. 6–8; Arisi 1986, 452, no. 447, repro., as autograph by both.

1937 Croft-Murray: 64.


1962 Wunder: 12.

1971 Cott.: 251–252, fig. 2.

1975 NGA: 258, repro. 259.


1981 Agnew’s: 12, repro. 61.

1985 NGA: 298, repro.


Pensionante del Saraceni
active c. 1610/1620

Pensionante del Saraceni ("boarder of Saraceni") is the name given to the unidentified artist whose style derives from Carlo Saraceni (1579–1620) and other Caravagesque artists active in Rome in the second decade of the seventeenth century. In an important study of painters in the circle of Caravaggio, published in 1943, Roberto Longhi gathered together a group of four stylistically similar paintings, attributing them to an independent personality whom he called the Pensionante del Saraceni. Because Saraceni was known to be a francophile, at least one French artist lived in his house, and these paintings had a "vague French intonation," Longhi suggested that this "boarder of Saraceni" was a French artist. Considering his geometric construction of figures and the atmospheric quality surrounding them, most scholars have agreed that the Pensionante was French. Subsequent attempts to identify him with Jean Le Clerc (1585–1633), Guy François (before 1580–1650), Georges de la Tour (1593–1652), as well as the Fleming Jacob van Oost the Elder (1603–1671) have failed.

Since Longhi’s identification of the Pensionante, twelve works have been associated with the artist. These paintings mostly represent half-length, expressionless figures set in unadorned surroundings. Gestures alone imply movement, and a dusky light bathes and softens the forms. These characteristics
tend to impart a mysterious and quiet atmosphere to his paintings, which has made them popular with the public. None of the paintings is dated, but one is listed in an inventory of 1621, which may be a terminus ante quern for the Pensionante’s entire oeuvre.
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Still Life with Fruit and Carafe

C. 1610/1620
Oil on canvas, 50.4 x 71.6 (19 7/8 x 28 2/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Inscriptions
Attached to reverse of central horizontal stretcher member:
- a paper label (apparently removed from an older stretcher) inscribed in script "Quadro di frutti e di Carafa del Caravaggio 125."

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave fabric with an uneven, open weave. The ground is a thin white or off-white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer. It was applied with a tool that produced thin diagonal strokes visible in the upper-left portion of the background. The paint was applied as a medium paste and the white layer.

Pronounced cusping is visible on all four sides and extends to the center of the fabric; the tacking margins have been removed. Abrasion has exposed the fabric in some areas, particularly in the foreground. There is a small repaired tear in the watermelon and small losses scattered throughout. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto about 1935. The most recent treatment was carried out by Sarah Fisher, who removed discolored varnish and restored the painting in 1982.

Provenance: Fejer de Buck, Rome, possibly by 1929.1 (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome and Florence); purchased 1935 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.2


The Still Life with Fruit and Carafe carried an old attribution to Caravaggio (1571–1610), and was first published as such by Roberto Longhi in 1929.3 The attribution found wide acceptance until Sterling’s dismissal of the picture from the artist’s oeuvre in 1952. The painting’s stylistic similarity to a group of works ascribed to the so-called Pensionante del Saraceni (“Saraceni’s boarder”) was subsequently noted by Baumgart in 1954, and most authors have since accepted the Still Life into this unidentified artist’s expanding corpus.4 Doubts remain, however, as to the painting’s placement within the oeuvre of the Pensionante and within the orbit of early seventeenth-century Caravaggism. Agreement has focused on the high quality and singularity of the picture and its importance in the history of Italian still-life painting.

The ascription of the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe to Caravaggio depended on its resemblance to the master’s Basket of Fruit (Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Milan, c. 1594) and to still lifes in such paintings as the Boy with a Basket of Fruit (Galleria Borghese, Rome, c. 1593), the Boy Bitten by a Lizard (National Gallery, London, c. 1596–1597), and, especially, the Bacchus (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence, 1596–1597) and the Supper at Emmaus (National Gallery, London, c. 1598–1599).5 Although the attribution of the National Gallery Still Life to Caravaggio can no longer be maintained, its stylistic and compositional roots lie in his innovations in naturalism. The reflection of light on the carafe, the molding of the three-dimensional forms, the uncomplicated naturalistic arrangement of the objects, and their placement against the forward plane before a neutral background depend directly on still lifes by Caravaggio.
Nevertheless, differences from the master point to later influences, especially that of Carlo Saraceni (1579–1620), who was active in Rome from c. 1598 until 1619. The Still Life reflects Saraceni’s simplification of form to geometric basics and a play of light intended to soften the objects it strikes. These qualities are exactly those found in the Pensionante del Saraceni, the unknown artist who may have been inspired by Saraceni’s style. Although at least a dozen works have been attributed to the Pensionante since his identification as an independent artistic personality by Longhi in 1943, a core group of four paintings has remained undisputed in the literature. To this group of Pensionante paintings—all of which represent half-length figures, some with still lifes on a table—belongs the Fruit Vendor in the Detroit Institute of Arts (fig. 1). Between the figures in this painting appears a still life of a basket of apples, a cut watermelon, and two cantaloupes. The similarity of the fruits to those in the National Gallery painting convinced scholars that the latter was indeed painted by the Pensionante. Furthermore, the clarification of form and atmospheric light effects are akin to those found throughout the Pensionante’s oeuvre.

The comparison of these two works in the exhibition of 1982, however, did not confirm the attribution of the National Gallery painting to the Pensionante, despite the many correspondences. But, even if, as Spike remarked, “only the basket of fruit in the Fruit Vendor displays identically the highly controlled technique observable throughout the Washington Still Life,” both paintings exhibit the same volumetric simplification of forms—especially in the melons—and the same haziness of contours. In addition, the pronounced folds of the tablecloth in the Still Life are similar to those on the sleeve and scarf of the woman’s costume in the Fruit Vendor. A difference of preparation, however, is evident between the Washington painting and the Fruit Vendor and some of the other paintings attributed to the Pensionante. The Fruit Vendor, the Saint Jerome, and the Denial of Saint Peter (Vatican Museum) are painted on fabric supports prepared with dark grounds, whereas the Still Life is lightly built up over a layer of white. Technical investigation of these grounds is preliminary and, in any case, there may be other reasons why the same artist used different preparations for different canvases. Although one cannot categorically ascribe both the National Gallery and the Detroit paintings to the same hand, stylistically their still lifes resemble each other more than they do other paintings of the period.

Authorities have placed the paintings of the Pensionante, including the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe, in the second decade of the seventeenth century. The recent discovery of a possible terminus ante quem of 1621 for the Detroit Fruit Vendor strengthens this hypothesis. This dating for the Washington and Detroit pictures is supported by the appearance of similar fruit in a somewhat analogous arrangement in the Allegory of the Seasons, which is attributed to Bartolomeo Manfredi (c. 1587–1620/1621) in the early seventeenth century (Dayton, The Dayton Art Institute).

The identity of the Pensionante del Saraceni has so far eluded scholars. His evident stylistic affinity with Saraceni, Baglione’s description of Saraceni as a
Pensionante del Saraceni, *Still Life with Fruit and Carafe*, 1939.1.159
francophile, and the presence in Saraceni’s house of at least one French artist, have led scholars, for the most part, to agree that the Pensionante was French. The atmospheric rendering of the contours, the geometricized forms, and what has been called a melancholy attitude have led authorities to infer a “French” tone to the group. Some scholars have even seen analogies with Georges de La Tour.

Whoever its author may be, his painting of the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe is representative of an early seventeenth-century Roman trend of dependence on Caravaggio’s innovative naturalistic portrayal of still-life elements. Tommaso Salini (d. 1625), Pietro Paolo Bonzi (1576—1636), and others specialized in still-life paintings with elements analogous to those seen here, but in each case the fruit, vegetables, and other objects are arrayed in horizontal rows, creating a regular and studied arrangement. In style and composition these artists have more in common with the so-called Master of the Hartford Still Life than with the artist of the Washington picture, and in comparison to him exhibit somewhat archaic tendencies. Likewise, these other artists drew different lessons from Caravaggio. Salini in his still-life elements concentrated onimitating the detailed descriptions of Caravaggio, but he used light to dramatize rather than soften form. Bonzi, whose style has been seen as similar to that of the Washington painting, hardened his carefully depicted fruit by means of a Caravaggesque raking light. Only in the National Gallery Still Life does the slightly elevated viewpoint as well as the atmospheric connection between the elements and the neutral background seem to increase the casual appearance of reality. The Still Life with Fruit and Carafe rises above such formalized, scientific display to create a painting of inanimate forms imbued with an interior life. As such it is one of the true successors to Caravaggio’s Basket of Fruit, which has been called the first modern still life.

The National Gallery Still Life portrays dessert items closely grouped on a table covered with a white tablecloth: from left are a cantaloupe, a carafe of sweet wine, and a cluster of mirabelo plums, while on a metal plate rest a peach (or summer apple), half a pear, two figs, white grapes, a pomegranate, and two peaches. Next to the plate is a bunch of cherries with stems and leaves, with a cut watermelon, chestnuts, and a pear, at right. On the tablecloth at the left and along its vertical portion below rest two flies attracted by the sugary scent of the late summer repast. Longhi correctly claimed that the painting depicts a postpasto; the array of fruits, nuts, and wine appears to be an attractive display for after-dinner consumption. The fruits shown mature at different times in the summer, but most would begin to ripen in mid- to late August. The pomegranate and chestnuts, however, mature in the autumn, suggesting that, in spite of the supposed naturalism of the table display, the artist depended on his imagination for the composition.

Although the direct and deceptively simple presentation of the edible forms on a table relies on the religiously significant still lifes of Caravaggio’s Lombard contemporaries, it is doubtful whether the National Gallery painting has a symbolic meaning. Unusual, however, in the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe is the smooth, white tablecloth. Except for representations of the Last Supper or the Supper at Emmaus, few Italian still lifes of the period show food on a covered table. In these religious episodes and in the symbolic still lifes, the cloth—either over a plain table or an oriental carpet—signifies an altar cloth. Ultimately, the National Gallery Still Life’s seemingly casual composition of a dessert about to be consumed comes closer to the spirit of Caravaggio’s modern conception of still life.

Whether the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe was painted by an Italian or by a French or Flemish artist living in Rome in the second decade of the seventeenth century, its legacy can be found among still lifes painted in northern Europe rather than in Italy. The true successors to this type of atmospheric rendering of monumental, geometricized yet naturalistic forms are the paintings by still-life specialists such as Jacob van Es (d. 1666), Louise Moillon (1610—1696), Paul Liegeois (mid-seventeenth century), and eventually Jean Siméon Chardin (1699—1779).

Notes

1. According to NGA 1941, 32. Longhi 1929, fig. 17, published the painting as in a Roman private collection. No information has been located about Fejer de Buck, from whom Contini-Bonacossi acquired two other paintings later sold to Kress (K834 and K197).

2. According to Shapley 1973, 65, and 1979, 1: 112; the expert opinions on the backs of photographs from the Kress Files, NGA curatorial files, are dated 1935.

3. An old label (see inscriptions), said to be from the seventeenth century, ascribed the work to Caravaggio. The
label is reproduced in Longhi 1929, 274, and in Swarzenski 1954, 37, fig. 17. See References for the various attributions of the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe.

4. For paintings attributed to the Pensionante del Saraceni by different authors, see note 8.


6. On Saraceni see Ottani Cavina 1968.

7. Ottani Cavina 1968, 40, noted that the Pensionante may have had little to do with Saraceni and that he was "più nobile ed inquieto e... sta 'pittoricamente' un tantino più in alto dello stesso Saraceni che peraltro fiancheggia nel secondo decennio."

8. Longhi 1943, 23-24. Longhi attributed to the Pensionante the following paintings: The Cook (Galleria Corsini, Florence; Papi 1990 was the sole voice to remove this painting from the Pensionante's oeuvre), The Chicken Vendor (Prado, Madrid), The Denial of Saint Peter (Pinacoteca Vaticana), and The Fruit Vendor (Detroit Institute of Arts). These paintings are reproduced in Ottino della Chiesa 1967, nos. 109-112. Over the years more paintings have been attributed to the same artist, including the Saint Jerome (Cavina collection, Bologna: repro. in Brejon de Lavarègné and Cuzin 1974, 80-81, no. 21; copy, 67.5 x 54 cm, sold at Finarte, Rome, 22 November 1988, no. 171, repro.) and The Burial of Saint Stephen (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Ottani Cavina 1984, 2: 608-614; copy in a private collection Turin, 100 x 132 cm). For other versions of The Denial of Saint Peter see Nicolson 1989, 1: 155. A copy also sold at Christie's, London, 1 November 1991, lot 52. For other paintings attributed to the Pensionante see Nicolson 1989, 1: 155. The Detroit painting, inv. no. 36.10, oil on canvas, measures 130 x 93 cm.

9. Borca 1972, 157, remarked that photographic comparisons between the two paintings were not conclusive evidence that the paintings are by the same hand. Moir 1965, 28, saw differences in technique between the two paintings, comparing the National Gallery Still Life with Manfredi's Allegory of the Seasons in Dayton (see note 15). Brejon de Lavarègné felt that the artist of the Washington painting was better than the Pensionante del Saraceni (oral communication to David Rust, 28-29 April 1974, recorded in NGA curatorial files). The Detroit painting, inv. no. 36.10, oil on canvas, measures 130 x 93 cm.

10. Moreover, recently suggested deletions from the Pensionante's oeuvre, including the Still Life with Fruit and Carafe, further complicate the issue. Papi 1990, 177-178, called the National Gallery Still Life a work by a northern artist, possibly Jacob van Oost the Elder (1603-1671). Comparing it with the Corsini Cook, he also, incorrectly in this writer's opinion, attributed the latter painting to van Oost. On secure paintings by van Oost see Meulemeester 1984.


Also, the version (or copy) of the Denial of Saint Peter in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, apparently has a darkish red ground, although no sections have been taken (letter of 26 June 1992 from Michael Wynne, NGA curatorial files).

13. In dating the National Gallery painting to the third decade of the seventeenth century, Papi 1990, 178, noted the dependence on Caravaggio's Basket of Fruit and Supper at Emmaus and believed that the "sviluppo di potentiissima sintesi formale e spirituale" is not at all like the more primitive paintings of the Caravaggio followers of the preceding decade. However, recent support for a dating of the Detroit picture before 1621 (see note 14) shows that this kind of formal synthesis was not precocious.

14. The Fruit Vendor is mentioned along with the Boston Burial of Saint Stephen, but without attribution, in the 1651 inventory of the heirs of Cardinal Jacopo Sannesi, who died in 1621. Ottani Cavina 1984, 608-614, took up the unpublished thesis of Scott Schafer that Sannesi, who had a special reverence for Saint Stephen, commissioned the Burial. One could argue that Sannesi patronized the Pensionante twice by commissioning also the Fruit Vendor. Ottani Cavina has kindly supplied us with a copy of the inventory of 1651, which is in the Archivio di Stato, Rome. The Detroit painting is described on fol. 10v.

15. Manfredi died in 1622, but the painting is usually dated on stylistic grounds to the first decade of the seventeenth century. See exh. cat. Cremona 1987, 62-63, no. 3. Longhi 1943, believed that the fruit in both the Fruit Vendor and Allegory of the Seasons "descended" from the National Gallery Still life (which he thought to be by Caravaggio), but all three paintings depend on precedents in Caravaggio. On the problems of authenticity of the Dayton painting see Spear 1975, 6-9.

16. Baglione 1642, 147. The three artists living in Saraceni's house were Jean Le Clerc (Giovanni Cleo francese) (1587-1631), Antonio Giarola (Antonio Girella veronese) (1595-1665), and Giambattista Parentucci. (For the relevant documents see Ottani Cavina 1968, 88-90.) Only Jean Le Clerc was once identified as the Pensionante (Moir 1965, 28), but this identification has been refuted by Ottani Cavina 1968, 68; Spear 1971, 138; Brejon de Lavarègné in Brejon de Lavarègné and Cuzin 1974, 77; Nicolson 1979, 77-78; and Rosenberg 1977, 153, who suggested that the Pensionante is closer to but not identical with Guy François.

The Pensionante's paintings have been seen as stylistically close to those of Giovanni Antonio Galli (Spadaro) (c. 1580-1650) by Spear 1971, 196-197; Previtali 1985, 76; and Giffi Ponzi 1987, 73. However, Galli has not been identified with the Pensionante. On this shadowy figure see Nicolson 1989, 1: 108-110; Giffi Ponzi 1987, 71-81; Papi 1986, 20-28; and Funagalli 1986, 28-39. Papi 1990 confused the issue by taking some paintings traditionally believed to be by Spadaro away from the artist in order to attribute them to Jacob van Oost the Elder, with whom he connected the National Gallery Still Life. As with the Italian still-life paintings of the early seventeenth century, there is no consensus
on attributions of many of the figure paintings by artists influenced by Caravaggio.

Soehner 1995, 10, argued that the Pensionante was either Flemish or from the north of France, to judge from the Flemish character of the still-life elements and the physiognomies in the Detroit Fruit Vendor.

17. Longhi 1943, 24, in defining the Pensionante, was the first to suggest that the artist was French, because he possessed “quelle venatura, quale intonzazione francese vagante.” Subsequent scholars agreed, until Cuzin 1982, 529, suggested otherwise.

18. See, for example, Ottani Cavina 1972, 18, n. 12. Marini 1974, 470, associated the French quality of the Still Life with Georges de La Tour. Bissell, “Review,” 1971, 249, expressed the belief that the Pensionante was a major link between the Italian baroque and Georges de La Tour.

19. Zeri 1976, 92–103, grouped paintings in the Galleria Borghese, Rome, and elsewhere with a Still Life in the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, and attributed the group to the young Caravaggio while in the workshop of the Cavalieri d’Arpino. These pictures have also been related to Fede Galizia (1578–1630), Francesco Zucchi (1562–1622), Salini, Bonzi, and Giovanni Battista Crescenzi (1577–1635). The stylistic characteristics of the still lifes by the last three artists have not yet been adequately defined, but see the discussion in Cottino, “Natura morta,” 1989, 2: 650–727. The attribution to Caravaggio of the group of paintings near the so-called Master of the Hartford Still Life has not met with approval. On this problem see Cottino, “Natura morta,” 1989, 2: 650–715, and Michael Mahoney in Cadogan 1991, 92–97. For reproductions of the paintings discussed see Cottino, “Natura morta,” 1989, and Cinotti 1991, 228–229, figs. 87–96. As with the Pensionante del Saraceni and with the authorship of many of the early seventeenth-century Italian still lifes, there has been no consensus as to the identity of the Hartford Master, nor has there been consensus as to which paintings belong to the group attributed to him.


22. Longhi 1950, 34–36, credited Caravaggio with ignoring the distinction between genres of paintings and thus giving still lifes the same importance as history and religious paintings. On this see also Spike 1983, 13–14.

23. Pomologists who have kindly written with identifications of the fruit have not been in total agreement. Miklos Faust of the Fruit Laboratory, Plant Sciences Institute of the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (letter of 6 July 1992, NGA curatorial files), identified the yellow-and-red fruit on the left edge of the plate as a summer apple on the basis of its stem, and the pitted fruit as a summer pear. Enrico Baldini, Istituto di Coltivazione Arboree of the Università degli Studi di Bologna (letter of 25 July 1992), believed that the white-and-red fruit on the dish are all white-flesh peaches, an opinion reiterated on a visit to the National Gallery (10 April 1993). He identified the cut fruit as a pear. Alessandro Roversi of the Facoltà di Agraria-Placenza, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (letter of 22 July 1992), identified the white-and-red fruit at left as a summer apple, the pitted fruit as a summer pear, and the others as peaches. Faust identified the clustered fruit at right as either black grapes or cherries. Baldini identified them as cherries, and Roversi as grapes. Some of these varieties (such as the unusual cantaloupe) may now be extinct. For a discussion of fruit varieties in still-life paintings of the later seventeenth century, see Baldini et al. 1982.


25. Faust, Baldini, and Roversi (see note 23), discussed maturation times of the fruit and chestnuts. As Baldini noted, the difference in maturation was not a problem for Italian still-life painters. Faust, noting the unrealistic representation of the chestnuts, suggested that perhaps the artist did not have the nuts in front of him at the time he was painting.

26. See, for example, paintings displaying plates with the symbol of Christ and with fish, reproduced in La natura morta in Italia 1989, 1: 201, fig. 219. Although the simplicity of the National Gallery artist’s arrangement of fruit and close viewpoint from above resemble those in the works of the Lombards Fede Galizia, Giovanni Ambrogio Piguino (1580–c. 1608), and Panfilo Nuvolone (1681–c. 1651), the influence from their works on our artist comes indirectly through Caravaggio (La natura morta in Italia 1989, 1: figs. 223–226, 251, 254–257).

27. In addition, there are tablecloths for ritual meals in other religious paintings. See, for example, later paintings of Jacob and Isaac by Francesco Guarino (1611–1654) and the Feast of Absalom by Bernardo Cavallino (1622–1654) (La natura morta in Italia 1989, 1: figs. 1017 and 1019).

For other Italian still lifes of the early seventeenth century with food on tablecloths, see the religiously symbolic painting mentioned in the preceding note, two paintings attributed to the Master of the Hartford Still Life (Cottino, “Natura morta,” 1989, 2: figs. 819–820), and a Madonna and Child with a Still Life, erroneously attributed to Annibale Carracci with an anonymous Caravagesque artist: Bocchi and Bocchi 1992, 179.

Oriental carpets, usually elaborately draped, as well as colored tablecloths, seem to have made their appearance in Italian still lifes about the mid-seventeenth century and were especially popular in northern Italy, probably influenced by northern still lifes. See, for example, the works of Evaristo Baschenis (1617–1677) and others in La natura morta in Italia 1989, 1: figs. 313–326, 328, 332–333, and 529–530. Most of the still lifes with oriental carpets, however, depicted musical instruments and objects other than fruit.

28. In this context, note the altar cloth neatly laid under the objects on the table in the Still Life with the Liturgical Apparatus of a Bishop, attributed to Benedetto Gennari (1633–1715) by Anna Colombi Ferretti (in La natura morta in Italia 1989, 1: 466–467, fig. 556) or to Paolo Antonio Barbarieri (1663–1649) by Salerno 1989, 140.

29. Cuzin 1982, 529, reviewing France in the Golden Age (exh. cat. Paris 1982), bravely and correctly asserted that “we must face the fact that in the absence of any documentation, nothing justifies the assertion that this genius [the Pensionante] is French.”

30. For paintings by these artists see Greindl 1983, 49–54 (Jacob van Es); Faré 1974, 48–69 (Moillon), 72–78 (Légeois); and Conisbee 1986 (Chardin).
Giovanni Battista Piazzetta

1683 – 1754

Early sources attributed Piazzetta's skillful handling of powerful chiaroscuro effects to his initial training in the shop of his father, Giacomo Piazzetta (1640–1705), a Venetian sculptor and wood carver. Modern scholars, however, have discounted the importance of this training as a sculptor and argue that the foundations of Piazzetta's style were established during his years (c. 1697–1703) as a student of Antonio Molinari (1655–1704), the last great exponent of the tenebrist school in Venetian seventeenth-century painting. Piazzetta owes to Molinari his reddish brown palette, agitated, restricted compositional structures, and naturalistic effects.

Piazzetta's friend and publisher Giambattista Albrizzi recounted that the painter went to Bologna at the age of twenty to study the works of other masters, especially the Carracci (q.v.) and Guercino (q.v.), whose styles he wished to imitate. Although a
direct association with Giuseppe Maria Crespi (q.v.) is not documented, scholars have long discerned Piazzetta’s lasting debt to Crespi’s organic contrasts of light and shadow, volumetric conception of form, saturated colors, and lively handling of the paint surface. In conception, Piazzetta’s scenes of everyday life owe much to the genre style developed by Crespi.

Upon his return to Venice (by 1705), Piazzetta soon established his reputation. Albrizzi noted that one of Piazzetta’s early works, a small nocturnal scene illuminated only by a lamp, was widely acclaimed as a singular achievement and sold for a great price. In these early works, Piazzetta employed the dark, compressed space characteristic of the older tenebrist painters; he also employed their contorted, sharply illuminated figures, but made these appear more natural and lively through his attention to anatomy, perspective, and careful drawing. Despite his innovations Piazzetta’s tenebrist manner did not find universal approval at a time when the luminist current, based in Veronese and exemplified by Sebastiano Ricci (q.v.), had established itself in Venetian painting. Piazzetta’s altarpiece of 1718–1719 for the Scuola dell’Angelo Custode was rejected but immediately purchased for an even greater price by the collector Zaccaria Sagredo (fragment, Detroit Institute of Arts). In its place, the scuola commissioned a work from Sebastiano Ricci. In 1722–1723 Piazzetta contributed the Arrest of Saint James the Great to the series of apostles by various artists for the church of San Stae in Venice. After this he began to receive many important religious commissions, all of which were for altarpieces with the notable exception of Saint Dominic in Glory (documented to 1727) for the ceiling of Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

In the 1720s and 1730s, Piazzetta continued to refine the manner developed during the preceding decade while also assimilating past and current developments in Venice. He is said to have studied the rich color of Johann Liss (c. 1597–before 1630) and Domenico Fetti (q.v.), and the chiaroscuro of the Neapolitan Francesco Solimena (1657–1747), whose works were highly esteemed in Venice. Piazzetta’s works of this period retain his characteristic dark background of finely modulated reddish browns. Within the resulting shallow, ethereal space are disposed a few strongly illuminated figures modeled and defined with a subtle play of light. Throughout this period Piazzetta’s palette remained somewhat restricted but became increasingly lighter and employed stronger accents of cool hues, such as blues and turquoises, especially in the draperies.

The Assumption of the Virgin, completed in 1735 for Clemens August, prince bishop of Cologne, has been seen as marking a definitive transition, first noted by Albrizio, to Piazzetta’s later luminist style. Although working with brighter, more diffused light and a cooler palette, Piazzetta still retained his characteristic chiaroscuro effects, creating a highly personal interpretation of the prevailing luminist current in Venetian painting, now led by his former follower Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (q.v.). Yet many of Piazzetta’s works of the later 1730s and 1740s also hark back to the darker, more somber effects of the first mature manner, and render his chronology somewhat difficult.

In addition to large altarpieces, Piazzetta’s painted oeuvre includes a number of genre paintings, many commissioned by the important Venetian collector Johann Matthias von der Schulenburg. Beginning in the mid-1720s Piazzetta also executed many small paintings of half-figures and character heads. The large, classical history paintings executed late in his life for Venetian and foreign patrons represent a new element in his production. In these, as in the character heads, he drew upon the light effects, compositional schemas, and loaded brushwork of Rembrandt (1606–1669), whose prints and paintings were increasingly well represented in eighteenth-century Venetian collections.

Although Piazzetta’s stylistic innovations were important in the development of Venetian painting in the eighteenth century, especially for the young Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, his much maligned slowness of execution hampered his personal success. It appears that Piazzetta found it more lucrative to sell his many drawings of heads and single figures, and indeed these were much sought after by collectors. He also provided many drawings to be engraved as book illustrations. From the mid-1730s he maintained a large shop of pupils and assistants to assist in carrying out his commissions. Their early works are often indistinguishable from those of the master, but several, like Giuseppe Angeli (q.v.), went on to successful careers of their own. In 1750 Piazzetta was named the first director of the academy created by the Venetian senate in that year.
1961.9.82 (1634)

Madonna and Child Appearing to Saint Philip Neri

Probably 1725 or after
Oil on canvas, 112.4 × 63.5 (44 1/4 × 25)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric prepared with a thick, dark brown ground containing coarsely ground pigment particles. Over this was applied a reddish imprimatura that was allowed to show through in thinly painted passages and which functions as the shading of most figures. The design elements were laid in with freely applied, slightly thick strokes of light brown paint. The main figures were then painted with a heavily loaded brush using thick, painterly strokes. The background was finished next, as it overlaps the figures in some areas. Finally, contour strokes were applied to finish the figures with special attention to that of the saint. A slight contour change is discernible along the lower edge of the Virgin’s blue mantle; a small artist’s change is also visible at its lowest point near her feet.

The tacking margins have been removed and the canvas extended approximately 0.5 cm beyond the original picture surface. Cusping is present along all four edges of the fabric. Inpainted losses are found primarily along the top and bottom edges. The varnish is slightly hazy. In 1954, the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Mario Modestini.

Provenance: Private collection, Rome, by 1941.1 (Adolph Loewi, Los Angeles); purchased 1950 by the Samuel H. Kress Collection, New York.2


Since its inclusion in the 1941 settecento exhibition in Rome, the Madonna and Child Appearing to Saint Philip Neri has been connected with the altarpiece of the same subject in the Oratorian Church of Santa Maria della Consolazione, commonly known as Santa Maria della Fava, in Venice (fig. 1). This altarpiece, one of Piazzetta’s most famous, is also among his earliest documented works. Although the initial contract of 23 January 1725 is lost, the records of the Oratorian congregation at the Fava note an initial payment of 620 lire on 30 January 1725, installation on the altar in December 1726, and final payments in December 1727 to pay the balance of the 1860 lire or 300 ducats specified in the contract.3 Presumably, Piazzetta had already presented a modello for approval prior to the contract and first payment in January 1725.

Scholars had been nearly unanimous in accepting the Washington painting as Piazzetta’s modello for the Fava altarpiece and in dating it to 1724.4 The clear lack of any significant compositional differences be-
between the two works was usually explained by the fact that Piazzetta would have been bound by the lost contract not to deviate from the approved modello. Too few bozzetti or modelli are known in Piazzetta’s oeuvre to draw any secure generalizations about his practice. It does appear, however, that he made slight changes in poses when executing the final work and that his sketches were executed with a markedly loose and rapid technique. Despite its relatively small size and somewhat sketchlike handling, the Washington painting appears too finished to be an actual bozzetto or even modello. It is instead a ricordo, or reduced replica of the altarpiece, and is thus datable to 1725 or slightly later. It was likely painted largely by assistants working under Piazzetta’s supervision, although almost certainly finished by him and sold as his work. In the eighteenth-century painters often made copies of their own modelli and bozzetti, as well as reduced copies of finished altarpieces painted in a more sketchlike manner.

The situation is further complicated by the existence of yet another, slightly smaller version of the Fava composition in the Residenzgalerie, Salzburg (fig. 2). A third version on the Italian art market in 1961 is of uncertain authorship, but attests to the popularity of the composition, as does the engraving by Innocente Alessandri (1741–1803). Given that all the painted versions are identical and their early provenances unknown, it is virtually impossible to judge which, if any, is the modello and which a ricordo. Stylistic analysis has produced nothing but disagreement among Piazzetta scholars. Pallucchini accepted the painting in Salzburg as a second, autograph modello. Knox called both modelli and found the handling of the Salzburg version more lively in the saint’s hands and the heads below the Christ child. Mariuz called the Washington version the modello, that in Salzburg a ricordo. Jones, however, seems correct in calling all three ricordi, although the one in Salzburg appears to be of the highest quality.

The Fava composition is generally acknowledged as a milestone in Piazzetta’s development, particularly for the lightening of his palette and the softening of his harsh chiaroscuro into a more unified ambient light. In particular, scholars have noted the controlled orchestration of reflected light and the subtle harmonies of blues, greens, and ivories carefully worked out within the overall warm brown tonality. Such changes in Piazzetta’s style are demonstrated by comparing the Fava composition to the darker, less chromatically vibrant Angelo Custode of 1718–1719. Of similar subject, both works employ the zigzag composition characteristic of Piazzetta and of eighteenth-century Venetian painting in general. Jones has noted that Piazzetta is unique in creating such an active composition through the glances of otherwise static figures, and that this fusion of clarity, monumentality, and implied motion forms the core of Piazzetta’s mature style, as seen in subsequent altarpieces like the Guardian Angel with Saints Anthony of Padua and Luigi Gonzaga of 1727–1730 in San Vitale, Venice.

Recent scholarship has implicitly but justifiably rejected Pallucchini’s suggestion that both the earlier Guardian Angel and the Fava altarpiece derive

Fig. 2. Giovanni Battista Piazzetta, Vision of San Filippo Neri, 1725, oil on canvas, Salzburg, Residenzgalerie
from a print by Claude Mellan (1598–1688) of the Madonna and Child with an angel. While the unusual motif of the standing Madonna may have been suggested by Mellan, placement of the Virgin diagonally above the figure to whom she appears is common to most seventeenth- and eighteenth-century depictions of heavenly apparitions. Ruggeri has pointed out that works by Giuseppe Maria Crespi, whom Piazzetta knew in Bologna, may have provided a general compositional model for Piazzetta’s altarpieces. Indeed, Piazzetta’s detached, almost haughty Virgins with their cocked heads, downward glances, and long, straight noses are strongly reminiscent of those in Crespi’s altar paintings. The pose of the standing Virgin in the Fava altar is a subtle reworking, particularly in the head and arms, of the seated Virgin in Crespi’s Virgin with Saints Philip Neri and Andrea Avellino of c. 1688–1690 in the Oratorio of Sant’Andrea Avellino in Veglio, near Bologna. By the early eighteenth century, Saint Philip Neri’s vision of the Virgin had become one of the most popular elements in the saint’s iconography, second only to depictions of him in prayer or contemplation. Philip Neri (1515–1595) was the founder of the Oratory at Santa Maria in Vallicella in Rome and the quasi-monastic Oratorian congregation, and played an active role in the spiritual and religious life of sixteenth-century Rome. In the years leading up to his canonization in 1621, his iconography was established largely within the Roman Oratory itself under the guidance of Cardinal Cesare Baronio. Philip Neri was presented primarily as a saint of visions and ecstasies in both contemporary biographies and the episodes from his life depicted in the cycles of prints often but not exclusively associated with the biographies. Of particular importance among these were the frequent and varied occasions on which the Virgin appeared to him as a result of his unwavering devotion to her. Such a vision was chosen for prominent display on the altar erected in the saint’s death-chamber in the Oratory at Santa Maria in Vallicella. Painted in 1614 by Guido Reni (1575–1642), it depicts the kneeling saint, arms outstretched, in front of a bust-length figure of the Virgin and Child born aloft by seraphim heads. A slight variation on Reni’s composition, with the saint standing before a table, was included on the large print commemorating the simultaneous canonization in 1622 of saints Philip Neri, Ignatius Loyola, Francesco Saverio, Theresa, and Isidore. Diffused by this print and perhaps others, Reni’s composition provided the inspiration for most later depictions of the saint’s Marian vision. While later works departed from Reni’s model in several ways, some elements remained constant, and these are seen also in Piazzetta’s invention for the Fava: the saint’s characteristic physiognomy; his richly decorated chasuble over a white soutane; and the lilies, symbol of his purity and devotion to the Madonna. The saint’s features were well known to artists and the faithful alike through the many portraits drawn from memory during his life and later directly from his death mask, of which several Oratorian houses possessed replicas. Piazzetta’s Saint Philip shows the same short, rounded beard, deep folds in the cheeks, large ears, prominent nose, and high rounded forehead. Yet other elements are apparently unique to Piazzetta’s image, but without the original contract or other documentation it is impossible to know which were his inventions and which were specified by the patrons. The standing Virgin, as noted above, is unusual in apparition scenes and unprecedented in the iconography of Saint Philip Neri. Also unique to Piazzetta are the miter, skull, and cardinals’ hats, correctly interpreted by Jones as symbols of the earthly honors rejected by the saint. Several of the many later variations on Reni’s composition have been mentioned in connection with Piazzetta’s Fava altarpiece, but there is no direct prototype for the image. Placement of the scene before an altar may have been suggested by the table in the commemorative print of 1622, or perhaps by Carlo Maratta’s (1625–1713) strikingly similar painting in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence, datable before 1674. While Reni and others had shown the saint frontally or in three-quarter profile in a pose of adoration, surprise, or intercession (looking at the Virgin and pointing to the viewer), the figure of the saint in profile, his hands joined in prayer, his head raised in contemplation of the vision, is not unprecedented. Francesco Maffei’s (c. 1600–1660) painting of c. 1655 in the Accademia, Venice, shows the saint in this pose, but with his fingers intertwined and his arms closer to his chest. The same outstretched arms, splayed fingers and intense gaze of Piazzetta’s figure of the saint are found in Marziano Franceschini’s (1648–1729) lost Holy Family Appearing to Saint Philip Neri of 1712–1714, formerly in the Pinacoteca, Rimini.
this attitude of absorbed prayer, Piazzetta created a deeply contemplative image in which the Marian vision is made almost palpably real to the viewer. The Virgin with her mantle held up by putti is a later variation on the Madon-
nas of the Middle Ages with their rigid cloaks around tiny supplicants, the latter type sits or stands much like any other with her cloak held up almost discreetly by angels or putti. One such example is Alessandro Turchi's (1578–1648) Madonna Appearing to Saint Roch of c. 1620 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.4 A direct precedent for inclusion of this type of madonna in Saint Philip Neri's Marian vision is Giambattista Pittoni's (1687–1767) painting of c. 1715 in San Giovanni Elemosinario, Venice, in which an angel holds up a corner of the Virgin's robe over the standing figure of the saint.5 In all three paintings, the mantle serves to express the Virgin's personal protection of the supplicant saint and her interces-
sion on his behalf, and through him on behalf of the viewer. Piazzetta is unique, however, in transforming the upheld cloak into an active, integral part of the composition.

No drawings are known for the Fava composition.6 Shapley suggested that the paintings of Saint Philip Neri in prayer now in the Brera, Milan, and the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, may have been connected with preparations for the altarpiece in some way. These are, however, finished works in their own right, and Mariuz has recently dated them after the Fava altarpiece.7

Notes

1. According to Morandotti 1941.
3. The altarpiece measures 367 x 200 cm. For its importance and place in the literature, see Jones, "Piazzetta," 1981, 2: 179–180, no. 61, and Mariuz in Mariuz and Pallucchini 1982, 85, no. 42, repro., who adds additional information to the documents published by Ravà 1921, 52.
5. In the Angelo Custode painted in 1718–1719 for the Scuola del Angelo Custode, of which a fragment is now in the Detroit Institute of Arts, the Virgin's head takes a different pose from that in the bozzetto in the Los Angeles County Museum; the ricordo of this composition in the Gemalde-
galerie, Kassel, follows the altarpiece, while the engraving from the shop of Giuseppe Wagner follows the bozzetto (Mariuz and Pallucchini 1982, 80–81, nos. 22–24, repro.; Knox 1992, fiigs. 63–66, and color pl. 4). Similarly, in the San Jacopo trascinato al martirio of 1722 or 1723 in San Stae, Venice, the executioner looks toward the upper left rather than down as in the bozzetto, now in a private collection, Venice (Mariuz and Pallucchini 1982, 83–84, nos. 33–34, repro.). Both of these sketches are very loosely painted with only rapid touches of white for highlights and summary indication of features, in contrast to the carefully finished Washington painting.
6. See 1939.1.71 and 1939.1.72 for such instances in the oeuvre of Sebastiano Ricci. Piazzetta's ricordo of the Angelo Custode in Kassel is in fact painted much more freely than the fragment in Detroit, but not so rapidly and loosely as the bozzetto in Los Angeles (see note 5, above). Earlier scholars considered the Washington painting to be more freely or nervously painted and the surface more vibrant: Pallucchini, "Unbekannte Werke," 1942, 29; Pallucchini, Piazzetta, 1942, 10; Pallucchini 1956, 18, 20; Zamperetti 1969, 128. The altarpiece has apparently been treated since they made their observations: the clumsy bit of drapery painted over the uppermost putto's genitals does not appear in more recent photographs.
7. Oil on canvas, 93 x 53.5 cm. Residenzgalerie 1975, 87, pl. 85.
9. British Museum, photograph in NGA curatorial files. Zanetti 1733, 189, notes an engraving "a fumo" executed in Augsburg, which may be identical with Innocenti's, 10. In an expert opinion of 1961, cited in Residenzgalerie 1975, 87. Shapley 1973, 138, and 1979, 1: 366, presented the Washington painting as the autograph modello and merely noted that the other versions had been "proposed as sketches for the altarpiece."
11. Knox 1992, 102, n. 23. He also stated that the Salzburg version is closer to the altarpiece "in all respects," citing as the principal similarity the lack of decoration on the back of the saint's chasuble. However, traces of such decoration are clearly visible on the altarpiece, even in photographs.
12. Mariuz and Pallucchini 1982, 85, no. 44. It is also noted that the other versions had been "proposed as sketches for the altarpiece."
14. On which see note 5, above.
18. For this and the very similar Virgin of Mount Carmel with Saints Simon Stock and Anthony of Padua of c. 1690 in the Parish Church of Bergantino near Rovigo, see Merriman 1980, 270–271, nos. 135 and 136, repro.


At the Roman oratory Reni’s painting had replaced an image of the saint without the apparition of the Virgin by Cristoforo Roncalli (Il Pomerancio; 1552–1626), who had decorated the chapel with scenes from the saint’s life, including an unspecified apparition of the Virgin. On the death-chamber chapel, destroyed in 1620, see Parma Armani 1978–1979, 133–134. Reni’s painting is probably a generic reference to the saint’s many encounters with the Virgin; no such corresponding event is described in Bacci’s Vita, but might at some point be found in Gallonio’s.

22. Parma Armani 1978–1979, fig. 70. 

23. The chasuble is subject only to variations of color and style. Parma Armani 1978–1979, 131, suggested that this ceremonial garb refers to the saint’s official role in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and thus stands in contrast to more private devotional images that show him in a plain black cassock.


25. For the portraits and the importance of the death mask see Müller Hofstede 1967, 171–180. (The death mask is reproduced as fig. 1.)

26. As Müller Hofstede 1967, 175–176, pointed out, these same features appear in Guido’s Philip Neri. It is very likely that the Oratorians of the Fava provided Piazzetta with one or more portraits of the saint, or possibly even with a replica of the death mask.


29. As suggested by Ruggeri 1983, no. 23, who hypothesized that Piazzetta could have known it from prints or drawings. For the dating of Maratta’s painting see Mezzetti 1955, 314; photograph in NGA photographic archives. The saint kneels in three-quarter profile, arms outstretched, in front of an altar table raised on two steps; however, the Virgin, with the Christ child, is accompanied by other saints. The raised platform in Franceschini’s painting suggests an altar just beyond the picture frame.

30. Moschini Marconi 1970, 3: 51, no. 110, repro. The painting may have come from the church of the Incurabili in Venice. On the basis of Maffei’s painting and Nicolò Renieri’s (c. 1590–1667) of the same subject in San Canciano, Venice, Jones, “Piazzetta,” 1981, 2: 181, postulated, rather implausibly, a “Venetian type” in which the Virgin appears without the Christ child and implied that Piazzetta depicted Guido’s “Roman type” with the Christ child. For the Renieris see Fantelli 1974, 106, no. 118, fig. 32.

31. The painting, originally in the Theatine church, was destroyed in 1943: Roli 1977, fig. 118d. See Zanotti 1739, 1: 236, for the dating. It is unclear how Piazzetta might have known Franceschini’s painting for Rimini; perhaps both painters were drawing on a now unknown prototype in Bologna.

32. First noted by Jones, “Piazzetta,” 1981, 2: 181–182, with reference only to the medieval and Byzantine traditions. This suggestion was taken up by Ruggeri 1983, 83, and Knox 1992, 102, who called the upraised mantle an aspect of the Madonna della Misericordia.


34. Pallucchini 1981, 1: 117; 2: fig. 316. Similar examples can be found in the work of Giuseppe Maria Crespi and his followers. The Madonna della Misericordia also appears in Italian paintings of varying subjects from the sixteenth into the eighteenth centuries.

35. Zava Boccazzi 1979, no. 204, fig. 1.

36. Ruggeri 1983, 83, identified a drawing in a private collection, Venice, as a “study with variations” for the head of the Madonna. The drawing has nothing to do with the painting: Riccoboni 1947, 43, no. 92, repro. 
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Jusepe de Ribera
1591 – 1652

Ribera was born in the town of Jativa, near Valencia, Spain. It seems likely that he first studied painting in Valencia, but there is no documentation for this or for an eighteenth-century biographer’s assertion that the young painter studied with Francisco Ribalta (1565–1628). No clues to Ribera’s artistic origins can be detected in his earliest known works.

Ribera may have come to Italy as early as 1608–1609, probably via Naples, then under the control of Spanish viceroys. He would then have passed through Rome on his way to Lombardy, where he is recorded by several contemporary sources as an already established painter. He is first documented in Parma in 1611, when he received payment for a Saint Martin and the Beggar (lost, known in copies) for the church of San Prospero. The artist is next documented in Rome in 1613 as a member of the Accademia di San Luca. The works of these years, such as the series of the Five Senses, reveal Ribera’s intimate study of Caravaggio (1571–1610) and his earliest followers. The unsparing naturalism and extreme chiaroscuro characteristic of such works have been taken as evidence that Ribera may also have had close contact with northern Caravagggesque painters. Ribera’s naturalism is tempered, however, by a monumentality of the human figure based on careful study of Roman cinquecento masters, such as Raphael (1483–1520), whom Ribera himself cited as a touchstone of his art, as well as ancient sculpture. Throughout his life, Ribera also made reference to the refined and languid yet sculptural figure style of Guido Reni (1575–1642). Ribera’s drawing technique, especially his chalk studies of individual figures, reflects his thoroughly Italian training and continued reference to Guido Reni.

Ribera is next documented in Naples in September 1616, when he married the daughter of the Neapolitan painter Gian Bernardino Azzolino, called il Siciliano (d. 1645). This marriage suggests prior contacts with Naples, and in fact Ribera soon established himself as an important painter there. Aside from a brief trip to Rome in 1620–1621 to learn the art of etching, and another in 1626 to receive the Order of Christ of Portugal from Pope Urban VIII Barberini, Ribera is not known to have left Naples. The few etchings of the 1620s were probably executed to make his works better known. They carried his fame into northern Europe. In this period Ribera’s chief patrons were the Spanish viceroys and nobility, who commissioned paintings for Spanish churches and collections. As earlier, Ribera signed and often dated his works and carefully appended “español” to denote his Spanish nationality, an important factor in a city where patrons often declined to patronize local artists.

In the early 1630s Ribera’s style began to change markedly. He moved away from sharp chiaroscuro toward a more luminous, golden overall tonality, became increasingly interested in color, and employed more expansive but balanced compositional schemas, without, however, completely abandoning his Caravagggesque roots. Some scholars have attributed this shift to a possible, but undocumented, trip to northern Italy or to Ribera’s encounter with Diego Velázquez (1599–1660) in 1630. Far more plausible, however, is that Ribera participated in the growing preference for Bolognese art, brought to Naples from Rome with Domenichino’s (1581–1641) commission of 1631 for the Treasury of San Gennaro in the Duomo, and by Giovanni Lanfranco (q. v.), active in the city from 1633 to 1646. Ribera would also have seen a wide range of works in Neapolitan collections, including those of Guido Reni and Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), which are also often cited as catalysts for the increasing painterliness of Neapolitan painting in the late 1630s and 1640s. The neo-Venetianism current in Rome during the 1620s and 1630s may also have played a role, reawakening Ribera’s earlier interest in the colorism of the Venetian cinquecento masters.

In the 1640s Ribera’s production fell off sharply due to chronic illness, although his studio continued to turn out numerous works, many bearing his signature. He executed several large paintings for the Certosa di San Martino in Naples and continued to send works to Spain.

Although essentially Italian in training and style, Ribera had great influence on painters in Spain and indeed throughout Europe. His modified Caravaggism informed the course of Neapolitan painting in the first half of the seventeenth century when many important artists passed through his studio, among them the Master of the Annunciation to the
Shepherds and Aniello Falcone (1607–1656). The dominant personality in Neapolitan painting of the later seventeenth century, Luca Giordano (q.v.), also began his career as a follower of Ribera.
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**The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew**

1634
Oil on canvas, 41 × 44.5 (104 × 113)
Gift of the 50th Anniversary Gift Committee

**Inscriptions**
At lower right “Jusepe de Ribera español / F. 1634”

**Technical Notes:** The support is a twill fabric prepared with a thin, smooth reddish brown ground. Over this is a second, dark layer, black or possibly brown, with a rough texture that suggests application with a palette knife only under the main area of the composition, as visible in x-radiographs. The paint was manipulated skillfully to express different textures. Thin wispy strokes were used to modify the fluidly applied flesh tones, which also show the wet-into-wet application of black paint. A pointed object was dragged through the still-wet paint of the executioner’s beard to create the texture of the hair. X-radiographs reveal two artist’s changes (fig. 1). Saint Bartholomew’s right forearm has changed position, with the previous arm left unfinished, without a hand, underneath it. The fingertips of the right hand were also slightly shifted.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but cussing is present along all four sides. Two long tears in the fabric support have been repaired, which can be seen in x-radiographs. Aside from losses associated with these tears, there are only minor and carefully inpainted losses scattered throughout and some abrasion in the executioner’s chest. The varnish is clear. The painting was treated most recently by Herbert Lank after 1983.

**Provenance:** Purchased in Italy c. 1810 by Richard Barré Dunning, Lord Ashburton (of the first creation) for his uncle-in-law George Cranston, Lord Corehouse [d. 1850], Corehouse, Scotland; by descent to Colonel Alstair Joseph Edgar Cranston of that Ilk by 1960; (his sale, Sotheby’s, London, 6 July 1983, no. 30). Private collection, London; (sale, Sotheby’s, London, 4 July 1990, no. 83).

**Exhibited:**
Edinburgh, Loan Exhibition of Works by Old Masters, 1883.

**The Martyrdom** of Saint Bartholomew was a favorite subject of Ribera and seventeenth-century Neapolitans for its portrayal of religious suffering and the participation of the faithful in the mystical passion of Christ. As one of the first apostles, Bartholomew, a native of Cana in Galilee, preached the gospel in Asia Minor, Armenia, and/or India. According to legend, he converted numerous followers by exercising demons and destroying idols. After curing the “moonstruck” daughter of King Polemius and converting his family, Bartholomew’s miraculous powers angered the local priests. They appealed to King Astrages, Polemius’ brother, who was not converted, to stop Bartholomew’s destruction of their gods and temples. Astrages took Bartholomew captive and ordered him to sacrifice to the gods of the land. Bartholomew refused, and while standing before Astrages brought down the king’s idol, Baldach, whose statue was destroyed. For this outrage Astrages ordered Bartholomew flayed alive. According to Voragine’s Golden Legend, Bartholomew may also have been crucified and beheaded.

Ribera presented different episodes in his numerous depictions of Saint Bartholomew’s martyrdom,
Jusepe de Ribera, The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, 1990.137.1
but always closely followed Voragine’s text. The saint is inevitably depicted nearly as described by Voragine: “His hair is black and crisped, his skin fair, his eyes wide, his nose even and straight, his beard thick and with few gray hairs; he is of medium stature; he is clothed in a white mantle, and wears over it a white cloak with purple gems at each corner.” According to De’ Dominici, when Ribera arrived in Naples (c. 1616), during a festival, he hung a painting of the martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew from a balcony across from the Palazzo Reale. The painting attracted the attention and eventual patronage of the viceroy, Don Pedro Téllez Girón, grand duke of Osuna, thus launching Ribera’s successful Neapolitan career. Of the ten known versions of the subject by Ribera and/or his studio, the earliest extant painting may be the Martyrdom of 1616–1618 (now in the Museo Parroquial de Osuna, Colegiata de Osuna), almost certainly painted for the duke. With the exception of the National Gallery painting, Ribera always represented the saint full length, tied to a tree, and either about to be or in the midst of being flayed by an executioner as hooded priest(s) and onlookers stand nearby. Sometimes Bartholomew’s arms are extended to show that he was crucified, and he is sometimes shown upside down to indicate a reverse crucifixion. The artist’s usual chiastic composition, emphasized by the saint’s arms in the National Gallery painting, occurs in most depictions of the scene. Here the onlookers are juxtaposed in profile and full face as they appear in several of the other scenes of martyrdom. In spite of these repetitions, each of Ribera’s martyrdoms is a unique composition.

Often the head of the fallen idol, evidently taken from a studio prop, lies in the foreground, indicating the artist’s fascination with the subject and various interpretations of the iconography. This head resembles the standard Roman or Greek portrayal of Apollo: a beautiful, youthful face with long, curly hair. According to Réau, Saint Bartholomew’s martyrdom was reminiscent of the flaying of Marsyas; Bartholomew was the “Christian Marsyas.” The flaying of Marsyas, depicted in 1637 by Ribera and popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, represented the fall of one who attempted to compete with the gods. It might be interpreted, too, as punishment for those who challenge religious authority. That Ribera recognized an identification of Saint Bartholomew with Marsyas, at least in a formal sense, is indicated both by the head of the Apollo-like god on the ground and the similarity of the screaming, tortured Bartholomew with Marsyas in his portrayals of the myth.

The representation of Bartholomew’s demise in the National Gallery painting differs significantly from all other depictions by Ribera. By limiting the number of participants to the main protagonists of the story—the saint, his executioner, one of the priests who condemned him, and one of the soldiers who captured him—and presenting them half-length and filling the picture space, the artist rejected an active, movemented composition for one of intense psychological drama. The cusping along all four edges shows that the painting has not been cut down: Ribera intended the composition to be just such a tight, restricted presentation, with the figures cut off and pressed together. In other paintings the executioner, just before or during the act of flaying, portrays emotions that vary from disinterest to cruelty bordering on sadism. Here, as the torturer sharpens his knife, he hesitates, transfixed by Bartholomew’s eyes, which look upward but reflect inward, as if in the midst of a mystical experience. The blade and whetstone form a cross, which Bartholomew points out with his raised left hand. The priest and soldier who stand behind the figures fail to notice the executioner’s possible conversion.

The signature and date of 1634 at lower right, in the same color seen elsewhere and contemporary with the painting, accord with the style of the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew. Like other works of the mid-1630s, such as Saint Peter (Museo del Prado, Madrid) or Saint Matthew (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth), both of 1632, Ribera here contrasted long strokes dragged over flesh and drapery with staccato strokes for hair and beards. In the paintings of saints, he used the broad planes of dark drapery as a foil for the brighter accents on the faces and hands, which stand out because of the highly worked-up impasto. Although Ribera used the half-length figure from the beginning of his career, mostly for representations of single saints and apostles, only in the 1630s did he begin to employ it for multfigured compositions, and then only rarely. In fact, the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew is the only extant half-length martyrdom in Ribera’s oeuvre. This new compositional device, as well as a concurrent move away from a deep palette and dramatic lighting effects to a brighter color scheme and a clarity of light.
and composition, was probably due to the influence of Domenichino, who had arrived in Naples in 1631 and was keen competition for local artists. The half-length composition for martyrdoms, however, was employed earlier by both Emilian and Roman artists, and Ribera was familiar with these works from his travels in Parma, Bologna, and Rome. Although there are no similar compositions by Domenichino or Guido Reni, paintings by Sisto Badalocchio (1585–after c. 1620) and Giovanni Lanfranco (q.v.) of half-length martyrdoms of Saint Bartholomew indicate that the tradition was strong in north Italy.

The Caravagggesque inspiration for Ribera’s Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew is also apparent in the face of the executioner, half in shadow, who seems to be based on the figure of Christ’s torturer in Caravaggio’s late Flagellation (Museo di Capodimonte, Naples), which Ribera would have seen in the church of San Domenico Maggiore in Naples. The smooth, soft folds of drapery in clear brown also recall the garments of some of Caravaggio’s figures. The long strokes of paint with high impasto, coupled with short, staccato strokes, set Ribera apart from his predecessor, however, creating a lively surface pattern that reflects the play of light on the painting. This technique became characteristic of Ribera’s style, setting his work apart from the smoother finishes in Caravaggio’s pictures. The intense naturalism of Ribera’s figures is heightened by this painterly technique, involving the viewer in the mystical experience depicted in the scene. Scholars have claimed that the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew is one of the finest achievements of Ribera’s full maturity and one of the most moving of his devotional pictures.

The painting is all the more remarkable for its state of preservation, rare in the artist’s oeuvre. The preservation of this work is due not only to its languishing unnoticed and unrecognized as an authentic Ribera until 1983, but also to Ribera’s handling of the medium. In most of his paintings Ribera employed a dark ground, building up from the dark into light areas, leaving the ground exposed to delineate the deepest shadows. In the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, Ribera built up the paint layers more thickly and applied the shadows and dark accents on the surface rather than using the ground. The result is a lively play of contrasting strokes: smooth, long strokes on the body and head of the saint and the drapery of the executioner; short strokes for the hair of the three figures; and dabs of light paint on the face of the priest who recedes farther into the background.

The care that went into the Martyrdom is shown also in the change of composition, visible from the x-radiographs (fig. 1). Ribera often adjusted contours of figures; in the present painting he had blocked in the saint’s right arm (but not the hand) directly above his head before he realized that the composition would be moved too close to the left and the arm would interfere with the focus of the viewer on the saint’s heavenward gaze. The finished and more successful composition employs the arms of the saint to delineate the edge of the psychological drama and to focus attention on the exchange between prisoner and executioner. The columnlike, expressionless figure at left works in a similar manner.

The composition of The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew is seen in a contemporary copy, perhaps from Ribera’s studio, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, and by a variation of the theme from the Museo Provincial in Malaga. The latter work may in fact be from the artist’s studio, since Bartholomew’s right arm is brought forward over the saint’s head, recalling the rejected arm in the National Gallery painting. Most Neapolitan artists imitated Ribera’s full-length martyrdoms or his half-length figures of saints, and several reinterpreted his portrayals of the martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew.

Notes
1. According to the Sotheby’s catalogues, which identify Dunning simply as Lord Ashburton. Scots Peerage 2: 598 gives his full name and lists his marriage to Corehouse’s niece Anne Selby Cunningham in 1805.
2. According to Sotheby’s Catalogue; a copy of the exhibition catalogue has not been located.
3. For the history and iconography of Bartholomew, also called Nathaniel, see Francesco Spadafora and Maria Letizia Casanova in BibSS 2: 852–877. Very popular in the seventeenth century, representations of the saint’s flaying rarely were seen before the end of the sixteenth century.
5. Golden Legend, 479–480. Brown 1973, 28, noted that Ribera followed Voragine’s description of the saint in his print of 1624. None of his paintings, however, reproduce the white cloak with purple gems.
6. De’ Dominici 1742, 3: 14. Brown 1973, 28, n. 16, disputed the notoriously unreliable De’ Dominici, suggesting that he was describing the iconography of the artist’s 1624 print or a painting made before or after the print. The duke of Osuna was viceroy of Naples from 1616 to 1620.
7. The paintings of the martyrdom include those in the following collections:


(2) Galleria Pallavicini, Rome, c. 1616-1618; Spinosa 1978, 93, no. 18, repro.

(3) The Osuna painting described in the text, dated c. 1616-1620 by Pérez Sánchez and Spinosa 1992, no. 1.9, color repro., and Felton and Jordan 1982, 103-105, fig. 119.


(5) Grenoble, considered a painting from the studio of c. 1630, Spinosa 1978, 97, no. 344, repro.

(6) The National Gallery of Art painting, signed and dated 1634.

(7) Museo de Bellas Artes, Barcelona, signed and dated 1644, Spinosa 1978, 97, no. 36, repro.


(9) Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, signed and dated 1651 or 1652, either by Ribera or his studio, Spinosa 1978, 141, no. 429, repro.

(10) Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, the attribution of which has often been questioned, most recently by Spinosa 1978, 143, no. 444, repro., who attributed it to Salvator Rosa.

8. One musts whether this was the painting that the viceroy saw or whether it was a subsequent commission for him. See Felton and Jordan 1982, 103-105, for this painting and three others of the series: The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, Saint Jerome and the Angel of Judgment, and a Penitent Saint Peter.

9. The composition of the two figures reappears in reverse in the painting in Barcelona. In the Palazzo Pitti composition the figure in the background in profile talking with a hooded priest is similar to the soldier at left in the National Gallery painting.

10. This same head, which looks like an Apollo (on this see text below), appears in the following versions of the Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew: Yale, Florence, Stockholm, and Barcelona (see note 7), as well as in the painting of The Sense of Touch. See note 5 and Spinosa 1978, 102, no. 65. The half-bust of the sculpture suggests a studio cast.

11. For comparisons with Roman statues see Bober and Rubinstein 1986, especially 71-72, no. 28, the Apollo Belvedere as an example of the Apollo image.


13. For two paintings of this theme, both dated 1637, see Spinosa 1978, 109, no. 103-104.

14. The tortured Bartholomew, screaming, is found in the painting in Barcelona.

15. For example, in the Osuna painting the executioner is expressionless, but intent on his job, somewhat like a contemporary butcher; in the Barcelona painting, he is extremely violent; in the Pitti painting, he jeers at the viewer.


18. On this painting see Mina Gregori in exh. cat. New York, Caravaggio, 1985, 322-327, no. 93. The comparison of Ribera’s executioner with Caravaggio’s was noted in the 1990 Sotheby’s sale entry on the National Gallery painting.

19. It has been said that the liveliness of Ribera’s brushstrokes reflects an influence of Guido Reni, some of whose paintings were visible in Naples. The present writer, however, feels that Reni’s impact on Ribera was minimal in this area but strong in the morphology of his figures and perhaps in the lightening of his palette.

20. William Jordan (letter of 7 May 1990, NGA curatorial files) deemed the picture a “masterpiece of the highest order,” and Craig Felton (oral communication 1 July 1990 and letter of 26 February 1991 to J. Carter Brown) called the painting “one of the finest paintings of the 1630s,” “one of the top pictures of his career,” and “one of this superlative painter’s finest works.”

21. When the Martyrdom sold in 1983, it was offered as studio of Ribera. In spite of its dirty state, the painting was recognized and attributed to the artist by all scholars of Ribera (see bibliography and provenance). After 1983, it was conserved by Herbert Lank.

22. See, for example, The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew in the Pitti and Barcelona (note 7).

23. Both paintings are smaller than the present work. The Munich painting is recorded in Spinosa 1978, 129, cat. 260, but incorrectly reproduced as 259. Its correct dimensions (99 x 110 cm) are given in Soehner 1963, 239.

For the painting from Malaga (77 x 64 cm), on deposit at the Museo del Prado, Madrid, see Spinosa 1978, 129, no. 261. The psychological interchange between the executioner and Bartholomew is heightened in the Malaga painting by the direct exchange of glances and by the reduction of the scene to the two single figures.

24. See, for example, a painting of the martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew attributed to Antonio De Bellis, formerly in the Astorita collection, Naples (Bologna 1991, 151, fig. 161). See also Mattia Pretti’s (1613-1699) interpretation of the scene in the Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Palazzo Corsini, Rome, and the Currier Gallery of Art, Manchester: Corace 1989, 94, fig. 38; 26, fig. 9.
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Marco Ricci
1676 – 1729

Marco Ricci was born in Belluno in 1676. He received his earliest training in Venice from his uncle Sebastiano (q.v.), who had returned to the city in 1696. Marco’s principal training, however, was not as a figure painter, and from the beginning he is likely to have had contact with the few, primarily foreign, landscape and view painters then active in Venice. Equally important in his formation was his study of Titian’s (c. 1488–1576) landscape paintings and drawings, as recounted by the biographer Zanetti.

Little is known for certain about Marco’s earliest career, but he appears to have begun collaborating with Sebastiano and may have accompanied his uncle to Milan and Rome. Early sources recounted that Marco killed a gondolier in a drunken brawl and was forced to flee Venice. He is reported to have studied with an unnamed landscape painter in Dalmatia, but this may have been, in fact, Antonio Francesco Peruzzini of Ancona (c. 1668–?), a landscape painter known to have worked with Sebastiano in Bologna and Milan. Scholars have long seen an initial influence from Salvator Rosa (1615–1673) in Marco’s earliest landscapes with their romantic subjects, strong chiaroscuro effects, and crowded compositions built up of towering masses of trees and rock formations. It may have been Peruzzini who first introduced Marco to the art of Salvator Rosa; it has also been suggested that Marco traveled to Naples, with a stop in Rome, to study among Rosa’s school. Scarpa Sonino has recently questioned the influence of Rosa, and seen much of Marco’s early landscape style coming from northern artists such as Johan Anton Eismann (c. 1613–1698) and especially Pietro Mulier (il cavalier Tempesta, c. 1637–1701).

In 1706–1707 Marco and Sebastiano worked together on the decoration of Palazzo Marucelli in Florence. It may have been at this time, or perhaps earlier in Milan, that Marco first encountered the Genoese painter Alessandro Magnasco (q.v.), with whom he is known to have collaborated on occasion. Marco’s works of this period begin to use Magnasco’s fluid, nervous brushstrokes and thick, pastose highlights for creating a scintillating paint surface and changing light effects.

After a brief return to Venice, Marco traveled in 1708 with the Venetian Giovanni Antonio Pellegrini (1675–1741) to England, where they collaborated on stage sets for the Italian opera in London’s Haymarket and on other projects. After a dispute with Pellegrini, Marco returned to Venice in 1711 and brought his uncle back to London with him, perhaps in hopes of securing the lucrative commission for the dome of Saint Paul’s Cathedral. Marco produced landscapes and other vedute for the English market and continued to collaborate with his uncle. They returned to Venice in 1715–1716, probably together, by way of Paris and the Netherlands, where Marco had stopped on previous journeys.

Marco’s conception of landscape was profoundly influenced by the Dutch landscape painters, encountered first through Mulier and others working in Italy and then on trips through the Netherlands. Beginning in his first English period, Marco’s compositions achieved a new sense of space through a lowered viewpoint and a clear differentiation between dark foregrounds and brightly illuminated backgrounds that recede far into the distance. The artificial, painterly light effects of Magnasco began to give way to a more real, luminous light keyed to the times of day and the seasons. The example of Titian, however, always remained central to Marco’s understanding of landscape, and throughout his life he made annual sketching trips to Belluno to refresh his memory of actual landscape settings.

The period from 1716 until his death in 1729 was one of intense activity, during which Marco collaborated frequently with Sebastiano and expanded the sphere of his own activity to include gouaches on kidskin and etchings. Although he continued to paint other landscape subjects, Marco seems to have turned increasingly to depictions of ruins populated with small figures sometimes painted by Sebastiano. These paintings do not represent actual sites, but are capriccios composed from a repertory of elements—obelisks, pyramids, sections of temples and colonnades, fallen architectural elements, statues, funeral urns, and vases. Such elements are often arranged in planes or as a screen in the middle ground, with views into luminous distances, reflecting the artist’s frequent work for the stage. Marco is known to have begun painting ruins quite early in his career and it
has been argued that his conception of ruins depends upon direct experience of Rome and its monuments. No trip to Rome is documented, although Marco may have gone there during his youth or, less likely, around 1720.

Like his uncle’s in history painting, Marco’s accomplishments were important in the subsequent development of eighteenth-century Venetian landscape and capriccio painting. Painters such as Canaletto (q.v.) and the Guardi (q.v.) drew upon his subtle and varied light effects and his masterful combination of real and imaginary elements.
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After Marco Ricci

1970.17.132 (2504)

View of the Mall in Saint James’s Park

After 1709–1710
Oil on canvas, 114.1 × 195.2 (45 × 76 %)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave, medium-weight fabric prepared with a white ground of medium thickness. There is no evidence of an imprimatura layer. The background was executed with paint of medium thickness; the figures were applied over it with a thin paint that retains some texture of the brushstrokes.

The bottom tacking margin is present. The other three edges lack cusping, which suggests that the fabric has been cut down on these three sides. X-radiographs reveal a fabric insert in the lower-left corner where the original fabric, ground, and paint layers were lost due to damage. The varnish is moderately discolored. Losses are at the far left of the painting and to the left of the large tree at the center right. Small losses corresponding to the craquelure are scattered overall. Slight abrasion has occurred throughout. The painting has not been treated since acquisition, except for an adjustment of the inpainting by Susanna P. Griswold in 1987. However, examination shows that the painting has been inpainted during at least two other treatments.

Provenance: Francis Astley-Corbett, 4th Bt. [1859–1937], Brigg, Lincs.; (his sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 8 July 1927, no. 66, as by Marcellus Laroon); purchased by (M. Knoedler & Co., New York); sold 1 April 1936 to Ailsa Mellon Bruce [1901–1969], Syosset, New York (as Laroon).


Marco Ricci’s original version of this composition at Castle Howard was published in 1926 and is universally accepted as autograph. It was probably painted during the years 1709–1710 while Marco was in the employ of Charles Howard, 3d earl of Carlisle; the painter received payments in London in November 1709 and again in October 1710 at Castle Howard, where he painted several overdoors and may have assisted Giovanni Antonio Pellegrini in decorating the main hall.

Even after its exhibition in 1940, the National Gallery’s painting carried an attribution to Marcellus Laroon (1679–1772), an English painter of conversation pictures. Only in 1973 did it receive the designation “attributed to Marco Ricci,” which in light of new evidence proves untenable. The lack of pentimenti and underdrawing may suggest that the work is a copy, perhaps by one of the English stage painters whom Marco likely employed as assistants in his work for the theater; it is possible that such painters helped in the production of copies. The white ground is more typical of an English artist than of Marco, who preferred reddish brown grounds. In comparison with the original at Castle Howard, the architecture is less skillfully executed, the landscape lacking in subtlety and shadow, and the figures stiffer, more wooden, and more thinly painted. In her cat-
After Marco Ricci, *View of the Mall in Saint James’s Park*, 1970.17.132
The absence of cusping along the top and sides suggests that the copy has been cut down, and in fact it lacks the band of sky above the trees that gives the original the sense of space characteristic of Marco’s view paintings. The copy follows the original except for minor variations in the relation of some figures. In the area of repaired damage in the lower-left corner, the two dogs have been omitted and a low fence in front of the milkmaids and their cows has been added. The Washington copy varies in significant details from the print by Giacomo Leonardis, which records a lost replica made by Marco, perhaps after his return to Venice in 1716.

The composition departs from Marco’s usual fanciful views and capriccios in that it is a recognizable, if inexact, depiction of a specific location. It owes much to early Venetian topographic views, particularly those of Luca Carlevarijs (1663–1730), with a high viewpoint, towering clouds, and minute observation of daily life. The view down the central allée of trees with open space expanding to either side recalls similar views of tree-lined roads by seventeenth-century Dutch landscape painters such as Meindert Hobbema (1638–1709) and Aelbert Cuyp (1620–1691). In Marco’s composition, the Mall is seen from Buckingham Palace looking west into Saint James’ Park. An Italian hill town rises on the left where Saint James’ Palace should be. The recently completed dome of Saint Paul’s Cathedral is prominently, but rather inaccurately, depicted at the right; it appears somewhat nearer than it is and thus much too large in relation to Inigo Jones’ (1573–1652) Banqueting Hall and the steeple of the Old Horse Guards, both of which were situated directly at the other end of the park.

Although previously discussed by others, the activities depicted can be further explained. The Mall itself consisted of two tree-lined walks flanking a central allée fenced and gravelled for the playing of “pall mall,” a game, similar to horseshoes, popular from the time of King Charles II until the mid-eighteenth century. In the early eighteenth century, the Mall also served as a gathering place where in the early afternoon and evening parties were made up for outings. Here men and women engaged in intense flirtations of a sort not permitted elsewhere in polite society. Women would often appear at the Mall in masks to hide their identity and protect their reputations. A number of such assignations and flirtatious encounters are depicted here in the midst of promenading clergymen, politicians, town fops, and children with their nursemaids.

The rural character of the park is reflected in the cows grazing at the right: individuals were granted the privilege of pasturing cows there as a sort of pension. It was the custom to consume milk fresh from the cows as well as in syllabubs, flavored concoctions of milk curdled with wine or cider. The sale of such delicacies is depicted at the lower left where two women and a child are shown conversing with milkmaids grouped around a cow; another milkmaid is setting off with a tub on her head while a third has collided with a sedan chair at the right. The coach-and-six accompanied by mounted guards at the far left most likely belongs to a member of the royal family or perhaps to a prominent person accorded the privilege of driving through the park.

Notes
1. A photograph in the Frick photographic archives (copy in NGA curatorial files) shows the painting at the time of the Astley-Corbett sale in 1927. Extensive overpaint extends both ranks of foliage farther to the left; careful comparison of the figures and the crackle pattern in the paint surface (clearly visible in the photograph) confirms that the two are the same work. Present areas of abrasion correspond to the areas of inpainting in the Frick photograph. The dimensions given on the photograph and in the Christie’s catalogue indicate that the painting was lined prior to its exhibition at Knoedler’s in 1940 (44 x 76 ½ in. vs. 45 x 77 in.). Barbara Pralle, formerly of the Conservation Department, NGA, was very helpful in analyzing the photograph.
2. APC, n.s. 6 (1926–1927), 438 no. 9494.
3. The Bruce Ledger, NGA curatorial files, no. 82, gives the purchase date and lists the painting’s location, as of 1 August 1956, as Syosset, Long Island, where Mrs. Bruce had an estate.
4. Oil on canvas, 131 x 190.5 cm. Borenius 1926, 207–208; Scarpa Sonino 1993, 119, no. 16, color pl. 3, with earlier literature; Delneri in Succi and Delneri 1993, 192–193, color repro. The Honorable Simon Howard kindly provided a color slide of the painting and a copy of the preliminary condition report. The painting is heavily inpainted under a layer of discolored varnish; the paint is applied fairly thinly throughout with some impasto in the paler colors, especially in the figures. Compared with the NGA copy, the painting appears to have been cropped at the bottom and sides.

8. Rizzi (as note 7) called the execution too “fredda e manierata” to be Marco. Given the quality of photographs from Castle Howard and the extensive overpaint in both pictures, it is difficult to compare the foliage.

9. Scarpa Sonino 1991, 137, no. 113, leaving open the possibility that it could be autograph.


11. Delneri in Succi and Delneri 1993, 104, fig. 7.

12. See Scarpa Sonino 1991, 110, no. 16, for the work’s place in Marco’s oeuvre; she also relates it to his work for the theatre.


14. The accuracy of Marco’s depiction can be gauged from engravings of 1708 and 1720 showing the park from the same vantage point; these are reproduced in exh. cat. London, Image, 1987, nos. 53–54. See also Canaletto’s views of the Old Horse Guards and the Banqueting Hall (Constable 1962, nos. 415–416).


17. Boulton 1970, 145–146, citing several plays of the period. In Thomas Dilke’s Pretender (1698) one character speaks of fetching her “mask, hood, and scarf” in order to “jaunt it a little” with whomsoever she can entice; a gentleman in Colley Cibber’s Double Gallant (1707) expects to find his wife in the park wearing a mask and flitting with strangers.

18. Boulton 1970, 152; see the similar scene at the lower left in the painting of the Mall from c. 1745 by Joseph Nickolls in the Royal Collection (exh. cat. London, Hogarth, 1987, no. 114); Nickolls’ women no longer wear masks.

19. A royal coach is seen at the left of the engraving of 1720 cited in note 14, above. Others could drive through the park only with royal permission (Boulton 1970, 149).
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Sebastiano Ricci
1659 – 1734

At the age of fourteen, Sebastiano Ricci left his native Belluno for Venice, where he soon entered the studio of Federico Cervelli (c. 1625 – before 1700), a Milanese painter active there since the mid–1650s. While contemporary biographers sometimes discounted Sebastiano’s debt to Cervelli, modern scholars generally agree that the Milanese master gave him solid practical instruction and introduced him to the Venetian painters of the seventeenth century.

Prompted by the first of several well-documented romantic misadventures, Sebastiano’s departure for Bologna in the summer of 1681 initiated a fifteen-year period of intense study and work in Emilia, Lombardy, and Rome. While moving about in the pursuit of love or refuge from the law, Sebastiano availed himself of the opportunity to study the works of earlier masters and to seek commissions in which to apply and refine the lessons learned from them. In Bologna he gravitated toward the studio of Carlo Cignani (1628–1719), then the leading exponent of the Carracci tradition. From his study of the Carracci (q.v.) and their students, Sebastiano improved his drawing and feeling for plastic form and learned to see the sixteenth-century Venetian masters in new ways. In Parma he studied the sensuous color of Correggio (1489/1494–1534) and Parmigianino (1503–1540), as well as their graceful, refined figure repertory. Supported by one of his most important Emilian patrons, Ranuccio II Farnese, duke of Parma and Piacenza, Sebastiano went to Rome in 1691. There he studied works of the great seicento decorators, the Carracci, Pietro da Cortona (1596–1669), Giovanni Lanfranco (q.v.), Andrea Pozzo (1642–1709), and Luca Giordano (q.v.), refining his own skills as a decorator, colorist, and manipulator of light effects.

The importance of Alessandro Magnasco (q.v.) in Sebastiano’s development remains a point of scholarly disagreement. Some scholars argue for direct influence of Magnasco’s loose, rapid brushwork and elongated figures, while others see merely a tem-
peramental affinity. Initial contact between Sebastiano and the younger Genoese artist may have occurred as early as 1694 or perhaps later in Milan. Sebastiano’s nephew Marco Ricci (q.v.) is known to have worked with Magnasco and thus may have been a point of contact.

In 1696 Sebastiano returned for a brief period to Venice. While at work on numerous commissions, he resumed his study of the sixteenth-century Venetian masters, particularly Veronese (1528–1588). From about this time, Sebastiano’s works reveal careful exploration of Veronese’s pure color and tonal highlights, expressive use of light, compositional schemas, and richness of costume, and the assimilation of these lessons into an already mature personal style formed during earlier years of travel.

After 1700, Sebastiano’s fame was such that he was summoned to execute commissions in Vienna and in Florence. In 1713 he accompanied his nephew Marco to England, where he executed a number of major commissions, some in close collaboration with Marco. On the return trip to Venice in 1716 Sebastiano stopped in Paris, where he was accepted into the Académie Royale de Peinture. Back in Venice, the collaboration between Sebastiano as figure painter and Marco as specialist in architectural and landscape backgrounds continued and intensified during the 1720s. Sebastiano remained in Venice until his death in 1734 and never lacked for commissions from Venetian patrons or from such foreign rulers as the duke of Savoy and Emperor Charles VI.

Scholars of Venetian painting since von Derschau agree that Sebastiano played a pivotal role in the reform of Venetian painting around 1700, without which the later achievements of Tiepolo (q.v.) and the Guardi (q.v.) could not have come about. While Daniels, perpetuating older views, wrote of Sebastiano’s almost mindless facility, unabashed borrowings, and all too evident lack of formal education, recent Italian scholars have seen Sebastiano as embarked upon a conscious, programmatic reform campaign grounded in the careful reevaluation of the previous two centuries of Italian painting. As Pilo has pointed out, this tradition was not unknown to earlier Venetian painters, whose art in many ways anticipates developments after 1700. Sebastiano’s unique contribution is in his profound understanding of this tradition, particularly Veronese, acquired, as Zanetti recounted, through “rich gifts of beneficent nature, constant practice...and a certain ingenious sagacity.” Sebastiano assimilated the lessons of this tradition into his own personal pictorial style, in effect making them accessible to his contemporaries and successors. Among his most important contributions are the renewed interest in the painted surface, rich luminous colors with rational light effects, and the use of carefully balanced highlights and shadows in constructing ordered, spatially coherent compositions. Sebastiano also initiated a renewed interest in the narratively coherent disposition of figures, although, as his contemporaries acknowledged, he always lacked exactitude in drawing and representing the proportions of the human figure.
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1939.1.71 (182)

A Miracle of Saint Francis of Paola

1733
Oil on canvas, 84.9 x 35.2 (33 7/16 x 13 3/16)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-fine, plain-weave fabric. The warm yellow-white ground has a rough, pebbled texture and is exposed above the incised line that defines the arched top of the composition. The ground influences the overall tonality and texture of the surface design. The unfinished seraphim heads at the upper left were drawn directly on the ground with lines of semitransparent dark brown paint; it can be assumed that the entire composition was roughly blocked out in a similar manner. The thick, opaque paint was applied wet-into-wet, but without blending the individual strokes. These short, choppy strokes create a lively “brushed” surface texture without forming a heavy impasto. The shadows of the darker colors are built up with thick glazes. X-radiographs reveal that a reserve for Saint Francis’ outstretched arm was left in the white robe of the turbaned figure.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is present along the left and bottom edges. Small, scattered losses are concentrated at the edges, which are partially overpainted. The varnish has darkened slightly. A file at the Frick Art Reference Library notes that the painting was relined in 1929. The Gallery’s files report that Stephen Pichetto relined, removed discolored varnish, and restored the painting about 1931.
Provenance: Count Gregory Stroganoff [1829–1910], Rome.¹ (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome, 1927); purchased 1931 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.²


1939.1.72 (183)

The Exaltation of the True Cross

1733
Oil on canvas, 84 x 35 (33 x 13 3/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-fine, plain-weave fabric. The warm yellow-white ground has a rough, pebbled texture and is visible above the incised line that defines the arched top of the composition. The ground influences the overall tonality and texture of the surface design. The seraphim heads at the upper left are less finished than the others and are drawn with a darker brown than in the pendant. Otherwise, the painting technique is identical in the two sketches. X-radiographs reveal several pentimenti. The shadowy image of arms and a partial torso below the left arm of the cross suggests that the left angel was placed higher or that an additional angel was planned. The angel at the upper right originally gazed outward. The legs of the figure kneeling before the cross were shifted downward. Cusping is present only along the right edge. Small, scattered losses are concentrated at the edges. The heaviest retouching occurs over areas of abrasion in the background sky. The varnish has darkened slightly. A file at the Frick Art Reference Library notes that the painting was relined in 1929. The Gallery’s files report that Stephen Pichetto relined, removed discolored varnish, and restored the painting about 1931.

Provenance: Same as 1939.1.71.


Since their appearance in the settecento exhibition of 1929 in Venice, these two works have been recognized as sketches for Sebastiano’s altarpaintings in the church of San Rocco, Venice (figs. 1–2). Documents show that Sebastiano executed the bozetti and the altarpieces in 1733.³ On 26 February the building committee of the Scuola di San Rocco resolved to commission paintings for four new altars under construction in the church. According to its minutes, the committee felt hard pressed to find painters able to meet the institution’s traditionally high standards, established by the many works of Tintoretto (1518–1594), Titian (c. 1488–1576), and Pordenone (1483/1484–1539) in the church and the scuola. The committee praised the outstanding abilities of Sebastiano Ricci and Francesco Solimena (1657–1747), and commissioned two paintings from each.⁴ Records of negotiations with Sebastiano are lost, but it is known that he had completed his preliminary studies by 7 June, when the scuola paid a third party for preparation of the large canvases.³ On 26 August Sebastiano received the agreed price of 600 ducats for the Miracle of Saint Francis of Paola, which had been completed a month earlier, and on 27 September another 600 ducats for the pendant, the Finding of the True Cross.⁶

The scuola requested preliminary sketches from the painters to approve their treatment of the subjects.⁷ Solimena refused to provide the requested drawing, but Sebastiano apparently presented two sets of preliminary sketches, the Washington bozetti and a drawing of the Saint Francis still preserved at the Scuola di San Rocco. These offer insight into Sebastiano’s working methods and the patron’s role in the evolution of the final version.

The Washington bozetti establish the essential treatment of the theme, to which only minor alterations were made. The first shows Saint Francis of Paola (1416–1507), founder of the Order of Minims, reviving a dead child before assorted onlookers. It does not appear to represent a specific miracle from among the many which he performed throughout his life, but is rather a general reference to his gifts as a healer of the sick and wounded and reviver of the dead.⁸ Sebastiano depicted the saint in characteristic form, bearded, leaning on his staff, and attired in a coarse brown habit with a short hood. The onlookers stand for the crowds that greeted him wherever he went and include a lame man with a crutch behind the central group and a contorted figure in the foreground waiting to receive the saint’s healing touch.

The second bozetto depicts the adoration of the True Cross after its discovery and identification in
the Holy Land. According to one of several conflicting legends, Saint Helen, mother of the emperor Constantine, was led to a spot where three identical crosses were unearthed. At the suggestion of Bishop Macarius of Jerusalem, each cross was placed over the body of a dead man, who was revived only by the touch of the third, the True Cross. The real subject of Sebastiano’s composition is the cross itself, to whose miracle-working substance the viewer’s attention is directed by the actions and gazes of the figures. The newly revived man, clothed only in his funeral shroud, kneels in thankful adoration before the cross. Surrounded by her retinue at the right, Saint Helen touches the miraculous wood and looks up to a vision of angels bearing the instruments of the passion. The figures at the left represent those who guided Saint Helen to the site, possibly including Bishop Macarius. In the foreground a pick, a shovel, a length of rope, and the funeral litter lie abandoned.

The small number of minor pentimenti indicates that Sebastiano had already worked out his ideas for each composition and for the individual figures before beginning the Washington bozzetti. Drawings of full compositions and of figure groups are known throughout his oeuvre. Scholars generally consider the figure on the left in a drawing of two angels, now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, to be a preparatory study for the angel at the upper right of the Saint Francis bozzetto.

Both San Rocco compositions include several other figure types that recur in various permutations.
Sebastiano Ricci, A Miracle of Saint Francis of Paola, 1939.1.71

Sebastiano Ricci, The Exaltation of the True Cross, 1939.1.72
throughout Sebastiano’s oeuvre. One is the nude figure in three-quarter profile, seen from behind, that can assume a variety of characteristic poses. This figure appears in the San Rocco compositions as the kneeling man adoring the cross and as the lame man seated in the foreground before Saint Francis. The page entering with a pillow at the left of the True Cross harks back to Sebastiano’s Beheading of the Baptist of 1682. Likewise, the mother and child in the Saint Francis are practically a mirror image of a group in the thematically and compositionally similar Saint Maur healing a Child of 1726–1727 for the parish church of San Paolo d’Aragon. It is evidence of Sebastiano’s facility that he could repeat these stock figures and still produce a fresh and vital composition, and this in the three short months between receiving the commission (after 26 February) and beginning work on the large canvases (around 7 June).

The finished altar paintings differ from the bozzetti in ways that serve to simplify the composition, enhance the narrative impact, and correct the iconography, suggesting that at least some of the changes were requested by the patron. The San Rocco drawing includes the significant changes to the Saint Francis and was probably presented to the building committee for its approval. The putto directly above the saint has been turned to face the viewer and holds a gloriole that in the finished work will bear Saint Francis’ principal, identifying attribute, the word CHARITAS. A young man clasp- ing his hands with joy, presumably the child’s father, has replaced the towering horseman at right, who somewhat overshadowed the central group. A poignant group of a mother explaining the miraculous event to her young son has been inserted at the left. In the True Cross, the angel at the right no longer bears the crown of thorns, which, although an instrument of the Passion, does not relate directly to the Crucifixion or the discovery of the True Cross. Also, the architectural background has been removed and thus the whole composition appears closer to the picture surface. The gestures and gazes of individual figures have been modified to focus more directly on the cross, while the figure at the lower left looks outward to suggest a larger, unseen crowd.

For all these changes, however, the finished altarpieces do not depart significantly from the compositions laid out in the bozzetti. As Rizzi noted, the figures are arranged in different planes that obscure the recession into space, but nevertheless produce a coherently arranged scene. The compositions are lighter and more open than those of the altar paintings of Sebastiano’s earlier career and reflect his study of sixteenth-century altars after his return from England. Already the bozzetti reflect the balanced play of light and shadow and the carefully calculated arrangement of colors, with the darker central group set off by the colorfully garbed figures grouped around it. Saint Francis’ healing arm stands out forcefully in front of the white robe of the figure next to him; the reserve left in this robe for the saint’s arm in the Washington bozzetto indicates that Sebastiano had conceived this simple but ingenious device early in the evolution of the composition.

One of Sebastiano’s major contributions to the reform of Venetian painting around 1700 was to reawaken interest in surface texture through a freer, more fluid application of paint, which he learned from studying Veronese and Tintoretto, and perhaps also Crespi and Magnasco. This expressive facility with the brush is nowhere more apparent than in his bozzetti. Twentieth-century scholarship has often considered the bozzetti superior to the finished works, noting in particular the superb vitality, scintillating surface quality, and dewy, luminous color of the Washington pair. Sebastiano himself held similar views; he or his studio often produced copies of the bozzetti as well as reduced versions of the finished works, responding to the contemporary demand for bozzetti as works of art in their own right.

Of the other known versions of the San Rocco subjects, none is unanimously accepted as autograph. Two small paintings in the Pinacoteca Stuard, Parma, repeat the compositions of the finished altarpieces and are probably reduced copies made in Sebastiano’s studio. The small version of the True Cross in the Residenzgalerie, Salzburg, is closest to the Stuard version; judging from photographs, the attribution to Sebastiano is untenable. A cropped painting in the Galleria Strossmayer, Zagreb, is a reduced copy of the Venice Saint Francis.

Notes
1. According to NGA 1941, 169. This painting and its pendant do not appear in catalogues of Stroganoff sales or in those of the collection, which include only selected works. According to Muñoz 1910, Stroganoff amassed his collection c. 1880–1890 and bought many things from the sale of Cardinal Immenraet. It has not been possible to locate a cata-

2. The dates are given on the back of a photograph sent to the Frick Art Reference Library by Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi at the NGA on 1 July 1969. The painting and its pendant are documented in the Kress collection in 1932 by Frankfurter 1932, 30.


4. Rossi 1976–1977, 428–429, and Document i. The relevant documents are also discussed by Moretti 1978, 119. Solimena delivered only one painting, an Annunciation; the two additional figures added in the far distance at the right, just below the young man's elbow, may have some significance for the narrative, but in photographs of the finished painting are too unclear to be identified.


8. On the iconography of Saint Francis of Paola see Pietro Cannata in BBUSS 5: 1151–1182. The San Rocco composition does not derive from the illustrations or text in Donde 1671. No similar event is described in the lists of his miracles given by Perinezzi 1737. The miracle is not that depicted in Donde's plate VII, in which the saint traces features on a faceless baby using his saliva, as claimed incorrectly by Cannata.

9. A sketch made at the time of the commission and preserved among the scuola's records (Archivio di Stato di Venezia, discussed by Rossi 1976–1977, 430, n. 5) shows the placement of the altars in the church and lists the subject of this work as "il legno della Croce." For the accounts of the discovery and identification of the True Cross see Elena Croce, s.v. "Elena," in BBUSS 4: 992–996. For discussion of the historical and legendary Helen Croce see Dryvers 1992.

10. The older man next to the cross is probably Bishop Macarius, who is, however, usually depicted in a miter with full regalia.

11. Many examples have been assembled in Rizzi 1975. Shapley 1973, 129, and 1979, 1: 399, suggested that Sebastiano based this composition on Simon Voutet's (1590–1649) painting of the same subject for the church of the Minims in Paris, known in an engraving by Tornelat: Crelly 1962, fig. 89. Voutet's painting is entirely different in conception, however, placing the scene in front of monumental architecture devoid of onlookers.

12. Rizzi 1975, 177, no. 116, repro., with earlier literature. The similar angel on the right in the drawing corresponds more closely to angels in other late altar paintings by Sebastiano, such as Saint Louis of France Exhibiting the Crown of Thorns, documented to 1729 (Superga, Turin; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 43b, fig. 283), and Pope Saint Pius V, Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Peter Martyr of c. 1732–1734 (Gesuati, Venice; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 452, fig. 302). Similar angels, the forward leg exposed and drapery blown behind, appear in still other paintings, including the True Cross.

13. For the Scuola di S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, Bologna; known through an engraving in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris (Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 62, fig. 63), Von Derschau 1922, 16, observed that the nude body of the behead-ed Baptist and the servant at right are figure types that reappear in paintings throughout Sebastiano's career.

14. Rizzi 1989, no. 59; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 37a, fig. 38.

15. Rizzi 1989, 196; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, fig. 311. Daniels, 131, identified this drawing as an intermediate stage, rejecting the assertion by Zampetti 1969, 50, no. 24, that it was the "schizzo originale" for the painting in Venice.

16. The two additional figures added in the far distance at the right, just below the young man's elbow, may have some significance for the narrative, but in photographs of the finished painting are too unclear to be identified.


19. To paraphrase the description by Pallucchini 1960, 17, which is repeated in nearly every discussion of the Washington becchetti: "stupendi per il rorido colore luminoso, ricco di vibrazioni e sfumature, e per quel senso di allegretto frizzante della forma, d'une superba vitalità." See also Martini 1976, 37–51, for a brief discussion of the importance of Sebastiano's becchetti:

20. In correspondence of 1730–1731 with Count Alessandro Tassis in Bergamo, who had commissioned the Pope Gregory the Great Interceding for Souls in Purgatory for S. Alessandro della Croce, Sebastiano wrote that he considered the sketch to be the original, the altar painting the copy. Tassis wished to keep the becchetti for himself and for the small fee of ten zecchini Sebastiano agreed to make the small changes requested by the count and necessary to make this a finished work. The episode is discussed by Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 10.

21. See, for example, the various versions connected with the Assumption of the Virgin in the Karlskirche, Vienna, listed by Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 521.

22. Both 35 x 72 cm. Discussed by Tanzi 1988, 74, and by Cirillo and Godi 1987, 146, with previous literature and color reproductions. These small works are most often assigned to Ricci's shop; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 323, suggested an attribution to Gaspare Diziani. Fornari Schianchi 1980, 238, suggests rather implausibly that the Stuard Cross is autograph.

23. 113.5 x 73 cm. Residentegalerie 1980, 85, fig. 82. The only other reference to this painting is Pigler 1974, 1: 471. In both the Salzburg and Stuard versions the angel at the upper right holds a crown of thorns, as in the Washington sketch, but assumes a pose almost identical to that in the finished altarpiece, suggesting that the angel in the altarpiece may also have held a crown of thorns at some point. A photograph in the Witt Library shows the supposed "version" once in the Spiridon collection, attributed to Sebastiano in the Florence exhibition of 1922 (cat. no. 837, not reproduced; cited by Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 153) to be an entirely different composition, which depicts the placing of the cross on the body of the dead man.

24. 61.8 x 53 cm. Zlamalik 1976, 155–158. He dated the painting to 1732 and attributed it to Sebastiano. Rizzi 1989, 194, called it a copy.
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**The Last Supper**

1713–1714  
Oil on canvas, 67 x 104 (26 1/2 x 40 3/8)  
Samuel H. Kress Collection

**Technical Notes:** The support is a loosely woven, medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. The moderately thick ground is white. Infrared reflectography reveals that the architectural surround overlaps the figure composition, partially obscuring the figure exiting at the left and completely hiding a seated figure at the right. Minor pentimenti, such as small changes in the hand on the left side of the table and in the right contour of Judas’s right elbow, are also revealed by infrared reflectography. The composition inside the frame was blocked in with opaque, fluid paint in broad, flat areas. Slightly more full-bodied paint was applied over this underlayer for details, ornamentation, and architectural elements. Daubs of somewhat pastoé paint, quickly and surely applied, define the features, musculature, and clothing. The most prominent are daubs of white that constitute the brightest highlights. The application of the darker valued colors in thin layers or glazes contrasts with the thicker application of the lighter valued colors.

The presence of cusping, most pronounced at the top and bottom, suggests that while the tacking margins have been removed, the composition has not been cropped. Inpainting over the scattered abrasions and losses, most concentrated at the edges, has become discolored. The more severe damages in the lower-left volute and at the forward corner of the table may have resulted from tears in the original support. The varnish is moderately thick, but clear. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1940.

**Provenance:** Possibly the Manfrin collection, Palazzo Vener, Venice.1 (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence), by 1937; purchased 1939 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.2


**From the winter of 1711–1712 to the winter of 1715–1716 Sebastiano Ricci was in England, where he executed several commissions for members of the English nobility.3 Among these was the decoration of the chapel at Bulstrode House, the country seat of Henry Bentinck, 1st duke and 2d earl of Portland. The chapel, along with all its decoration, has since been destroyed. This commission is generally dated 1713–1714.4 As described by Vertue in 1733, the principal elements were a circular Ascension on the ceiling, the Salutation (Annunciation or Visitation) at the entrance end over the gallery, the Baptism on the right (from the altar), and the Last Supper on the left, plus “ornaments & the 4 Evangelists &c.”5

The Last Supper in Washington and at least one of the three versions of the Baptism (Metropolitan Museum, New York;6 Fogg Art Museum,7 fig. 1; and Horace Block8) can be identified as sketches for the chapel at Bulstrode. Both compositions have the same architectural surround and are conceived for placement above the cedar wainscoting of the chapel, recorded in a description of 1847.9 This wainscoting was probably about six feet in height, judging from contemporary chapels of the same type, such as that planned by James Thornhill (1675/1676–1734) for All Souls’ College, Oxford (before 1719) and Thornhill’s existing two-story chapel at Wimpole Hall (1724).10 Installed just above the wainscoting, the figure compositions would have been seen just slightly from below, which is the viewpoint adopted for the sketches. Despite this viewpoint, the table in the Last Supper is tilted forward as if seen from above in order to make it more visible to viewers standing in the chapel. The architectural elements at the top of the Bulstrode sketches are painted as if seen quite sharply from below, a device employed to make the chapel seem taller. Furthermore, the architectural surrounds are mirror images of each other, so that a viewer standing in the chapel would have seen into each at the same angle. Light strikes each scene from a different side, reflecting the actual light.
source in the chapel, the windows on the east wall. Also, the figure behind the table in the Washington Last Supper is identical in pose to Sebastiano’s self-portrait in the finished painting, as recorded in Vertue’s sketch: the right hand held across the chest, the left resting jauntily on the left hip. Allowing for differences in costume, both figures closely resemble the fleshy, almost corpulent self-portraits in Sebastiano’s other paintings of this period. Like Sebastiano, the servant with the platter at the far end of the table appears to wear a painter’s cap; he has been identified as Marco Ricci, Sebastiano’s nephew. The many extant versions of the Baptism suggest either that Sebastiano executed more than one sketch in connection with the chapel at Bulstrode, as he did elsewhere, or that additional copies of the sketches were made—by Sebastiano, his workshop, or other artists—in response to the popularity of the composition. The Washington Last Supper can be most closely associated with the Fogg Baptism (fig. 1) on the basis of their reported Venier-Manfrin provenance and certain shared characteristics. Similarities in technique are impossible to gauge from the available reproductions, but, even in photographs, it is apparent that the architectural surround of the Fogg Baptism extends over the figure composition as it does in the Washington Last Supper. In the other two Baptisms, the crouching figure at the left has been moved away from the architectural frame (his drapery now stops just before it), and the young girl entering at the right has been moved further back behind the frame. These other versions share additional details in common: the small wreaths below the monochrome relief on the left (absent in both the Washington and Fogg paintings), the spelling “fillius” rather than “filius” in the inscription, the presence of sketchily indicated trees behind the figures at the left, and similarities in figure poses. In the Block version, before it was cut down, the architectural surround once extended an additional bay on each side with portrait busts in round niches above empty pedestal brackets.

The technical evidence provides clues to the place of this painting in the progress of the commission. Judging from the small number of minor pentimenti, the composition appears to have been worked out prior to its execution on this fabric, probably either in a drawing or a preliminary oil sketch. It is somewhat more finished than other sketches from this period of Sebastiano’s career. The architectural surround was clearly added later, perhaps once Sebastiano had seen the site and determined the placement of each composition on the respective walls of the chapel. Only the need to establish the appropriate view into the architecture could explain why Sebastiano would allow the lateral faces of the arch to overlap his carefully devised figure composition, thereby obliterating one apostle at the right and leaving his companion talking inexplicably into space. Once made evident in the sketch, this problem would have been avoided in the finished work or in subsequent sketches, as suggested by the differences between the Fogg Baptism and the other, probably subsequent versions or copies.

The surviving sketches for Bulstrode indicate that the entire wall surface above the wainscot was painted, most likely in oil on plaster. The main figural composition was seen through a proscenium-like arch embedded in fictive architecture composed of elements also found in Sebastiano’s earlier decorative programs. The simple enframing arches and their supporting pilasters resemble those in the Hercules cycle in Palazzo Marucelli, Florence. The personifications on volutes and the square monochrome reliefs appear in the earlier decoration of the Oratorio del Seraglio, San Secondo (Parma). Indeed, most scholars see the quadratura of the Bulstrode sketches as essentially Emilian or Bolognese, recalling in particular the art of Sebastiano’s early collaborator, Ferdinando Bibiena (1657–1743). The use of an enframing arch reflects the generic relation between theater set design and quadratura painting, both of which use monumental architecture to define the perspective of the space inside the arch, thereby dwarfing the figures on the stage. By reducing or omitting this monumental architecture in the Bulstrode sketches, Sebastiano brought the narrative scenes closer to the picture surface and thus rendered them more immediate for the viewer in the small chapel. It is generally assumed that Sebastiano’s nephew Marco executed the painted architectural elements in the chapel; the sketches, however, appear to have been the work of a single hand, suggesting that Sebastiano designed the architecture as well as the figure composition.

No central programmatic conceit can be discerned for the chapel decoration beyond the selection of events from the Life of Christ for the principal narrative paintings: the Visitation over the entrance, the Baptism and the Last Supper on the side walls, and
finally the Ascension on the ceiling. The secondary elements in the surviving sketches relate directly to the main scenes. The monochrome reliefs in the Washington sketch depict the Agony in the Garden and the Kiss of Judas, events subsequent to the Last Supper. The corresponding reliefs on the Baptism appear to depict scenes from the life of John the Baptist, of which only the Beheading is clearly legible. The gilded female figures on the pedestals are clearly identified by their attributes as Divinity (with flaming spheres and forehead) and Obedience (with a yoke) in the Last Supper, and as Meekness (with a lamb) and Penance (with a scourge) in the Baptism.

The representations of the evangelists noted by Vertue were probably placed in the cartouches held up by pairs of angels to either side of the central arch or in the niches of the outer bays once shown in the Block Baptism. The Washington sketch depicts the confusion of the apostles following Christ’s announcement that one of them would betray him. In the midst of this tumult, Judas has risen abruptly and is about to leave the room at Christ’s command, clutching the money bag with the thirty pieces of silver received as advance payment for his betrayal. Sebastiano inserted himself, standing behind Christ, in the role of host or the owner of the house in which the Passover meal is being celebrated. The apostles flanking Christ, the sleeping evangelist, and the older, bearded Peter, like the dog in the foreground, have no basis in scripture, but are conventions in representations of the Last Supper in Italian painting.

In creating this complex scene, Sebastiano drew upon earlier depictions by Tintoretto, whose nine paintings of the Last Supper he would have known from his youth in Venice. The most obvious (and most often noted) borrowing from Tintoretto is the diagonally placed rectangular table which appears in scenes of the Last Supper in Santo Stefano, San Rocco, and San Giorgio Maggiore. The distinctive figure reaching backward for a bottle of wine is derived directly from Tintoretto’s early depictions of the Last Supper in Santo Stefano and San Trovaso; the figure bracing himself against the table depends upon a similar figure in another early Tintoretto in San Marcuola. Sebastiano’s enclosed interior is a simplification of similar rooms in Tintoretto’s Last Supper paintings; the evening hour of the Gospel ac-

![Sebastiano Ricci, Baptism of Christ, 1713/1714, oil on canvas, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, Cambridge, Massachusetts](image-url)
Sebastiano Ricci, The Last Supper, 1943.4.32
counts is indicated by steeply angled shafts of light falling across an adjacent, unornamented room and a colonnade derived from Veronese.

Scholars have been almost unanimous in noting the quick, “nervous” brushstrokes of the Washington Last Supper but have not agreed about the work’s significance within the evolution of Sebastiano’s style. D’Arcais sees it as the logical development of Sebastiano’s works in Palazzo Pitti (which she dates to after 1708) and thus an expression of the “new rocco language” developed by Sebastiano in Florence. Pilo sees the Bulstrode sketches as stylistically related to works of the 1720s, while Pallucchini and Rizzi characterize the paint handling of the Last Supper as a “tocco magnaschesco,” implying influence from a younger Genoese artist, Alessandro Magnasco, in the years just prior to Sebastiano’s English trip. It would be more precise to say that only the breaking up of form into individual, choppy strokes recalls Magnasco’s distinctive technique and contrasts with Sebastiano’s usually more fluid handling of paint. Nevertheless, here Sebastiano maintained his characteristic close attention to highlights and shadows in the definition of individual figures, particularly in the drapery. By carefully distributing these highlights and shadows in the composition, he created a flickering play of light across the surface. The effect must have been even more pronounced in the chapel, leading Vertue to praise the “great force of lights and shades.”

Notes

1. Shapley 1979, i: 400, listed only “Palazzo Venier,” while Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 153, gives “Venice, Palazzo Venier, Manfrin.” Neither offers any documentation. The Palazzo Priuli-Venier was purchased in 1787 by Count Giro-lamo Manfrin [d. 1801], a wealthy tobacco producer, who installed his art collection there. The painting does not appear in the Catalogo dei quadri 1856 or in the subsequent sales of Manfrin’s daughter Giovanna Platti (Sambon, Venice, 24–25 May 1870) or granddaughter Lina Plattis-Sardagna (Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 13–14 May 1897). On the collection’s history, see the prefaces to the sale catalogues and Tassi 1879, 191–192. Neither Tassini nor other nineteenth-century guidebooks mention significant art collections in the other Venier palaces.


3. Sebastiano’s English period is discussed by Daniels, “Ricci in England,” 1976, 68–74, with earlier bibliography and relevant sources. New documents have since been published by Moretti 1978, 110.

4. On the basis of two letters from Angela Pellegrini in Düsseldorf to her sister Rosalba Carriera (1675–1758) in Venice (published by Garas 1964, 131). On 7 October 1713 Angela mentioned a recent letter from England that placed Sebastiano at a “villa in the countryside” (possibly Bulstrode); on 9 July 1714 Angela reported that Sebastiano was having difficulty collecting payment from “my lord Portelant.” Shapley 1973, 127, and 1979, i: 400, followed Garas in dating the sketches to 1713, the paintings to 1713–1714; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 40, gave a more general date of 1713–1714. The project could just as easily have been completed in 1713, with a dispute about payment dragging on into 1714. On the other hand, the dispute could have involved the three rooms Sebastiano painted for Portland in London at Portland House (later Norfolk House, now destroyed).


6. 66 x 101.6 cm. Rizzi 1989, no. 36, color repro.; Christiansen 1982, color repro.; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 400, fig. 121.

7. 69.5 x 105 cm. Sold Finarte, Milan, 13 December 1989, lot 101, color repro.; now Fogg Art Museum; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 62, who gave the provenance as “Palazzo Venier, Venice” but with no documentation. The painting was previously referred to as the Drey version, for its previous owner, Paul Drey, New York.

8. 66 x 105 cm. Formerly Agnews, London. Exh. cat. London 1989, 36, repro. It was sold earlier by Henry Spencer & Sons, Retford, 13 November 1985, lot 144, repro. When at Spencer & Sons, the painting measured 67 x 130 cm. Vertical additions at right and left were subsequently removed. From photographs (NGA curatorial files) they appear to have been consistent in design with the rest of the painting, but possibly were added at a date later than the original canvas.


10. Wimpole Hall and the drawings for All Souls’ are illustrated in Croft-Murray 1962–1979, 1: 272–273, figs. 136–137. See also Allen 1985, 204–211.

11. Assuming the chapel was east-oriented. Its exact placement is indicated on unpublished plans of Bulstrode drawn by J. Wyatt in 1812 (London, RIBA), mentioned by Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 41, n. 1, who also placed the windows on the east wall based on Vertue’s account and the shadows in the becetti. The present reading of the becetti contradicts Pilo’s attempt (1976, 99, n. 159, following Martini 1964, 161, n. 46) to associate them with the (destroyed) church of the Cappuccine di Castello in Venice. Here, according to Zanetti 1771, 440, and 1733, 207–208, a Last Supper, a Baptism, and a Visitation were placed “n’alto della chiesa” or “nell’ordine di sopra.” This suggests placement above the cornice of the nave and thus would require steep di sotto in su in the figure composition as well as in the architecture. Pilo supported his dating of the Washington and related becetti to the 1720s with a comparison to similar sub-
jects in the chapel of the Crucifixion in Corpus Domini, Venice; Moretti 1978, 105–106, has since shown that the previously accepted dating of the Corpus Domini frescoes resulted from a misinterpretation of the sources and suggested a date in the 1710s. As known from Fragonard's engraving, the Last Supper in this chapel displays the steep di sotto in sù to be expected in frescoes placed on the high walls of a church (Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 506, fig. 349).


13. Especially in the Saint Paul Preaching, now in the Toledo Museum of Art. The self-portrait in the Marriage at Cana in the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, shows the artist in modern dress as in the finished work at Bulstrode. See also Sebastiano’s self-portraits in the Uffizi (Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, nos. 420, fig. 133; no. 124, fig. 134; and 90a–b, figs. 104, 106, respectively).

14. By Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 153. This figure resembles one in the Kansas City Marriage at Cana and in the watercolors after the destroyed Belluno paintings (Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, fig. 26). See also Scarpa Sonino 1991, 25.

15. Another Baptism in the collection of John Harris, London (61 × 68 cm; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 280), cannot be a preliminary sketch for the figure composition, as Zampetti 1969, 28, claimed, because it has a slightly indication of the architectural frame. Martini 1981, 479, n. 60, may be right to call it a copy. Minor details (the absence of trees at the left and the torso of the standing figure at the right) suggest that it is a copy of the Fogg version and not of the Metropolitan version as Martini suggested.

An Ascension in the Shipley Art Gallery, Gateshead, may relate to this group of sketches; however, it is not unanimously attributed to Sebastiano, nor can it be linked convincingly to Bulstrode. Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 112, lists the widely divergent attributions proposed for this work. Citing Simon 1974, no. 71, he points out that the dimensions of the sketch (100.5 × 75.9) correspond to those of the chapel (40 × 25 or 30 feet, i.e., 4:3) and that its height is equal to the width of the surviving sketches for the side walls. The width of the Horace Block Baptism before it was cut down (see note 8) suggests that the chapel was in fact longer than was indicated by the previously known, shorter sketches for the side walls.

16. For Sebastiano’s sketches and for the popularity of bozzetti, copies after them, or bozetto-like ricordi of the finished works, see 1939.1.71–72, especially notes 20–21.

17. Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 117, 153, considered the Washington and New York paintings to be the bozzetti for Bulstrode and the Fogg paintings to be a copy, even though he knew it reportedly shared a Venier provenance with the Washington Last Supper. He did not know the Block version. Pallucchini 1952, 78, who saw the Fogg Baptism but did not know the Metropolitan or Block versions, considered the Fogg and Washington paintings to be pendant sketches for Bulstrode. In photographs, the Block version appears to have a harder surface quality than the Metropolitan version.

18. Even to the naked eye, it is evident that elements of the figure composition in the Metropolitan version extend over the innermost pilaster of the architectural surround.

19. In the photograph, a seam is visible at the center of each pilaster, which in the other versions is the edge of the fabric.

20. For example, the Resurrection for Chelsea Hospital, London (Dulwich College Picture Gallery, London). See also the slightly earlier Hercules sketches for Palazzo Marucelli (Uffizi, Florence), the Venus and Adonis for Palazzo Pitti (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Orléans), and the Assumption of the Virgin for Clusone (Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, Mass.): Rizzi 1989, nos. 38, 25, 26, and 30, respectively, all reprod.). Too few technical studies of Sebastiano’s sketches have been carried out to determine whether the white ground of the Washington Last Supper is unusual in this period of his career. Later he used a thicker yellow-white ground (compare 1939.1.71 and 1939.1.72). The support could have been prepared by local assistants working in a shop run by Sebastiano and Marco, or have come to the studio already prepared (see 1970.17.132, notes 6 and 7).

21. The figure compositions of the Baptist and the Last Supper are similar and not necessarily intended for the left or right wall.

22. This technique was common in England, where the damp climate made true fresco painting unsuitable (Croft-Murray 1962–1970, 1: 275–276). Sebastiano employed this technique in the apse of Greenwich Hospital, but he used oil on canvas for some of his smaller decorative commissions. Thornhill painted in oil on plaster in the chapel at Wimpole Hall (see note 11 above).


24. Correctly identified by Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 153. Shapley 1979, 1: 400, suggested the Annunciation to Joachim and the Meeting at the Golden Gate, but these make no sense here.

25. The other scenes, including those once in the outer bays of the Block version, may show the Baptist Preaching or the Blessing of the Baptist (prior to his departure for the desert), but are too sketchily painted to be identified for certain.


27. Both angels are visible above the cornice in the once larger Block Baptism. The portrait busts, a bearded man on the left and a woman on the right, may reflect an earlier project for donor portraits. The program also included the Stoning of Stephen and the Conversion of Paul in the stained glass windows, executed after designs by Sebastiano and mentioned in the 1769 description (cited in note 5).

Christ's announcement of the Betrayal, as opposed to the institution of the Eucharist in the breaking of the bread, show Judas still seated at the table, clutching the money bag behind his back. Sebastiano also depicted the Last Supper in a slightly different room with Judas still standing at the table; this composition exists in several versions: Cloister of the Dinesse, Padua; Worcester College, Oxford; formerly Drey, now Blaffer Foundation (Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, nos. 288; 280, fig. 270; and 263, respectively). Another version was sold at Christie's, New York, 11 January 1989, lot 198, repro.

29. According to Mark 14: 12–16; Luke 22: 7–13; and Matthew 26: 17–19, Jesus sent his disciples into Jerusalem to seek out a house and ask its owner to accommodate their Passover celebration.

30. Aurenhammer 1959–1967, 12; Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 80. For Venetian examples see paintings of the Last Supper by Paolo Veronese (Brera, Milan) and his school: reproduced in Kaplan 1987, 51–62; and by Nicolò Bambini (Chiesa Parrocchiale, Morgaño; Pilo 1976, fig. 5). Aurenhammer 1959–1967, 15, suggested that such dogs, especially when gnawing on bones as this one is, represent the evil of Judas' deed.

31. As Sebastiano’s friend and biographer, Anton Maria Zanetti, recounted, when confronted with a new subject, Sebastiano would seek out the master who had excelled at that subject in the past: “Quando qualche soggetto veniagli proposto a dipingere ei sola era dire (ed io più volte l’udii) il tal Pittore pensò pur bene in questo caso: non si può far meglio; e quel pensiero seguendo con i modi suoi, felicemente quell’opera dipingeva, che in fine doveasi confessare essere sua; o al più dì poteasi che facea souvenire l’altro imitato Maestro” (Zanetti 1771, 439).


33. This figure also appears in S. Paolo handing a piece of bread to a beggar. It is not a “genre element” derived from Veronese, as Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 40, 153, suggests.

34. Pallucchini 1952, 78; Rizzi 1989, 128. For a synopsis of opinions on Sebastiano’s relation to Magnasco, see Pilo 1976, 42–45. Pilo accepted Pallucchini’s view that the two artists met in Florence in 1703–1705 and again in 1711–1712.
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Sebastiano Ricci and Marco Ricci

1961.9.58 (1610)

Memorial to Admiral Sir Clowdisley Shovell

1725
Oil on canvas, 221.1 x 158.8 (87 1/4 x 62 1/2)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Inscriptions
On fragment of entablature at lower left:
B. Ricci/ Faciebant
M.

Technical Notes: The support is a gauzelike fabric. The reddish brown ground shows through in areas of abrasion and in passages where it was used as shading. Over the uniform ground layer are additional layers, toned to conform with the related paint layer. For example, a light-toned layer is under the sky, a darker tone is under the foreground, and a yellow layer is under the shield. First the background was painted, using dark brown washes; next the sky, architecture, and foreground were added, leaving reserves for the subsequent execution of the sculptural and “live” figures. The exactness of these reserves suggests that the placement and poses of the figures had been established in advance. The tonal layers, contour strokes, and highlights were added last. The consistency of paint in the nonfigural sections varies from thin in the foreground to low impasto in the sky and architecture, and tends to be applied with blended strokes. The figures are painted with thick, fluid, unblended strokes. Pentimenti appear throughout the architecture, the sculptures, and in the trees. X-radiographs and infrared photographs reveal three figures in the foreground, at the bottom of the fountain, which were brought to a finished state and then painted out by the artist.

The original tacking margins have been opened and incorporated into the painted surface. Cupping appears along all but the top edge. The paint surface at the upper corners has darkened due to an optical effect of the dark ground showing through. The painting has extensive traction cracks, overall abrasion, and scattered losses. The painting was relined in 1953 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


The Memorial to Admiral Sir Clowdisley Shovell was commissioned from Marco and Sebastiano Ricci by the Irish opera impresario Owen McSwiny (before 1684-1754) as one in a series of “Monuments” to British or, more accurately, Whig “Worthies” who had played a role in the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which placed William III on the throne, and in the establishment of the ensuing social and political order. In Italy to escape his London creditors, McSwiny conceived this series as a speculative enterprise intended to secure profits from the sale of the paintings and subsequent subscriptions for engravings after them. He found an initial purchaser in the young Charles Lennox, 2d duke of Richmond, who acquired a number of the paintings for the dining room in his country estate, Goodwood House. Correspondence between the two men shows that McSwiny added subjects to suit the duke and adjusted the dimensions of the paintings to fit the dining room.3 With his own project in mind, McSwiny commissioned more paintings than the duke wished to purchase and, before the paintings left his possession, had reduced grisaille copies made.4 According to McSwiny’s prospectus announcing subscriptions for the engravings, beginning with an initial set of eight, the final number of “Monuments” was to total twenty-four. It is not known if all twenty-four were executed; presently twenty paintings are known in public and private collections or through copies.5

McSwiny’s correspondence with the duke indicates that the Memorial to Admiral Sir Clowdisley Shovell was originally intended for Goodwood. It was sent to England by October 1725, along with the Riccis’ other contribution, the Allegorical Tomb of the 1st Duke of Devonshire, now in the Barber Institute, Birmingham.6 Other paintings in the series had not yet been delivered, and so it would appear that the Riccis’ paintings were not installed until later. In a letter of 8 March 1726, McSwiny wrote of having increased the number of paintings to fifteen, seven on each side of the dining room and one on the end wall. The number was later reduced to eleven and then to ten, to accommodate the size of the room and the addition of a fireplace, but the Shovell retained its position at the center of one side wall, opposite the fireplace. It is thus slightly larger (origi-
Among the "British worthies" commemorated in the paintings sent to Goodwood was a single naval hero, Admiral Sir Clowdisley Shovell (1650–1707). After several successful campaigns against the Barbary pirates during his early career in the Mediterranean, Shovell distinguished himself in the capture of Gibraltar in 1704 and in numerous decisive victories against the French. In 1688 he was among the captains of the fleet who allowed the prince of Orange to land in England and assume the throne as William III. 8

 Appropriately for an admiral, the monument takes the form of a fountain and has as its principal theme "naval honors," as it was described by an informed contemporary, George Vertue.13 The figure seated on the sarcophagus is not Shovell himself, as is often thought, but a figure of Naval Victory, much as the equestrian statue in the Marlborough16 stands for victory in the field. The seated figure recalls Sebastiano’s own languid Scipios17 and is not based on any identifiable antique statue. In his right hand, the figure holds the principal symbol of naval victory, the "rostral column," studded with the rostra, or beaks, of captured ships. The other ships’ parts heaped around him are somewhat fanciful renderings of still other Roman naval trophies known from coins and reliefs.18 These include two ships’ beaks armed with points used to break holes below the waterline of enemy ships, one emblazoned with a menacing eye and the other with three daggers.19 Both the poop or stern, seen on the right with its long steering oar, and the similar prow on the left are decorated with the "chenicus" or goose head, to ensure that the ship would float like a goose.20 The two cylindrical objects may be either Roman anchors, which took the form of lead weights, or "assers," the battering rams that hung from the mast and were used to beat off attackers or to knock holes in enemy ships.21 In the relief on the base, victorious Neptune, brandishing his trident, rides triumphantly over the waves in a horse-drawn chariot; a bound figure sits behind him and a putto flies ahead bearing victory wreaths.22 The conch-blowing, winged men seated on dolphins are a variation on the tritons (usually half-man, half-fish) commonly found in fountains and other monuments connected with the sea, where they announce the triumphant arrival of Neptune, Oceanus, or a naval hero. The female figure holding a bowl and the other holding a sphere are...
doubtless intended as personifications of Shovell’s personal virtues, but cannot be identified on the basis of these single attributes.\textsuperscript{23}

The “Visitants” at Shovell’s tomb have come to honor him for his early exploits in the Mediterranean. The figures in the left foreground are slaves freed from the Barbary pirates, shown breaking their fetters and surrounded by barrels, oars, and other objects that identify them as seafarers. Shovell’s former adversaries, shown in “oriental” garb, are gathered in the right background. The lone oriental figure and the black child in the center foreground perhaps represent the honors paid the admiral by the descendants of those he had conquered. To the right, a young soldier in armor with the Order of the Garter is shown the tomb by his tutor, a plainly dressed old man. This group depicts merely a “young hero introduced” to a dead hero, to use the term applied by Vertue to the similar group in the \textit{Devonshire}.\textsuperscript{24} The shield held up behind this group bears a rough approximation of Shovell’s arms, placed here because there was no place for them on the tomb, where arms were placed in the rest of McSwiny’s series.\textsuperscript{25} The young draftsman and his companion in the right foreground translate the “young hero” theme into artistic terms and refer to lessons learned from sketching such monuments.

For each picture McSwiny assembled a group of artists consisting of a figure painter and specialists in landscape and architecture, to execute the individual parts of the composition. While they were bound to follow McSwiny’s instructions, especially in iconographic details, the painters were allowed to work in their accustomed manner.\textsuperscript{26}

In the case of the \textit{Shovell} and the \textit{Devonshire}, Marco executed both the architecture and the landscape, leaving carefully planned reserves for the figures to be executed by Sebastiano. Many of the architectural elements are found in Marco’s ruin paintings, such as the lion, the section of entablature, and the circular temple next to it (based on the so-called Vale of Tempe in Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli), not to mention the nearly leafless tree cutting across the composition at the right. The obelisk and the pyramid, although funerary monuments in their own right, play only a minor role in McSwiny’s series, and were probably included here simply as part of Marco’s repertoire of ruin elements.\textsuperscript{27} In marked contrast to the more open compositions of the other paintings in the series, Marco’s architectural elements are arranged in overlapping planes across the whole width of the picture surface, leaving only small glimpses into the distance. This is characteristic of his ruin paintings, except that in the \textit{Shovell}, and also in the \textit{Devonshire}, these elements are pushed farther back into space leaving a free area in the foreground for McSwiny’s numerous “Visitants.” In executing these small figures, Sebastiano employed some of his usual figure types, such as the male figure, often partially nude, seen from behind in twisted three-quarter profile. The central group of the old man and the young soldier with the young boys holding the shield is taken from the earlier \textit{Family of Darius before Alexander} in the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, with the poses slightly altered to fit the present context.\textsuperscript{28} Sebastiano’s figures have been seen as inspired by Bernini, particularly those on the tomb itself.\textsuperscript{29}

Although the artists must have provided at least a rough sketch or painted \textit{boceto} of the composition for McSwiny’s approval, only one preparatory drawing is known for the \textit{Shovell}. A sheet formerly with Yvonne ffrench, New York, shows the young man leaning on a pike at the center and his black servant. In the upper-left corner the main figures from the group of oriental visitors are lightly sketched in.\textsuperscript{30} Two grisailles are known for the \textit{Shovell}. They differ from each other in the forms of the trees at the right and the foliage on the broken architrave, the area where pentimenti are concentrated. Neither, however, corresponds to the painting, although the version formerly in the Ehrich Gallery, New York,\textsuperscript{31} is closer than that formerly on the art market.\textsuperscript{32} The \textit{Shovell} was included in the first set of nine engravings executed by French artists after drawings by Domenico Maria Fratta (1696–1763) and published in 1741. The engraving of the \textit{Shovell} by Nicolas-Henri Tardieu corresponds most closely to the Washington painting, suggesting that Fratta’s drawing was made from the painting itself or possibly from yet another grisaille.\textsuperscript{33}

Although replaced at Goodwood by the politically more important William III, the Riccis’ \textit{Memorial to Admiral Sir Clowdisley Shovell}, like their \textit{Devonshire}, was deemed worthy of being copied immediately after its arrival in England. On 29 March 1729 McSwiny complained to the duke that the paintings had been copied, contrary to their agreement, for Lord Bingley.\textsuperscript{34} A copy of the \textit{Devonshire} is presently in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London,\textsuperscript{35} while a copy
of the Shovell has recently come to light in the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes, Buenos Aires. These two paintings are nearly identical in size, suggesting that they were painted at the same time for the same patron, possibly Lord Bingley, although from photographs it appears that they were not executed by the same hand. Like the copies made in Italy for McSwiny, both lack the rounded top of the originals.

McSwiny objected to the copying of his paintings because he feared that the compositions would become known and disseminated in engravings before he could publish his own edition. Ultimately, however, McSwiny’s project for a set of twenty-four engravings remained incomplete due to problems of production and the declining topicality of his subjects. Furthermore, contemporary taste was coming to prefer ruin pictures that evoked a more generalized emotive response over those, like McSwiny’s, that made heavy demands upon the viewer’s learning and erudition.  

Notes
1. The circumstances of commission and the painting’s sale are discussed in the text. Martha Hepworth of the Getty Provenance Index provided an annotated copy of the 1814 Goodwood sale catalogue and has identified P. Hill “almost certainly” as the London dealer Philip Hill, about whom little is known (letter of 8 June 1990, NGA curatorial files).
2. Shapley 1973, 132, and 1979, 1: 404. According to a typed notation in the NGA curatorial files of a letter from David Koetser of 23 October 1954, Koetser acquired the painting through an agent working for an old English family whose name he would not divulge to Koetser.
3. Relevant passages from the correspondence between McSwiny and the duke have been published by Knox, “Tombs,” 1983, 228–235. Richmond met McSwiny in Italy while on the Grand Tour (1719–1722) and the two maintained close ties until the duke’s death in 1750.
4. The grisailles were made with the duke’s knowledge (letter of 11 October 1726, quoted in Knox, “Tombs,” 1983, 232) and may have served as intermediate models for the engravings. Twenty of these were included in the posthumous sale of McSwiny’s pictures. The remaining “Monuments” were sold to Sir William Morrice, another Whig.
6. On 13 November 1725 McSwiny informed Richmond: “Four of your Grace’s pictures I sent away about five weeks ago.” Knox, “Tombs,” 1985, 231, stated that the Shovell and the Devonshire (signed and dated 1725) were among these four. The Shovell was definitely in England by 8 March 1726 when McSwiny told the duke to observe its dimensions (see note 7).
7. Describing the placement of the pictures to the duke on 8 March 1726, McSwiny wrote: “That which stands in the Middle is 12: inches higher and proportionally broader, as your Grace may observe from that of Sir C. Shovell.” The William III on the end wall was to have been even larger. (Quoted in Knox, “Tombs,” 1983, 231, with a summary of the successive schemes for arranging the paintings in the dining room.)
8. As indicated by “a list of my pictures that are at Somer- est House” in the second duke’s hand cited by Daniels, Sebastian, 1976, 154, n. 5. This course of events explains why in 1747 George Vertue did not see the Shovell among the ten pictures in the dining room at Goodwood. Vertue’s description of Goodwood is published in the Walpole Society 26 (1937–1938; Vertue Notebooks 5), 149–150. See Knox, “Tombs,” 1983, 231, for the final arrangement.
9. There is no reason to assume, with Daniels, that the 1814 catalogue misattributed the William III by Valerian, Cimaroli, and Balestra to Sebastiano and Marco Ricci. Although cropped, this painting is a good 20 cm taller (241 cm) than the other pictures, all of which came from the side walls of the dining room.
10. Mazza 1976, 83–85. She quite rightly noted that McSwiny’s series has nothing to do with the generalized meditation on death found in Thomas Gray’s Elegy, as suggested by Levey 1980, 82.
11. The most common among the former are “Alexander at the Tomb of Achilles,” and “Augustus at the Tomb of Alexander.” See the examples cited by Pigler 1974, 2: 356; by Aris 1986, nos. 22, 26, 114; and by Croft-Murray 1962–1970, 2: 22. The place of McSwiny’s “Monuments” in the history of this theme, and of ruin painting in general, not to mention their relationship to contemporary literary traditions, remains largely unexamined.
12. In the Prospectus cited in note 5 above and in a letter of 27 September 1730 written from Milan to John Conduitt in London (quoted in Jaffé 1973, 10–11). McSwiny was writing in response to specific criticisms by Conduitt, for whom he was coordinating the execution of a similar “Monument to Sir Isaac Newton.”
13. The confusion engendered by the lack of a portrait image was one of the principal criticisms voiced by Conduitt (letter of 4 June 1730, quoted in Jaffé 1973, 9). He complained that a copyist working for Lord Bingley had mistakenly rendered Sir Clowdisley as a Roman admiral and the duke of Devonshire as a Brutus. On the copies, see text.
14. DNB 50: 159–161. The ironic nature of his death (shipwrecked, he washed ashore alive but was killed by an old woman for his emerald ring) was not known until thirty years after the fact, and thus after McSwiny’s painting had been executed. The monument in the painting bears no resemblance to the tomb in Westminster Abbey commissioned by Queen Anne from Grinling Gibbons (1648–1721): Whinney and Millar 1957, pl. 72b.
15. As cited in note 8. Vertue may have spoken with McSwiny or read a written explanation from his hand in the dining room at Goodwood.
16. By Donato Creti (q.v.), il Mirandolese, and Nuntio Ferraiuoli, Bologna, Pinacoteca Nazionale, 220 x 140 cm. Mazza 1976, fig. 21.
ITALIAN PAINTINGS

17. Especially in the position of the legs, as in the versions of the Continen
te of Scipio in Windsor Castle and in the Galleria Nazionale, Parma (Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, no. 147, color pl. 3, and no. 316, fig. 9, respectively).

18. For detailed discussion of Roman naval trophies, with engravings reprinted from earlier sources, see Montfaucon 1721–1723, 4: 104–109, pl. 35, 38. Ripa 1992, 483, s.v. "Vittoria Navale," also lists the elements depicted here.

19. Montfaucon 1721–1723, 4: 136, pl. 44.


23. A search through Ripa’s Iconologia provided no possible identifications. McSwiny seems to have invented his own iconography or used another source, as suggested by the Stanhope, in which the figure that Vertue identifies as "Wisdom" is an old man and not one of the variations on Athena/Minerva in Ripa’s "Sapienza" (1992, 391–395).

24. Vertue as in note 8. In the letter to Conduitt cited in note 12, McSwiny stated explicitly that in the Marlborough he intended to show nothing but a soldier come with his troops to honor the duke. Identification of the young man in the Shovell as the duke of Richmond, suggested by Shapley and others, is implausible. By the time the painting was in progress he had achieved his majority, completed the Grand Tour (1719–1722), and succeeded his father as the 2d duke (1723). Like his father, he became a Knight of the Garter, but not until 16 June 1726, well after the painting had been sent to England. Furthermore, he was not a navy man and would more likely have been depicted at the tomb of another hero.

25. For the arms, see Rietstap 1950, 4: 772; 5: pl. 305. The arms on the shield most likely represent the Riccis’ attempt to recreate arms they knew only from information provided by McSwiny. The arms may, however, have been added by a different artist. Technical evidence does not indicate conclusively when the arms were added to the shield.

26. According to Zanotti 1739, 1: 221–222, the painters did not understand the subjects, "che ne favole, ne storie sono," but still managed to create excellent works that are a testament to their abilities.

27. Other examples of paintings by Marco that use these elements could be added to those noted by Valcanover 1954, no. 24, and especially nos. 21 and 22, repro.


29. Mazza 1976, 90. Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 154, n. 2, called the tomb a cross between Bernini’s papal tombs and his Triton fountain in Piazza Barberini, Rome.

30. A photograph from the files of Sir Francis Watson is in the NGA Photographic Archives. According to Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, 154, ffrench had the drawing in 1963.

31. 34 x 21 in.; photograph in NGA curatorial files.

32. 85.5 x 54.4 cm (33 5/16 x 21 5/8 in.). Sold at Sotheby’s, London, 10 July 1992, no. 279, repro.; formerly Arcade Gallery, London, and Sotheby’s, 8 July 1964, no. 111.

33. The engraving measures 64.5 x 42 cm and is reproduced in exh. cat. London 1978, no. 29.


36. 216 x 148 cm, photograph in NGA curatorial files. It was given to the museum in 1975 by Mrs. Yvonne Necol de Fourville Rigoleau as Panini (letter of 6 February 1992 from Mauro Herlitzka, NGA curatorial files). This is the same painting advertised as Panini (85 x 58 in. or 215.9 x 147.3 cm) in IntSt 97 (September 1935), 85, repro., by the dealer Howard Young, New York and London.

37. The Buenos Aires Shovell is slightly shorter than the London Devonshire, but the former appears to have been cropped at the bottom. Kaufmann 1973, 1: 239, suggested that the London copy was the work of an Italian working in England, an English copyist, or possibly either the Ricci themselves or a central Italian artist (as suggested orally by Giuseppe Maria Pilo). The Buenos Aires painting, however, seems more faithful stylistically to the original. McSwiny later stated that the perpetrator of these unapproved copies was just a “framemaker” (Scarpa Sonino 1991, 55, n. 214). This angry comment is probably based on hearsay and should not be taken as evidence that Lord Bingley’s copies were necessarily executed by one artist.

38. For the general change in attitude toward ruins see Hunt 1981, 260–263.
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Pietro Rotari
1707-1762

Rotari was born in Verona on 30 September 1707, the son of a distinguished local physician and scientist. He received drawing lessons as a child from the Flemish engraver Robert Van Auden-Aerd (1663–1743), and from an early age produced etchings, mostly of sacred themes. He was apprenticed (1723–1725) to the Veronese painter Antonio Balestra (1666–1740), who greatly influenced his early style of history painting. In 1726 he traveled to Venice to study the city’s old master and contemporary paintings, in particular the works of Piazzetta (q.v.) and Tiepolo (q.v.). From 1727 to 1731 Rotari lived in Rome under the aegis of a Veronese canon, Francesco Biancolini, and studied with Francesco Trevisani (1656–1746). Rotari’s local reputation was established when one of his paintings was sent from Rome to the Accademia Filarmónica in Verona in 1728 and was praised by the noted scholar and author, antiquarian and dramatist, Francesco Scipione Maffei. He interrupted his Roman sojourn in 1729 to visit Naples, where he studied the works of Francesco Solimena (1657–1747) and other artists attached to the Bourbon court of Ferdinand IV. In 1734 he returned to his native Verona, and in the following year opened a private academy of painting.

Rotari forged these eclectic influences into a pretty, if bland, academic style that brought him modest success with commissions for churches and palaces in Bergamo, Brescia, Casale Monferrato, Guastalla, Padua, Reggio Emilia, Rovigo, Udine, Verdara, and Verona. At the same time he received numerous commissions from Italian patrons as diverse as Cardinal Silvio Valenti Gonzaga, the Palatine elector Karl Theodor, and Queen Louise Ulrike of Sweden. On 7 February 1749, Rotari, in recognition of his merit as a painter, was invested with the title of “Conte dal Senato Veneto” by the Venetian Republic.

In 1750 Rotari moved to Vienna to work for Empress Maria Theresa, producing mythological and religious paintings and portraits of the nobility. There he encountered the work of Jean-Étienne Liotard (1702–1789), and his own paintings began to reveal the clear, cold colors, porcelain surfaces, and smooth handling associated with the Swiss artist’s oils and pastels. Around 1752–1753 he was summoned to Dresden by King Augustus III, elector of Saxony and king of Poland, where he painted devotional works and portraits of members of the Saxon court. He developed there the genre upon which his fame rests: elegant and idealized bust- and half-length studies of attractive young women in ethnic or regional dress exhibiting a broad range of expressions such as melancholy, surprise, joy, and languor.

In 1755 Empress Elizabeth of Russia invited Rotari to Saint Petersburg and the following year appointed him court painter. He spent the remainder of his life working in the city and its environs for the imperial family and for the Russian aristocracy. He produced, together with assistants, hundreds of so-called character heads, bust-length images of young women displaying superficial psychological and emotional states. The most famous assemblage of these is the so-called Cabinet of the Muses at Peterhof, but Rotari’s works also graced other imperial residences at Oranienbaum and Gatchina, and noble houses like Arkhangelskoye, the Yusopov palace near Moscow.

Rotari is historically important as one of the main representatives of a group of Italian artists who worked in Germany, Poland, and Russia, spreading a sort of international rococo style in which Italian origin is often hardly recognizable. He instituted at Saint Petersburg a private academy of painting, and his most important Russian pupils were the painters Alexei Petrovich Antropov (1716–1795) and Feodor Stepanovich Rokotov (1735–1808). Rotari died at the imperial court at Saint Petersburg on 31 August 1762.
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A Sleeping Girl

1760/1762
Oil on canvas, 45.4 x 35.3 (17 1/6 x 13 7/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric with irregular threads throughout and is identical in thickness and weave to that of the pendant. A thick white ground was applied unevenly with a broad brush and toned with a reddish brown imprimatura. The paint was applied evenly in layers of medium thickness and brushed wet-into-wet. The background was laid in before the figure was painted, although the contours of the face and other passages were reworked as the design approached completion. The shadow at the corner of the sitter’s mouth has been adjusted and may originally have been larger; the prominent curl of hair may originally have been a completely circular lock.

The painting has been restretched onto a stretcher slightly larger than the painted surface. There are small losses and abrasion throughout. The varnish is very slightly discolored. About 1933 the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto, who also removed discolored varnish and restored the picture.

Provenance: Said to have been given by Empress Catherine II of Russia [1729-1796] to Prince Aleksandr Andreyevich Bezborodko [1747-1799], her secretary of petitions and later imperial chancellor; given by him to Prince Viktor Pavlovich Kochubei [1768-1834], Russian diplomat and statesman; (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome); purchased 1932 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.

A Girl with a Flower in Her Hair

1760/1762
Oil on canvas, 45.8 x 35.4 (18 x 13 7/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric with irregular threads throughout and is identical in thickness and weave to that of the pendant. A thick white ground was applied unevenly with a broad brush and toned with a reddish brown imprimatura. The oil paint has been applied evenly in layers of medium thickness and brushed wet-into-wet. The sequence of the paint layers corresponds to that of the companion: the composition was blocked in and a brown imprimatura applied to the area designated as background; the figure was painted wet-into-wet, with delicate blended brushstrokes in the face and broader handling for the costume; the flower and details of the face were completed last and impasto highlights added as required. Examination by infrared reflectography suggested that the composition was laid out with paint containing carbon black pigments. It also revealed that numerous compositional changes were made during the evolution of the final design: the sitter originally leaned against what appears to be the back of a chair; her bottom lip was originally lower than its present position; her hand was added after the costume was completed.

The painting has been restretched onto a stretcher slightly larger than the painted surface. There are small losses and abrasion throughout, which have been extensively inpainted. The varnish is very slightly discolored. About 1933 the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto.

Provenance: Same as 1939.1.107.

On 15 July 1755, Empress Elizabeth of Russia invited Count Pietro Rotari to Saint Petersburg, offering 1,000 golden rubles for the journey. The artist arrived in the city in May 1756 and resided there as court painter until his death in 1762. Although he painted a few altarpieces for the chapels in various royal residences and portraits of the empress, her entourage, and various nobility, his Russian sojourn is best remembered for his paintings of pretty girls and winsome youths that decorate the walls of the country palaces around Saint Petersburg. The genre of single heads and bust-lengths in oils, chalks, and pastels was developed in Italy early in the eighteenth century by artists such as Benedetto Luti (1666-1724) in response to new ideals of charm and intimacy. By the 1740s these pretty and fanciful heads of girls and young women were popular throughout Europe and had become a significant feature in the repertory of artists like Ubaldo (1728-1781) and Gae- tano (1734-1802) Gandolfi, Tiepolo, Piazzetta, Rosalba Carriera (1675-1758), and Boucher (1703-1790).

Rotari’s paintings of this kind are of two types: bust-length têtes de caractère purporting to show the various psychological states or passions of the sitters, who are shown variously smiling, weeping, frowning, and flirting; and half- and three-quarter-length figures in a variety of attitudes and dress. The women in Rotari’s paintings occasionally engage in activities like sewing or reading, but usually they gaze directly at the viewer with coy or coquettish expressions, and they always possess a sober and graceful mien. They are frequently characterized by their costumes and accessories as representatives of a type, a “city-dweller,” or “peasant,” or native of a particular province or country. His use of props (fans, masks, handkerchiefs, muffls), subtle facial ex-
pressions, twists and turns of the head, and different psychological states create a remarkable relationship between the viewer and the viewed, the spectator and the painted image. He unified his paintings with a cool palette of gray-greens, pinks, browns, and blacks, at the same time varying widely the surface between the viewer and the viewed, the spectator goro^jianka, or townswoman, among Rotari's paintings. The psychological states create a remarkable relationship through the effects of his paintings, alternating between a porcelain-like finish imitative of Liotard and, as in the present pair, feathery brushstrokes and a chalklike surface reminiscent of the pastels of Rosalba.

Although these fanciful paintings are not portraits per se, even in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the models often retained their identities. As Nikolenko observed, an anonymous Russian description of local sites of interest, dated 1847, noted that the head of a so-called goro^jianka, or townswoman, among Rotari's paintings at Oranienbaum is a portrait of a famous local beauty, Mlle. Melnikov, and that two girls in court dresses are the daughters of one Commandant Förster. Another nineteenth-century source alleged that Rotari toured the fifty provinces of Russia to show the empress how rich her empire was in beautiful women, but it has also been suggested that the artist employed only eight individual models, dressing them in different costumes and setting their poses in the manner of a modern fashion photographer.

The empress Elizabeth presented fifty of Rotari's têtes de caractère to the newly founded Russian Academy of Art, but it was only after the artist's death, when Empress Catherine II acquired the majority of his Russian paintings and installed them in various country palaces around Saint Petersburg, that his work achieved widespread repute. Catherine dispersed his pictures of pretty young girls among court favorites (who in turn passed them on to others, enabling paintings like the National Gallery's pair to reach the European and American art markets in the present century) and placed them in her residences like Gatchina and the so-called Chinese Palace in the park at Oranienbaum. Commissioned by Catherine in 1762 from the Italian architect Antonio Rinaldi (c. 1710–1794), the palace contains a group of twenty-two pictures of young girls set into molded frames and linked with garlands and leaf sprays on the walls of a "Portretnaya," or portrait room, a typical installation of Rotari's work.

The largest collection of Rotari's fanciful heads was installed in 1764 in a hall of the great palace of Peterhof by Jean-Baptiste Michel Vallin de la Mothe (1729–1800). The room was originally designed by Bartolomeo Carlo Rastrelli (1675–1744) during his reconstruction of the palace, and Rotari's portraits provided the perfect decorative complement to the curvilinear and irregular forms of the white-and-gold boiserie. This apartment, known as the Cabinet of the Muses and Graces, was a stupendous affair in which 368 of Rotari's female heads adorned the walls from top to bottom, the canvases separated only by thin strips of gilded frame.

The effect of the Rotari gallery at Peterhof is recounted by a visitor to the palace early in the nineteenth-century, an English physician, A. B. Granville, whose account underscores the seductive nature of these "young females of every class and description" upon the contemporary spectator:

It is supposed, that having been sent for to assist in decorating the palace of Peterhof, while in progress of being erected, he had been ordered to paint all the female beauties of the time, which he could find in and about the capital, no matter from what class of people he drew his originals. The artist has acquitted himself admirably, but there is poison in most of these portraits; for although designed and clad in the strictest sense of the word and according to the most approved principles of decorum, they produce in reality, a contrary effect on the beholder. This effect is due to the wanton attitude and sensual or voluptuous look given to the female figures.

The National Gallery's female heads epitomize Rotari's work for the empress Elizabeth and, in fact, derive from prototypes in the imperial residences: the original model for the image of the young woman wearing a flower is a painting at the left of the fireplace in a room adjacent to Catherine the Great's dressing room in the palace at Oranienbaum; the painting of the sleeping young woman wearing a Russian fur cap repeats almost exactly a composition in the Cabinet of the Muses and Graces at Peterhof.

The relationship of the Washington paintings to these originals, or prototypes, is not at all clear, however. Rotari unquestionably employed assistants in the execution of the hundreds of paintings he produced for the Russian court that the empress Catherine acquired after his death. The quality of the present paintings is comparable to what is at present generally accepted as Rotari's own work in this genre, but the possibility of workshop assistance or collaboration cannot be excluded.
Pietro Rotari, *A Girl with a Flower in Her Hair*, 1939.1.108
A half-length workshop variant of the painting of the sleeping girl suggests that the bust-length composition at Peterhof is itself possibly a reduction of a lost original in a different format.\(^{13}\) Several versions of the Washington painting, identical except for variations in the costume, exist in varying degrees of quality.\(^{14}\)

Notes

1. In notations in the Samuel H. Kress Foundation records, NGA curatorial files.

2. The date of purchase is often given as 1939, which is, however, the date the painting entered the National Gallery. Roberto Longhi’s expert opinion on the back of a Kress photograph (NGA curatorial files) is dated November 1932. Frankfurter 1932, 10, repro. p. 7, documents the painting in the Kress Collection by December of that year.


11. Réau 1922, 60, suggested the collaboration of Rotari’s Russian pupil, Feodor Rokotov.

12. Excepting a common twentieth-century provenance, there is no reason to conclude that the Washington pair once belonged to a series that included a pair of fanciful female heads of identical dimensions and format in the El Paso Museum of Art (Shapley 1973, 157, figs. 300-301).

13. Galerie Helbing, Munich, cat. 41, 1903, no. 29, as Louis Toqué, 64x46 cm.

14. Foto Boccardi, 55 via delle Carrozze, Rome, 36x47.5 cm; Sotheby’s, London, 4 April 1984, no. 198, 45x35 cm (sold previously 9 July 1975, no. 104); Palais Galliéra, Paris, 11 March 1975, no. 36, 43x23.5 cm (sold previously 14 June 1974, no. 36).

References (1939.1.107 [218])

1932 Frankfurter: 10, repro. 7.

1941 NGA: 176.


1969 Nikolenko: 195, fig. 2.

1972 Fredericksen and Zeri: 179.

1973 Shapley: 157, fig. 298.

1975 NGA: 310, repro. 311.


1985 NGA: 356, repro.

References (1939.1.108 [219])

1932 Frankfurter: 10, repro. 7.

1941 NGA: 176.

1965 NGA: 117.

1969 Nikolenko: 195, fig. 1.

1972 Fredericksen and Zeri: 179.

1973 Shapley: 157, fig. 299.

1975 NGA: 310, repro. 311.


1985 NGA: 356.

Bernardo Strozzi

1581/1582 – 1644

Born to impoverished parents in Genoa, Bernardo Strozzi trained under Pietro Sorri (1556-1622), a Sienese imitator of Barocci’s manner, who was in Genoa around 1595-1597. Strozzi entered the Capuchin order in 1599 as a novice and became a brother in 1600, an obligation that, though brief, was to haunt him his entire career. By 1609 Strozzi was granted a dispensation to leave the monastery when his mother fell ill, leaving his unmarried sister without support. He immediately devoted himself full time to painting and to various projects as an engineer for the port of Genoa. Among his most important commissions were the *Madonna della Giustizia*, c. 1620, for the Palazzo Ducale (now Louvre, Paris), the celebrated fresco cycle for Luigi Centurione’s Villa at Sampierdarena (1623-1625), and the ill-fated and incomplete decorative cycle planned for Centurione’s palace on the Strada Nuova in Genoa (also 1623-1625). At the same time, he produced highly regarded portraits, altarpieces, and genre scenes, among which *La cuoca* (Palazzo Rosso, Genoa) is one of the most original.

Strozzi, who was also called “Cappuccino,” continued as an independent artist through the 1620s, until, after his mother’s death in 1630, the brothers of San Barnaba demanded that Strozzi complete his
obligation to the Capuchin order. In 1630, Strozzi was brought before the procurator of the order who denied his requests to become a canon regular of the Lateran (the Augustinians of San Teodoro) and ordered him to return to the Franciscan Minorites. Despite safe conducts and extensions of Strozzi’s dispensation, which came through the intervention of the Roman Curia and the Genoese senate, he appears to have had to choose between imprisonment and flight. The date and circumstances of his departure for Venice are hotly contested. Beginning with contemporary biographer Raffaele Soprani’s account (1674), Strozzi was believed to have escaped incarceration by a clever ruse and an even cleverer disguise. Alternate versions of his controversial departure center on either a bitter struggle between lay and ecclesiastical powers in Genoa or upon the jealousy and enmity that existed between Strozzi and his imitators. Whatever the case, recent discoveries of family documents place the artist in Genoa as late as 1632. These records also confirm Strozzi’s close connections with his sister (in whose will he is mentioned) and with his pupils/collaborators Giuseppe Catto and Giovanni Francesco Cassana (both active mid-1620s–c. 1640s). Catto married Strozzi’s sister and the latter eventually accompanied Strozzi to Venice, where the artist hoped to avoid the strict censure of the church. In July 1633, Strozzi requested and was granted a safe conduct by the Savio della Serenissima on the basis of his being “persecuted” by the papal court in Rome.

Within two years, Strozzi rose to a position of celebrity and esteem, as he was granted the title of “Monsignor” (and known more popularly as “Prête genovese”). His Venetian patrons included the doge Francesco Erizzo—whose portrait Strozzi must have painted soon after his arrival—the patriarch Federico Corner, and at least two members of the Grimani family, as well as musicians and poets such as Claudio Monteverde, and Giulio and Barbara Strozzi. Bernardo Strozzi also received important public commissions for allegorical figures in the Biblioteca Marciana, altarpieces in San Niccolò da Tolentino, and a ceiling fresco for the Chiesa degli Incurabili. He finished his career as he began it, working both as painter and engineer.

Strozzi’s style marks an important shift in Genoese taste and sensibilities, and his innovations are not restricted to his highly individualized blending of color or his signature brushwork and impasto. Indeed, Strozzi assimilated not only the lessons of Caravaggio’s (1571–1610) naturalism and directness, but also the elegance and compositional sophistication of Van Dyck’s (1599–1641) Genoese portraits, with which he was clearly very familiar. From these seemingly disparate and incompatible elements, Strozzi forged a distinctive style that found a wide audience and many imitators. Soprani listed Giovanni Andrea de’Ferrari (1598–1669?), Antonio Travi, also known as “Sestri” (1608–1665), and a “Carlo,” among Strozzi’s students. In addition to Catto and Cassana mentioned above, Strozzi was copied by numerous emulators who are now largely unknown.
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1961.9.41 (1403)

**Bishop Alvise Grimani**

1633 or after
Oil on canvas, 146.7 x 95.1 (57 3/4 x 37 3/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

**Technical Notes:** The support consists of a coarse, plain-woven fabric to which a narrower strip of similar fabric about 10.2 cm wide was joined by a vertical seam at the right. The fabrics were evidently sewn together before the painting process began. The ground is a moderately thick layer of warm gray with a second tan layer under the figure, the miter, and the table. The paint was applied in opaque layers that range in consistency from full-bodied paste to fluid semitranslucent paint in areas such as the tablecloth. Details were added with more fluid paint over the dry underlayer. The hair was loosely brushed in as a final single, thin, opaque layer. The damask pattern in the greenish-gray habit was built up of thickly applied swirls in the same color to create a relief pattern. The pattern and embroidery of the miter were freely brushed in with sweeping strokes of color followed by lines made with a small hard object like the handle of a brush, which exposed the tan underlayer. The white lace was painted over a strip of very dark gray paint. A triangle of dark brown paint extends approximately 25 cm along the top and about 15 cm down the left side. The left side of the collar was originally brushed in wider and spread farther from the center opening.

Although there is a lack of cusping, the composition does not appear to have been cut down. Air-path x-ray
fluorescence spectroscopy suggests that the paint used for the mozzetta contains smalt as well as smaller amounts of vermilion and lead white. The present gray-green color is due to discoloration of the smalt. There is extensive inpainting in the red tablecloth, the shadows of the right hand and tablecloth, and in the background to the right side of the figure from elbow to mid-thigh. Inpainting in the lower portion of the right side of the robe and throughout the background presumably compensates for abrasion. There is a fabric insert below the bishop’s right hand. The considerably discolored varnish is thicker over the darker areas of the picture. Conservation files record that the painting was relined and underwent slight restoration in 1947 by Stephen Pichetto.


Despite confusion over the author of Alvise Grimani earlier in the century, when it was sold at Christie’s as a Van Dyck, the painting is now universally accepted as one of the best of Bernardo Strozzi’s portraits. The name, nationality, and rank of the sitter were not, however, as easily determined, and the cleric has variously been called a Spanish cardinal, a Medici bishop, or, more ambiguously, a cardinal archbishop.

The identity of the bishop was established by Suida when he catalogued the painting into the Kress collection. At that time, he transcribed an inscription from a copy, which read “[Al]oisius Grimmanus [Episcopus Bergomi].” More recently, an inscribed copy of the painting (Antiquario Attilio Oddone, Genoa) has come to light, in which there are no abbreviations to the Latin. This latter copy shows a wider composition than the National Gallery’s picture, one that includes the entire bishop’s miter, the inscription, and extensive red drapery across the upper and right borders, yet the composition is cropped by several inches along the entire base. The copy was apparently enlarged on the left side at approximately the midpoint of the miter, which is also the point at which three letters were missing from each line of the inscription on the copy Suida knew. It seems plausible, therefore, that the Genoese copy is the one Suida had seen in a photograph. The addition could then be a relatively recent restoration or possibly a recovered piece of fabric that had been folded around the stretcher.

Since there is no cusping along the cut edges of the National Gallery’s painting—which suggests that it, too, may have been cut down—one cannot easily determine the format that Strozzi originally intended. During the recent technical examination, it was discovered that the National Gallery portrait comprises two pieces of fabric that were joined from the beginning: the main body and a small, 10.2 cm strip at the right. Yet even this does not explain why there are such unusual discrepancies between what was added and what was subtracted in the copy, nor does it explain why Strozzi cropped the miter. The copy may, however, provide other information regarding the National Gallery’s portrait.

The painting of Alvise Grimani has suffered losses in the background and the tablecloth, and, most significantly, a color change in the mozzetta (short cape) from what may have been a violet or bluish purple to a more neutralized greenish gray; only the buttons and border are now red. If Grimani followed the rules of the day, his mozzetta should have been violet or black. The Genoese copy, by contrast, shows the mozzetta as a vivid red. It should be noted that colors for bishops and clerics were prescribed but not generally enforced before the eighteenth century. They were also limited only in the materials that they could use; silk, for example, was reserved for the pope and the cardinals. Whereas the damask pattern on the National Gallery portrait suggests that Strozzi was painting silk, the miter is clearly that of a bishop. The copy, though somewhat abraded, lacks the damask pattern, and its surface resembles velvet more than silk. In both cases the alb imitates the stiffness and translucency of linen, which is edged by lacework. The habit in both pictures is probably a generic reference to the proper attire of a mid-seventeenth-century bishop, but the very specific pattern of lacework at the base of the alb resembles the dress of the canons regular. If this is true, perhaps Strozzi shared more in common than a simple commission with his patron, for it was to this order that the artist had applied for transfer in 1630.

Similar links between Strozzi and his Venetian pa-
trons have been elaborated by Ellen and David Rosand. In their study of Strozzi’s contemporary portraits of poets, musicians, and clerics in the Accademia degli Incogniti, they suggested that Strozzi may indeed have had close contacts with Venice well before he moved there. They contended that the Venetian Don Andrea Fossa, visitor of the Augustinians and respondent to Strozzi’s supplications to join the order, provided the artist’s entree into the upper echelons of Venetian society. As mentioned above, immediately upon arriving there Strozzi received important portrait commissions from Doge Francesco Erizzo (Accademia, Venice; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), Cardinal Federico Corner (Museo Correr, Venice), a procurator from the Grimani family (Accademia, Venice), Claudio Monteverde, and Giulio Strozzi (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford). He also worked on major public commissions for the Biblioteca Marciana and several churches, including the Incurabili’s Invitation to the Wedding Feast (now largely destroyed).

Alvise Grimani fits comfortably with the other portraits in this group on the basis of its composition, which lies between the very late Genoese Portrait of a Bishop (Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini, Genoa) and the Portrait of Cardinal Federico Corner. In fact, the former is nearly a mirror image of the figural pose of Alvise Grimani. All three works share the same handling of paint, especially the folds and impasto highlights of the alb. The brilliant brushwork on Corner’s mazzetta, which evokes the shimmer of watered silk, hints at the complexity of the damask pattern that formerly shone on Grimani’s cape.

Beyond the stylistic similarities to contemporary works, there are sound historical reasons to date Alvise Grimani to about 1633. Grimani (d. 1656), like many of the luminaries in his venerable noble family, first served a number of political posts in Venice and was several times elected to the Savio dei Dieci. In 1633 he was appointed bishop of Bergamo, a terminus post quern for the commissioning of the portrait. The proximity to Van Dyck’s compositional manner and the controlled, yet increasingly loose, brushwork point to the earliest possible Venetian date. Thus there is little reason to doubt that Strozzi’s portrait was meant to commemorate Grimani’s recent appointment.

As the Rosands have argued in their study of the portrait of Barbara Strozzi, Bernardo’s connections to the city of Venice almost certainly predate his ar-
rival there in 1633. Could it be possible that Strozzi had developed a special relationship with Grimani in his capacity as a member of the Savio dei Dieci? Alternatively, might Strozzi have turned to Grimani in his capacity as a bishop, particularly if he was, as suggested here, a canon regular? On 20 July 1633, Bernardo Strozzi petitioned the Savio dei Dieci for a safe-conduct in Venice, asking that they grant him “rifugio delli oppressi et asilo della liberta.” Thus, the recently elevated Alvise Grimani could have been one of the “most noble protectors” Strozzi garnered when he fled the oppression of Genoa for the promised freedom of Venice.

Notes
1. In the copy (see below, note 9) this may have been interpreted as a curtain. Also, there is no evidence of a tassel having been present in the right background, as seen in the copy.
2. The catalogue gives no dimensions, but describes the picture as a “portrait d’un évêque, représenté en pied, de face, grandeur nature, tenant un livre d’heures.” Although no inscription is mentioned, this could also be the copy now in Genoa (see note 9). Many of the items in the sale came from the Grimani collection, as the last member of the Grimani family had married a Morosini in the eighteenth century, as noted in the introduction to the catalogue and by Levi 1900, lv.
3. No. 676 in the French edition of the catalogue. Both catalogues gave incorrect dimensions (187 x 185 cm or 78 x 53 in.).
5. According to a note from Silberman (NGA curatorial files), the painting was in the Royal Palace, Budapest, until it was sold at auction in 1868; it subsequently passed to Count Ambroszy-Migaszy, Budapest, before being brought to the United States at an unknown date. It has not been possible to locate sales or other catalogues for these collections, and this information remains unverified.
7. See the references in the provenance above. In the Christie’s and the American Art Galleries sales, the bishop is called a cardinal and the cardinal, an archbishop, respectively. In the Christie’s sale, he is even identified as a Medici prelate. This latter reference, never pursued, may perhaps be more than one of superficial resemblances. When Paul Mitchell examined the frames in the National Gallery’s collection, he remarked that the frame on Alvise Grimani—with its gadrooned border, cartouches, and corner masks—relates to other examples of Medici provenance in the Pitti Palace (Mitchell report, A21, in NGA curatorial files).

If, however, the National Gallery’s painting can be traced to the Morosini sale in 1894, the links to the Grimani fami-
ly would be sealed (as in note 2 above). Together with the evidence of the inscription on the copy discussed below in the text, the provenance suggests a Venetian and not a Florentine history.

8. Suida in Kress 1951, 142. Though Suida acknowledged that he was working from an old photograph, he did not give a source or collection. This reference was erroneously read by Mortari 1966, 193, as having been found on the National Gallery's picture, an error that continues to be repeated.

9. 134 x 109 cm. Oil on canvas. Photograph in NGA curatorial files. Bolaffiarte 7, 64 (November 1976), 9, repro.

10. According to an unsigned note in the curatorial files, someone suggested the possibility that the copy Suida had seen might be the same as the one reproduced in Bolaffiarte (see note 9), that is, the Oddone picture. In this note, the author also indicated that the strip at left in the Genoese copy was definitely added later.

11. X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy by Lisha Glinsman suggested the use of small, vermilion, and lead white. The proportion of vermilion was small, so it very well could have been violet.

12. Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 3: text below fig. 217. Pisetzky also commented on the mozzetta (mantellina), which was reserved exclusively for popes, cardinals, and bishops. The color of the bishop’s mozzetta around the time that Strozzi painted Grimani should have been violet or black; nonetheless, each order could preserve its color in the short cape. By the end of the seventeenth century there were mandates that forbade all clerics below the rank of cardinal to wear anything but black. For further information and bibliography, see Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 3: 229–234.


14. These same canons also wore a mozzetta, though with a larger hood. There were a number of monasteries belonging to the Canons Regular of Val-Vert throughout Italy. See the discussion in Histoire des ordres monastiques 1714–1719, 2: 349–354, and especially the illustration facing 349. Strozzi had applied to the canons regular of San Salvatore: Barzazi 1981–1982, 50, 55–56, 61.

15. It was well known at the time that the canons regular of Saint Augustine were a less strict order than the ascetic Capuchins. See especially the revisionist documentary history of Strozzi’s trial in Genoa and his departure for Venice by Carpaneto da Langasco 1983, 10.

16. Rosand and Rosand 1981, 249–258. They illuminated the wider circle of academicins and intellectuals with whom Strozzi was associated during the last twelve to fourteen years of his life, with particular emphasis on Giulio and Barbara Strozzi.

Just after their article went to press a series of documentary studies was published on the occasion of the four hundredth anniversary of Strozzi’s birth. See biography for the publications between 1981 and 1983, and Belloni 1988, 48–51. Thus, the Rosands were unaware of several revisions to Strozzi’s chronology. The most significant of these is that Strozzi is now known to have been in Genoa through 1632, probably leaving for Venice in late 1632 or early 1633.

17. Mortari 1966, figs. 237 and 396, respectively.

18. Dentella 1939, 366, quoted the dedication to Grimani in Paolo Bonetti, Specchio de Prelati rappresentanti nella vita di Girolamo Razzaconi, conte S. Oderzo e Vescovo di Bergamo (Bergamo 1642). Grimani was selected as bishop because “non mai erra ne’ suoi giudici” and because he had been elected to the Savio dei Dieci several times while still quite young. Grimani apparently had an honorable, although not particularly productive tenure as bishop. Suffering from gout, he often had to delegate his visits to diocesan parishes. In addition to his ceremonial and synodal duties, Grimani was probably also a member of the literary Academy degli Eccitati in Bergamo, which flourished under his episcopal sponsorship from 1642 onward (Dentella 1939, 367–370).

19. Every scholar since Suida in Kress 1951, 42, has accepted this date. A quick survey of the provenance indicates the degree to which Strozzi’s assimilation of Van Dyck’s manner and composition caused confusion among the connoisseurs and dealers of the early twentieth century. Van Dyck’s presence in Genoa from 1623 to 1625 and again around 1626–1627 was commanding, and his portrait style in particular was emulated throughout the entire seventeenth century. Strozzi was thus in a unique position to reintroduce Venetianism into seicento Venice through the intermediary of the Fleming Van Dyck. The volume of Strozzi’s portrait commissions in Venice testifies to his success and critical acceptance. On Van Dyck’s career in Italy and especially his years in Genoa, see Barnes 1990, nos. 24–43.

20. See note 16 above. Belloni’s 1988 chronology of Strozzi’s life is used here as he has considered the greatest number of documents and contemporary sources to date.
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Tanzio da Varallo

Tanzio da Varallo (Antonio d’Enrico) was born in the small German-speaking town of Alagna in the Alpine valley of the Sesia. Orphaned in 1586, he moved to Varallo where his older brothers were at work on the Sacro Monte. He appears to have received his earliest artistic training from his brother Melchiorre (1570/1575—after 1641), a painter working in the local mannerist style established by the Lombard Gaudenzio Ferrari (1475/1480—1546). In 1600 Tanzio and Melchiorre obtained a passport from the local authorities to practice their art as itinerant painters and to travel to Rome for the Jubilee Year. It is unknown how long Tanzio stayed in Rome, but the development of his style shows an awareness of works created there in the first decade of the seventeenth century by Caravaggio (1571—1610) and his followers, particularly Orazio Gentileschi (q.v.), Giovanni Baglione (c. 1573—1644), and Orazio Borgianni (1578—1616). On the basis of an old account and securely attributed works, Tanzio is known to have traveled to Naples (fragments in Santa Restituta) and thence to Venice via the Abruzzo, where he executed the Madonna dell’incendio sedato, an ex-voto in the Collegiata of Pescocostanzo, and the Circumcision in the parish church of Faro San Martino. These works show his assimilation of Caravaggio’s sharp modeling of forms in raking light, figures set before a dark background, and careful observation of naturalistic details, particularly in the depiction of faces. These new Roman developments are here assimilated into the sixteenth-century Lombard mannerism of Tanzio’s Alpine origins, which has its own traditions of tenebrist effects and interest in naturalistic details. Tanzio’s highly personal style also characterizes his first documented work, the Saint Charles Borromeo Giving Holy Communion to Plague Victims, installed by August 1616 in the Collegiata in Domodossola. The date of the Domodossola altar indicates that Tanzio had returned to Piedmont by early 1616 or even 1615. He is not known to have left Lombardy and Piedmont thereafter, aside from a possible but undocumented trip to Vienna in 1626—1627. In 1617 he is documented at work in a chapel of the Sacro Monte in Varallo (Christ Conducted to Pilate). Along with his brother, the sculptor Giovanni, he decorated two more such chapels in 1618—1620 (Washing of the Hands) and in 1628 (Christ Presented to Herod). He also executed frescoes and altarpieces in the Alpine valleys and in Milan, where he came into contact with the works of Giulio Cesare Procaccini (1574—1625), Cerano (Giovanni Battista Crespi, c. 1575—1633), and Morazzone (Pier Francesco Mazzucchelli, 1573—1626). The works of these last years reflect his contact with the postmannerist Lombard school as well as his experiences in Venice, particularly of Veronese’s (1528—1588) frescoes at Maser, which find echoes in the fictive statues of the Sacro Monte chapels. Even with the firm dates of the Sacro Monte chapels and two other documented commissions, the chapel of the Guardian Angel of 1627—1629 in San Gaudenzio, Novara, and the San Rocco of 1631 for the parish church of Comasco, it is nearly impossible to establish a chronology for the works of Tanzio’s brief but productive maturity.

Tanzio now enjoys a lasting reputation as one of the most intriguing painters of the seicento and has been claimed for both the Piedmontese and Lombard schools. He is not known, however, to have had many students or to have established an artistic following.
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1939.1.191 (302)

Saint Sebastian

c. 1620/1630
Oil on canvas, 117.3 x 93.7 (46 3/4 x 36 3/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric with unevenly spun threads. It was prepared with a white ground. Distinct impressions of the brushstrokes can be seen in the paint surface. X-radiographs show extensive changes in the white and green cloths draped over Saint Sebastian’s legs, the blue robe of the angel, and the
green drapery of Irene. A minor change is apparent in the
curvature of the hand removing the arrow.

The support was extended by a 2.5 cm wide fabric strip
sewn along the bottom edge. At the top, left, and right, the
paint surface has been extended by approximately 2.5 cm
onto the lining fabric, and by 0.5 cm at the bottom. The
original dimensions were closer to 112 x 90 cm, as verified by
the cusping and tacking holes detected in x-radiographs.
Extensive abrasion and paint loss have occurred in the drap-
ery, legs, and faces, which were originally built up with
the green drapery of Irene. A minor change is apparent in
the painting. The thick varnish is considerably discolored. The
original dimensions were closer to 112 x 90 cm, as verified by
the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and
the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1936.

Provenance: (Tomei, Milan, 1916). 1 Achilliito Chiesa, Mi-

necessity to traditional iconic presentations
of Christ supported by angels. 13 However, although
the figure at the right appears to have one shoulder
bared like the angel at the left and no ointment jar is
visible, her features are those of a woman and con-
trast with the sharper, more masculine faces of the
angel and Saint Sebastian; the figure is wingless as
well. Also unique is Tanzio’s inclusion of Sebastian’s
shield as a means of supporting his leg and project-
ing the composition into the viewer’s space. It serves
to remind the viewer of Sebastian’s status as a Ro-
man guard and his rejection of his profession in a pa-
gan regime.

Although some writers have identified the sub-
ject of this painting as Saint Sebastian between two
angels, 1 it seems more likely that Tanzio represented
Irene attending to the saint’s wounds, a subject often
depicted in the early seventeenth century. Sebastian,
an officer of the Praetorian guard, aided his fellow
Christians who had been imprisoned and helped in
burying their dead. His disloyalty was discovered by
Diocletian, who condemned him to death. After hav-
ing been stripped and shot with arrows, he was left
for dead. Irene, the widow of the Christian martyr
Castulus, came at night to bury the corpse, but she
discovered that Sebastian was still alive and nursed
him back to health. 3 When Diocletian learned that
Sebastian had survived, he had him beaten to death
and thrown into the Cloaca Maxima.

Saint Sebastian has been a frequent subject
throughout Christian history, especially in the six-
teenth century, when artists portrayed him as a
beautiful nude youth pierced with arrows, tied to a
tree. 7 Not until after 1600 did the subject of Irene
nursing Sebastian become popular, reflecting the
Counter-Reformation’s interest in the participation
of the faithful in the sufferings of martyred saints. 8
Various versions of the theme are known: the young
widow tenderly extracts the arrows while anointing
the wounds, either alone 9 or aided by a servant. 10 In
some representations she attends to Sebastian while
he is supported by angels. 11 Tanzio’s interpretation
of the subject is unique in its presentation of Sebas-
tian in rapt ecstasy rather than on the verge of death,
and in giving the angel an active role while Irene sup-
ports the saint. 12 The misinterpretation of Irene as a
second angel is understandable: the composition in-
tentionally relies on traditional iconic presentations
of Christ supported by angels. 13 However, although
the figure at the right appears to have one shoulder
bared like the angel at the left and no ointment jar is
visible, her features are those of a woman and con-
trast with the sharper, more masculine faces of the
angel and Saint Sebastian; the figure is wingless as
well. Also unique is Tanzio’s inclusion of Sebastian’s
shield as a means of supporting his leg and project-
ing the composition into the viewer’s space. It serves
to remind the viewer of Sebastian’s status as a Ro-
man guard and his rejection of his profession in a pa-
gan regime.

In 1916, when Roberto Longhi discovered the
Saint Sebastian, it carried an untenable attribution to
Rubens (1577-1640); Longhi’s reascription to Tanzio
da Varallo, published in the catalogue of the 1922
Palazzo Pitti exhibition, has never been ques-
tioned. 14 The painting’s appearance in that exhibi-
tion brought Tanzio’s art to the attention of the pub-
lic and scholars, thus initiating research on and
revaluation of the artist. 15 It has since become one
of his best-known paintings. Although the attribu-
tion is secure, the date of the Saint Sebastian is
debatable, as few documents exist relating to either
Tanzio’s life or his work. The artist traveled to Rome,
sometime between 1600 and 1619/1616; 16 his work
after this trip reflects the influence of Caravaggio
and his followers. The strongly sculpted figures
pressed close to the picture plane and illuminated by
a strong light from the left against a dark back-
ground indicate Tanzio’s continued interest in works
made in Rome in the early seventeenth century. The
broad folds of the garments, the delicacy of the ma-
terial, and the face of Irene suggest that Tanzio
looked especially at the paintings of Orazio Gen-
tileschi 17 and Giovanni Baglione. 18 In addition, sim-
ilarities of morphology and of the clarity of light on
flesh link Tanzio’s forms with those of Orazio Bor-
gianni. 19 The paintings by these artists that attracted
Tanzio are datable to the first decade of the seven-
teenth century, suggesting that in those years the
north Italian artist was likely working in Rome.

Tanzio’s own paintings that are most closely re-
lated to the Saint Sebastian are also undated, and scholars have not concurred on their chronology. These paintings include two canvases of David with the Head of Goliath (both Pinacoteca, Varallo), two canvases of Saint John the Baptist (Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, and Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin), and frescoes in Santa Maria della Pace, Milan. More persuasive resemblances occur, however, between the drapery, physiognomy, and contorted poses of the figures in the Saint Sebastian and in the Battle of Sennacherib and other paintings in the chapel of the Guardian Angel (San Gaudenzio, Novara) of 1627–1629. The angel in the even later vault of the chapel of San Francesco, Chiesa Collegiata, Borgosesia (1632–1633), turns and rotates in the same manner as the figure of Saint Sebastian in the National Gallery painting.

In Tanzio’s works of the 1620s and 1630s the sculptural quality of the naturalistic figures is tempered by a penchant for acidic, changeant colors, impossibly contorted poses, and broad areas of drapery in faceted surfaces and sharp folds. These characteristics, as well as the preciousness of the elongated fingers and hands and the jewel-like application of highlights to the curly hair, eyes, and nails, recall paintings by the Lombard mannerists Cerano, Giulio Cesare Procaccini, and especially Morazzone. Tanzio would have encountered works by these painters in Milan and Varallo. Morazzone painted frescoes in several chapels at the Sacro Monte in Varallo between the years 1602 and 1617; in the chapel of the Ecce Homo his paintings were the background for sculptures by Tanzio’s brother Giovanni d’Enrico. It is likely that Tanzio and Morazzone met while Tanzio was in Varallo 1616–1617; in any case, Tanzio’s palette, brushwork, and elegant details are reminiscent of Morazzone’s decorative style.

Much of Tanzio’s morphology remains consistent throughout his career, and without documents, dating his works accurately is nearly impossible. The highly lit naturalistic forms in elegantly mannered poses which intrude into the viewer’s space are traits that are constant in Tanzio’s art, but they appear to be more frequent in the 1620s, as is the thick impasto for the highlights on flesh and drapery. That these characteristics appear in the Saint Sebastian suggests a broad dating for this work of c. 1620–1630.

Ruggeri, followed by Shapley, connected a drawing of eight human heads and a horse’s head (Civica Raccolta delle Stampe e dei Disegni Bertorelli, Milan) as preliminary for those of Saint Sebastian and the angel and probably also for Irene, but the quality of the drawing (judged by the author only in photographs) makes its authenticity questionable.

Notes
1. Longhi 1961, 511, took credit for changing the attribution from Rubens to Tanzio in 1916 when the painting was owned by "l’antiquario Tomé.
2. Listed as the owner in the 1922 Palazzo Pitti catalogue; following Chiesa’s bankruptcy, the collection was dissolved at several sales in New York and Europe beginning in 1924: see Towner 1970, 382–383, 412–414. The painting does not appear in the New York sale catalogues.
4. Longhi 1943, 53, n. 66; Testori 1959, 37; and Bologna 1953, 43, n. 45.
5. Irene has often been mistakenly identified as Saint Irene. As Sandoz 1955, 67, pointed out, there is no Roman saint of this name found in any of the martyrologies.
7. For the numerous representations of the saint and his changing iconography see Pietro Cannata in BblSS 11: 789–801; Kraehling 1938, passim; and Saint Sébastien 1979. For this episode specifically, see Pigler 1974, 1: 468–470.
8. On this see Stechow 1954, 70. Sandoz 1955, 68–69, noted the seventeenth century’s new sentiment for such mystical subjects, suggesting a connection with the rise of the Oratorian orders.
10. As in renditions by Hendrik Terbrugghen (1588–1629) in the Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin (Stechow 1954, fig. 1), Trophime Bigot (1579–1650) in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Bordeaux (Saint Sébastien 1979, fig. 105), and a follower of Gioacchino Assereto (1600–1649) recently on the art market (Sotheby’s London, 28 October 1992, lot 109).
11. As in the painting by Georges de La Tour (1593–1652) in the Louvre, Paris, of which a copy is in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin: Nicolson and Wright 1974, no. 41, pl. 76 and figs. 116–117 respectively; or one by Eustache Le Sueur in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Tours: Saint Sébastien 1979, fig. 121.
12. Schwarzenberg 1969, 399–400, repro., suggested that numerous depictions of Saint Sebastian with his head slung backward and his mouth open were based on the Hellenistic sculpted head of the so-called Dying Alexander (Uffizi, Florence). Tanzio’s Sebastian, although in ecstasy and pain
Tanzio da Varallo, Saint Sebastian, 1939.1.191
with his eyes turned skyward and his lips parted, does not resemble this beautiful, classically proportioned form.

13. For example, two by Giovanni Bellini (c. 1427–1516), National Gallery, London, and Staatliche Museen, Berlin; Bottari 1963, 1: fig. 83 and 129; another is by Rosso Fiorentino (1494–1540), Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Darragon 1983, fig. 17. See also ZuPnick 1975, 257.


15. Scholars agree that it was this painting that made Tanzio known (Shapley 1973, 81, and 1979, 1: 438–439).

16. The first and best discussion of Tanzio’s documentation is Tioli 1939–1940; the details of the trip to Rome have been most recently discussed by Valsecchi 1973.

17. One wonders if Tanzio knew Gentileschi’s versions of Saint Francis Supported by an Angel (now Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome, and Museo del Prado, Madrid), usually dated in the first lustrum of the seventeenth century: Bissell 1981, figs. 15 and 26. Tanzio may possibly have known Gentileschi’s work in Turin, which was produced during the latter’s Genoese sojourn between 1621 and 1623; however, Gentileschi’s Roman works were far more influential on Tanzio.

18. For example, the more direct fall of light on the smooth figures of Baglione’s Sacred and Profane Love, 1602 (Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome) and his similar Ectasy of Saint Francis (Cleveland Museum of Art): Nicolson 1989, 2: fig. 83. Baglione’s Saint Sebastian Attended by Angels in S. Orsola, Rome, could also have been influential (photograph in NGA photographic archives).

19. See, for instance, Borgianni’s Holy Family with Saints Anne, John the Baptist, and an Angel (Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome); Nicolson 1989, 2: pl. 124.


22. Testori 1959, pl. 2. For dating see Bologna 1953, 41.


24. Debiaggi 1976–1977, fig. 3. This article also gives information on Tanzio’s death date.

25. For similar works by these artists see Valsecchi 1973, 2: pls. 45–55 (frescoes by Cerano in the Duomo, Milan); 2: pls. 77–78 (Martyrdom of Saints Rufina and Seconda by Cerano, Morazzone, and Procaccini, Pinacoteca, Brera); 2: pls. 87–113 are further paintings by Procaccini that are similar compositionally to Tanzio; and 2: 114–130 are paintings by Morazzone. See also Cannon-Brookes 1974. A Saint Sebastian Attended by Angels was attributed to Cerano by Rosci 1964, 62–63, who also associated it with Tanzio’s style, especially with the Washington Saint Sebastian. In each the monumental figure of the saint fills the available picture space, leaning toward the viewer. Giulio Bora, who suggested an attribution to Melchiorre Gherardini (1607–1688), informed the writer that the picture will be included in Rosci’s forthcoming Cerano monograph (letter of 15 June 1992, NGA curatorial files).

26. Morazzone worked in the chapel of the Way to Calvary in 1602–1606; the chapel of the Ecce Homo from 1610 to after 1612; the chapel of the Condemnation of Christ from 1612 to 1615/1616. For the controversy over when Morazzone finished these frescoes, see Bernardi 1960, 82, 84. See also Cannon-Brookes 1974, 39–39, 53–55. Tanzio was working at Varallo in 1616–1617 (chapel of Christ Conducted to Pilate), c. 1615–1620 (chapel of Pilate Washing his Hands), and 1628 (chapel of Christ Presented to Herod) (see biography).

27. Inv. no. B 717. reproduced in Ruggeri 1965, 98. Ruggeri connected the head at lower right with Saint Sebastian and one at the left with the angel at the left in the painting; instead, the head at left holds more the pose and attitude of Saint Sebastian. Shapley connected the two heads above Irene. The sharp hatching of this drawing, however, makes it appear to be a copy. Another drawing of an angel, holding a bunch of paper with one leg jutting forward in the same manner as Saint Sebastian, has also been connected stylistically and compositionally with this painting by Shapley 1973, 81, and 1979, 1: 439; Testori 1959, 48, cat. 38 and pl. 131. It is in the Pinacoteca, Varallo. This drawing appears to be a study for one of the angels in the vault of Santa Maria della Pace, Milan, although Testori connected it with the Sacro Monte frescoes.
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Giovanni Battista Tiepolo
1696 – 1770

Born in Venice to a prosperous merchant, Giovanni Battista (Giambattista) Tiepolo chose to pursue a career in painting. He was taught by Gregorio Lazzarini (1655–1730), studying under him probably c. 1710. In 1717 Tiepolo was inscribed in the Venetian painters’ guild as an independent painter. His earliest datable works, in the Ospedaletto, Venice (1715–1716), do not display the classical compositions and smooth finish characteristic of Lazzarini’s paintings, but rather the avant-garde tenebrism of Federico Bencovich (1677–1726) and Giambattista Piazzetta (q.v.). Much controversy surrounds the course of Tiepolo’s development in the next fifteen years, in which there are few dated paintings. Knowledge of his activities in the teens and twenties comes mostly from Vincenzo da Canal’s biography of Lazzarini (1732), in which the author devoted several pages to the talented pupil whose popularity had soared in the previous decade. Recent scholarship based on da Canal’s listing of Tiepolo’s paintings prior to 1732 has shown that the artist vacillated between the tenebrism practiced by many Venetian contemporaries and a lighter, more atmospheric style. We know that Tiepolo was practicing fresco painting on the mainland as early as c. 1716. Non-Venetian artists had reintroduced the technique into the Véneto in the late seventeenth century, and it is evident that Tiepolo looked at the frescoes of such artists as Louis Dorigny (1654–1742), whose delicate palette and airy compositions are reflected in his ceilings in Biadene (c. 1716) and Massanago (c. 1719–1720).

During these early years Tiepolo experimented with various styles simultaneously. Many of his oil paintings of the 1720s suggest that, while still interested in Piazzetta’s Bolognese-influenced chiaroscuro style, the artist was also turning to the great Venetian cinquecento painters for inspiration, possibly swayed by Sebastiano Ricci’s (q.v.) lead. His grandest decorative cycle of the period, painted for the Archbishop’s Palace in Udine (c. 1726–1729), reveals his interest in Veronese’s color and compositions.

Tiepolo’s frescoes in Udine brought him immediate fame and commissions for further decorative ensembles. In the next ten years he worked in palaces and villas in and around Milan, Bergamo, Venice, and elsewhere in the Veneto. These works, the subjects of which derive mostly from ancient history, announce a mature style of rich chromatic and plastic effects. The ceiling frescoes of the late 1720s and 1730s are also characterized by a new and dramatic di sotto in sù perspective. With the Bolognese quadratura painter Girolamo Mengozzi-Colonna (c. 1688–c. 1766), who designed his architectural surrounds, Tiepolo revolutionized the art of fresco decoration in Venice by combining the deep perspective of Venetian cinquecento ceiling decoration with a compositional clarity that integrated the diverse elements of the design into a greatly expanded pictorial space. Unlike their direct precedents, in which forms were arranged haphazardly across the ceiling, Tiepolo’s compositions are ordered in zigzag patterns that expand the illusionistic view into the heavens. By 1740, after conquering the towering church ceiling of the Gesuati, Venice (1737–1739), he was turning to secular themes in long, low rooms, bringing his figures closer to the spectator by distributing them along the cornice and contrasting them with increasingly lighter pastel hues in the open skies (Palazzo Clerici, Milan, 1740). In the same years Tiepolo developed as an artist of religious altarpieces, in which he captured Counter-Reformational devotional images in a neo-Renaissance format.

Tiepolo’s fame and prices increased in the 1740s. He moved several times during his career, always to grander quarters, which he shared with his wife Cecilia, sister of Francesco Guardi (q.v.), and their nine children. The artist had already rejected an invitation to Sweden in 1736, and now his paintings were being requested in northern Europe. His friendship with Francesco Algarotti (1712–1764), whom he met in 1743, brought him commissions from the Saxon court of Dresden. At the same time, he entered a neo-Veronesian and neoclassical phase, encouraged by Algarotti. Although always inspired by ancient history, in this period Tiepolo turned increasingly to representations of antique monuments and dress. At the same time, he took up etching, producing two sets of prints—the Scherzi di fantasia and the Capricci—both heavily laden with antique references.

External political forces kept foreigners from
Venice in the second half of the 1740s, causing an economic slowdown in the city and compelling local artists to seek employment abroad. Although Tiepolo was so active in this decade that he enlisted the help of his son Giovanni Domenico (Giandomenico, 1723–1804), he nevertheless accepted the lucrative invitation to work for Prince Bishop Carl Philipp von Greiffenklau of Würzburg in the archiepiscopal palace, where he resided from late 1750 to 1753. There he produced what is considered his greatest triumph, the enormous ceiling fresco over the grand staircase with *Olympus and the Four Continents* (1752–1753). Another, less talented son, Lorenzo (1736–1777), also accompanied Tiepolo to Würzburg as a helper.

In the 1740s and 1750s, Tiepolo’s paint handling became looser, his palette even lighter, and his brushstrokes more rapid, abbreviated, and assured. His expanded repertoire included literary, historical, mythological, allegorical, as well as religious works. He continued to produce masterpieces in both Venice and the Veneto, such as the story of Antony and Cleopatra in the Palazzo Labia, Venice (1746–1747), and the scenes from Tasso in the Villa Valmarana, Vicenza (1757). Commissions from abroad continued: Tiepolo sent works to the kings of France and England and the czarina of Russia. In 1761, King Charles III of Spain requested Tiepolo’s services to paint in the newly completed Royal Palace in Madrid. Responding to political pressure, Tiepolo, in spite of his age and suffering from gout, set off on his last journey in 1762. Although his large ceiling fresco for the Throne Room in the Royal Palace, Madrid (1762–1764), has been criticized as a reworking of earlier compositions, its breadth and sophistication mark it as one of his late successes. His altarpieces for San Pascual Baylon at Aranjuez (1767–1769) reveal a simply presented but deeply religious meditation and emotion.

About the time of Giambattista’s death, the taste for dramatic allegorical subjects and passionate religious themes had faded throughout Europe in favor of a severe neoclassical style that reflected the new rationalism of the period. By the end of the century, and the fall of monarchic power and lessening influence of religious institutions, Tiepolo’s art was outdated. Even his son Giandomenico had taken up more objectively motivated themes and a realistic style. In spite of this, Tiepolo is recognized today as one of the most brilliant and celebrated artists of the eighteenth century, and the last of the great practitioners of the Renaissance and baroque tradition.
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### 1939.1.100 (211)

**Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel**

Before c. 1762  
Oil on canvas, 27 × 49 (10 ⅞ × 19 ⅛)  
Samuel H. Kress Collection

**Technical Notes:** The support is a relatively coarse plain-weave fabric prepared with a red ground. The paint was applied rapidly in short fluid strokes with low impasto in the principal color areas of the sky and foreground. The linear description of the figures is fluid and calligraphic in nature. The textured brushwork ends at a boundary approximately 0.7 cm above the bottom edge of the painting. Air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy suggests a palette of Prussian blue, white and red leads, iron oxide, Naples yellow, vermilion, and possibly ultramarine.

Because a lead-based adhesive was used to adhere the present lining fabric, the x-radiographs cannot be used to determine whether the tacking margins have been removed, the support has been cut down, or the original dimensions of the work. Abrasion is present in the thinly painted sky, and there are scattered losses around the edges. The varnish is clear. The painting was relined about 1932. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting conserved in 1932 and again in 1988.

**Provenance:** Possibly Edward Cheney [1803–1884], London, after 1860 Badger Hall, Shropshire; possibly by inheritance to his brother-in-law, Colonel Alfred Capel-Cure [1826–1896]; by inheritance to his nephew, Francis Capel-Cure [1854–1933], Badger Hall, Shropshire; purchased 1932 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.

**Exhibited:** Fort Worth, Kimbell Art Museum, 1993, *Giambattista Tiepolo: Master of the Oil Sketch*, no. 53.
Although no writer has questioned the attribution of this small bozzetto, there has not been agreement about its subject, date, or purpose. Because the flying putto appears to offer a crown to the bearded figure at left, scholars have declared that Tiepolo meant to represent the apotheosis of a poet. Longhi believed that the poet might be Homer, and others attempted to connect the sketch with the lost and unphotographed Apotheosis of the Poet Soderini, painted by Tiepolo in 1754, or with the Ca’ Rezzonico Apotheosis of the Poet Quintiliano Rezzonico. This misidentification of the subject matter stems perhaps from the erroneous assumption that the bozzetto might be the complete composition for a ceiling. However, even those who considered the painting a fragment of a larger composition seem to have accepted the subject of the apotheosis of a poet without question.

Rather than representing a poet, the seated figure at left personifies Counsel as described in Ripa’s Iconologia, the source for most of Tiepolo’s allegorical figures. Ripa characterized Counsel as an old man with a beard, dressed in a long red robe, carrying a book in his right hand and an owl in his left. Ripa also described him wearing a chain of gold from which hangs a heart. The chain is not visible in this di sotto in su sketch and the only red discernible is that worn near the figure’s neck and the highlights on his tan robe. Tiepolo, however, depicted the main attributes of the figure correctly, and he often disregarded the colors of the garments described by Ripa. In fact, the figures of Counsel in both the modello (National Gallery of Art, Washington) and the ceiling of the Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III in the Throne Room of the Royal Palace in Madrid do not wear red. In the modello Counsel is dressed in blue and in the fresco his garment is beige, similar to that in the present bozzetto. All these portrayals of Counsel represent him wearing a laurel wreath.

Brown has shown that the National Gallery sketch is likely a fragment from a larger study, with the subject of the Magnificence of Princes, for a ceiling in Saint Petersburg. The figure of the old man and the flying putto appear in a drawing, formerly in the Orloff collection, present location unknown, and in reverse in an etching by Lorenzo Tiepolo after a ceiling by Giambattista (fig. 1). In Domenico Tiepolo’s catalogue of prints after his father’s paintings this ceiling is described as “Magnificenza de Principi. In Petroburgh.” Since the etching is listed in a bill for prints purchased from the Tiepolos by Pierre-Jean Mariette, c. 1762, the ceiling must have been painted sometime before this date.

The connection between the drawing, print, and the bozzetto in the National Gallery is not entirely clear. Scholars have assumed that the Orloff sheet is a study for the ceiling reproduced in Lorenzo’s etching. Its close proximity in composition to the print and the diversity of the figures in the sketch of Counsel, however, bring this assumption into question or suggest that the bozzetto is related to a different commission. The figure of the old man in the drawing and print is accompanied by a figure behind and a putto to the right below carrying a book. The accompanying group on the other cloud includes a woman and another putto. In the painting in the National Gallery Counsel sits alone, the putto below
supports the clouds, and the accompanying group is made up of two figures, one clothed and one partially nude. 17 Below Counsel sits the owl, his symbol. In fact, a personification of Counsel in the ceiling for Saint Petersburg is located below the central group: his owl perches on the branch beneath him. The bearded old man in the print may in fact be a poet.

One explanation for the disparity in design between the Washington sketch and the etching may be that the sketch was cut from the modello for the Saint Petersburg ceiling before the artist had fully worked out its components. Few of Tiepolo's modelli correspond exactly to his finished paintings. If this is so, then the Orloff drawing cannot have been a study for the ceiling made before the modello but is a ricordo, perhaps made as a guide for Lorenzo's print. 18 The second, less likely explanation would be that the figure of Counsel was painted for another ceiling, certainly as a minor figure within a larger composition. The indication of the clouds in the print, so close to Tiepolo's brushstrokes in the National Gallery bozzetto, however, argue against this assumption.

The aqueous quality of Giambattista's brushstrokes in this canvas anticipate his late paintings, and one can understand Morassi's dating of the sketch on stylistic grounds to the years 1762–1770. 19 The horizontal strips of blue sky and clouds in the background are like those above the figures of Zeus and Minerva in the Washington modello for the Throne Room ceiling. 20 The nervous strokes of brown and black paint that delineate contours occur in both paintings. Striking in Tiepolo's late bozzetti (1767–1769) for San Pascual Baylon, Aranjuez, such as the Saint Joseph and the Saint Pascual Baylon in the Courtauld Institute, London, 21 is the fluid and whipped quality of the foreground rocks, which appears in the cloud forms of the National Gallery sketch. Two other paintings dated universally to Tiepolo's Spanish period, the Entombment (formerly Pinto Basto Collection, Lisbon) and the Rest on the Flight into Egypt (Staatsgalerie Stuttgart), contain the same curved, fluid rock forms and nervously sketched figures. 22 The pastel color scheme of the Stuttgart painting is also akin to the Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel. In spite of these connections, the evidence of the Orloff drawing and the print by Lorenzo Tiepolo argues that the oil sketch is earlier and that the artist had already developed elements of his late style by c. 1760. We must therefore conclude that the Personification of Counsel was probably cut from Tiepolo's modello for Saint Petersburg. 23

Notes
2. NGA 1941, 192, and a note in the Kress records, NGA curatorial records, placed the painting "formerly in the Capel-Cure Collection," most of which was inherited from Cheney as recounted by Knox 1975, 4–5. Waagen 1857, 73, noted that Cheney had a collection of nineteen sketches for ceilings executed for churches in Venice, and 171, that Cheney acquired most of his collection while resident in Venice. A number of these were sold at Christie, Manson & Woods, London, on 29 April 1885; the present painting may have been included in lot 170, "Three designs for ceilings."
3. Placed in this collection by NGA 1941, 192, and a note in the Kress records, NGA curatorial files. The painting does not appear in the Francis Capel-Cure sale held at Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 6 May 1905, or in the list given by Sack 1910, 223, of paintings then owned by Francis Capel-Cure. Perhaps Sack had rejected the attribution or was not aware of the painting's existence.
5. A typed notation in the Kress records, NGA curatorial files, states that the painting was acquired in 1932 without stating from whom.
6. Attributions to Tiepolo from Raimond van Marie, Bernard Berenson, Adolfo Venturi, William Suida (1935), Giuseppe Fiocco, and Roberto Longhi (1932), are in the NGA curatorial files. Published attributions are listed under references.
7. Longhi 1946, 70, no. 165. Ross Watson suggested the connection with Tiepolo's paintings in the Villa Soderini in Nervesa, destroyed in 1917 (notes in NGA curatorial files). These frescoes were dated by Morassi 1962, 32, to c. 1754. He reproduced a bozzetto (fig. 152) very different in composition, style, and date from the Washington sketch, which he believed to be a possible study for the Poet Soderini. Fiocco suggested a connection with the Ca'Rezzonico, Venice (note in NGA curatorial files). Morassi 1962, 60, dated the Ca'Rezzonico frescoes c. 1758. Reproduced in Morassi, Tiepolo, 1955, fig. 54. There is no apparent connection between the Washington sketch and this fresco.
8. Pallucchini 1968, 133, cat. 288, believed this work to be for a small ceiling.
9. According to Shapley 1979, 1: 320, n. 3, Hans Tietze and Erica Tietze-Conrat believed the painting to be a fragment. Only an unsigned manuscript opinion in the NGA curatorial files suggested that this is not an apotheosis; that opinion also stated that the sketch is a fragment of a larger composition.
11. Ripa 1992, 70–71, stated that Counsel appears as an old man because the Greeks sought the advice of the ancient and wise Nestor; he wears a long robe because senators in antiquity wore long togas. The red robe signifies charity, which is needed in giving counsel; the heart indicates that
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel*, 1939.1.100
true counsel stems from the heart. The book suggests that
counsel is born from study and knowledge; the owl, the at-
tribute of Minerva, signifies knowledge and wisdom.

12. See 1943.4.39.

13. Brown 1993, 296-298, no. 53. Her assertion that the
fragment was replaced by an altered composition refitted
into the modello seems unlikely. In addition, it is speculative
to suggest that the Orloff drawing, which is known only in
photographs (see following note), was altered from an ear-
ier composition because a piece seems to have been cut and
pasted at top. Possibly the drawing was cut later and re-
paired.

14. For the print see Rizzi, Disegni, 1971, 117, no. 98, with
previous bibliography. For the drawing see exh. cat. Paris
1920, no. 156. On the Orloff drawings see Knox 1961,
269-275.

15. On the history of the catalogue and its various edi-
tions published by Giandomenico, see Dario Succi in Succi,
I Tiepolo, 1988, 40-44.

16. On the dating of prints by the Tiepolo based on those
sent to Mariette see Frerichs 1971, 233-252. There were four
prints, one by Giandomenico and three by Lorenzo, after
ceilings made by Giambattista for Saint Petersburg. Only
one of these ceilings, now destroyed, is known in pho-
tographs, Mars and the Grace, which was published by Sack
1910, 206, no. 421. That the others existed is confirmed by a
letter of 14 January 1764 from Francesco Algarotti to
Michael Woronstof, the chancellor to the Russian court, in
which Algarotti notes “avendo ella di sua mano alcuni soffiti
[del Tiepolo] nel suo palagio di Pietroburgo.” See Levey
1962, 118-119; noted by Frerichs 1971, 246. In addition, in a
letter of 16 March 1761 from Tiepolo to Algarotti the artist
mentioned that he was working on a “gran soffito in tela per
la Corte di Moscovia.” Published by Molmenti 1911, 23-24.
Scholars assumed that it is the Magnificence of Princes to
which Tiepolo referred and that it was being painted for the
Winter Palace in Saint Petersburg. Levey suggested instead
that these ceilings may well have been in Woronstof’s
palace (“suo palagio”). Levey’s contention may be ques-
tioned by the fact that Mariette noted on the bill sent by Gi-
andomenico “pitture per la Czarina” (Frerichs 1971, 244).

17. The figures may both be women, but it is difficult to
distinguish the sex of the half-dressed form at right.

18. Scholars have assumed that the Orloff sheet is an au-
tograph work by Giambattista Tiepolo, but this assumption
is made on the basis of old photographs. It is possible that
the drawing is a ricordo by Giandomenico made as an aid for
Lorenzo’s etching. Without knowing the sheet in the origi-
nal, attribution is difficult. Brown 1993, 296, admitted the
possibility that the drawing could be by Lorenzo for his
print.

19. Scholars have dated the painting as follows: Longhi,
in a 1932 manuscript, 1730-1740; Fiocco, in a 1932 manu-
script, 1740 (both NGA curatorial files); Morassi 1962, 67,
c. 1762-1770; Watson, in a 1967 manuscript, c. 1750 (NGA
curatorial files); Pallucchini 1968, 133, cat. 288, 1765-1770;
Shapley 1973, 67, and 1979, t. 148, c. 1750; and Gemin and
Pedrocco 1993, 129, no. 482, 1758-1760.

20. In fact, Tiepolo reused the main components of the
Magnificence of Princes for the lower-left portion of his mod-
ello for Spain (see the entry for 1943.4.39), with modifica-
tions to accommodate the difference in scale between the
two throne rooms but certainly to include the more com-
plicated iconography of the Spanish ceiling. It should be
noted here that this picture was in the same nineteenth-
century collection as Tiepolo’s Wealth and Benefits of the
Spanish Monarchy under Charles III (1943.4.39), suggesting
perhaps that it too came from the Tiepolo family and that
the paintings were together in Spain.


22. Morassi, Tiepolo, 1955, fig. 56, dated the Lisbon paint-
ing 1762-1770, and Barcham 1992, 124, cat. 40, dated the
Stuttgart painting c. 1767-1770.

23. In a letter to the author (16 October 1993, in NGA cu-
rotorial files), Catherine Whistler underlined the fact that
Tiepolo had suggested further ceiling subjects for the Roy-
al Palace and may have executed some bozetchi for other
rooms after 1764. It is then a possibility that the National
Gallery sketch is cut from one of these bozetchi done in
Spain.
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1939.1.365 (458)

Scene from Ancient History

c. 1750

Oil on canvas, oval, 140.3 x 109.3 (55 1/4 x 43)

Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave, medium-
coarse fabric. The double ground consists of an initial red
layer covered by a yellow layer, which was brushed on thick-
ly overall and has a pebbled texture. The paint was applied
in thick, heavy layers that are highly opaque and do not al-
low the color of the ground to show through. The broad,
textured brushstrokes, applied wet-into-wet, produced a
moderate to heavy impasto. The borders between different
compositional elements are not blended, but are often
defined by a fluid contour line. The drapery was executed
with thick, heavy strokes compared to the fainting woman’s
thinly painted fingers, which are articulated with finely tex-
tured strokes and outlined with a liquid stroke of brown-red
glaze. In some areas, such as the ornaments on her shoul-
der, dry paint was dragged across the surface. X-radi-
ographs reveal that the arch behind the figures was slightly
modified and the head of the crowned figure has been shift-
ed to the right.
In 1938 the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto. It was conserved most recently in 1992–1993 by Susanna P. Griswold, who removed discolored varnish and restored the painting.

Provenance: Almoró Barbaro [b. 1681], Venice; by descent to Marc Antonio Barbaro [d. 1860]; his sister, Elissa Bassi; sold to (Vicenzo Favenza) by 1866; sold to an unidentified Frenchman, probably a dealer;¹ (Palazzo Barbaro sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 9 February 1874, no. 3); bought by Count Isaac de Cammundo, Paris;² (his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, 1–3 February 1893, no. 27); bought by (Eugène Féral);³ Baron Adolphe de Rothschild, Paris; reportedly passed from his family via marriage and inheritance to Baron von Springer, Vienna.⁴ Dr. Joseph Kranz, Vienna, by 1902.⁵ Stefan von Auspitz, Vienna, by 1931;⁶ (K. W. Bachstitz, The Hague);⁷ purchased 1937 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.


Scholars concur on the authenticity, provenance, and date of Tiepolo’s Scene from Ancient History, but its subject matter remains a mystery. Although there are no documents relating to its commission, all agree that it was painted for a room in the Palazzo Barbaro (now Palazzo Barbaro-Curtis), Venice, from whence it was sold in the nineteenth century.⁹ The painting belongs to a series of oval soprapporte representing virtuous women from Roman (and possibly Greek) history. The number of paintings in the group and its underlying theme have yet to be adequately explained.

Until now it was assumed that Tiepolo’s Barbaro series consisted of at least four canvases, each of similar dimensions, with the following subjects: Tarquin and Lucretia (fig. 1, Städtische Kunstsammlungen Augsburg);¹⁰ the Matronalia Offering Gifts to Juno Regina (fig. 2, High Museum of Art, Atlanta);¹¹ and Latino Offering Lavinia to Aeneas in Matrimony (?) (fig. 3, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen);¹² and the Washington painting. The canvases in Copenhagen and Washington are the artist’s only versions of these subjects known. The Matronalia Offering

Fig. 1. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Tarquin and Lucretia, c. 1750, oil on canvas, Städtische Kunstsammlungen Augsburg

Fig. 2. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Matronalia Offering Gifts to Juno Regina, c. 1750, oil on canvas, Atlanta, High Museum of Art, Gift of Samuel H. Kress, 1932.⁶
Giovan Battista Tiepolo, *Latino Offering Lavinia to Aeneas in Matrimony,* c. 1750, oil on canvas, Copenhagen, Royal Museum of Fine Arts

Gifts exists in a second example, formerly in the Necchi Collection, Pavia, which, because it bears a signature (or inscription), has also been attributed to Tiepolo. The Augsburg *Tarquin and Lucretia* is also known in several copies, the best of which is in the Art Institute, Zanesville, Ohio. In addition, the compositions of the *Matronalia* and *Tarquin and Lucretia* were copied in drawings, now in Stuttgart, which were probably the basis for two etchings by Giandomenico Tiepolo.

Both the Copenhagen and Washington pictures appeared along with a ceiling painting by Tiepolo in a sale at the Hôtel Drouot, Paris, in 1874. The catalogue reported that the three works came from the "grande salle de bal" of the Palazzo Barbaro, Venice. The ceiling painting, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, was described as the *Apotheosis of Francesco Barbaro* and the two ovals as pendentives (that is, overdoors). This incorrect description of the subject and ambiguous location of the ceiling has led to a continued misreading of the meaning of the series of ovals. Scholars seem to have ignored the description by Gianjacopo Fontana, written sometime between 1845 and 1863, but certainly before the removal of the Tiepolo ovals, of the large salon facing the grand canal (called the cameron as well as grande salone) in the palace. Although Fontana, whose book covered numerous families and palaces in Venice, made mistakes of attribution, it is evident that his description of the contents of the cameron was fairly accurate. He mentioned seprapprore paintings by Domenico and Lorenzo [sic] Tiepolo, surrounded by gilt stucco stemmi and putti. The room still exists in its stuccoed splendor, but the ovals over the doors now contain later portraits. Mariuz was the first to notice that the measurements of Tiepolo’s canvases were consistent with the oval stuccoed frames in the room. The original ceiling paintings, also described by Fontana, are in situ; they have been identified by Hannegan as works by Antonio Zanchi commissioned for Alvise Barbaro (d. 1698) before 1697. Aikema published further documents and dated the three large wall canvases by Antonio Balestra (1666–1740), Giovanni Battista Piazzetta, and Sebastiano Ricci, and proposed the commission of Tiepolo’s seprapprore.

The ceiling painting in New York, whose subject is probably not the *Apotheosis of Francesco Barbaro,* is a separate Barbaro commission from the works mentioned above. It comes from a smaller room that faces the courtyard where its original molding and a copy of the composition still exist, and has no iconographic or physical connection with the oval canvases. Aikema suggested convincingly that Tiepolo’s ceiling was commissioned in 1750 to celebrate the appointment of Almorò Barbaro (1681–1754) as procurator of San Marco. It is not the famous ancestor Francesco Barbaro (1390–1454) being honored, but Almorò himself. Aikema accepted the subject as that inscribed on Giandomenico’s etching after the painting: “Valor, prudenza, e nobiltà.” Thus, Francesco Barbaro’s famous treatise on marriage, *De re uxoria,* could not have been the inspiration for the feminine subjects portrayed by Tiepolo in the four canvases, as had been assumed.

The ceiling paintings by Antonio Zanchi depict the triumph of Aurelian over Queen Zenobia, Hypsicrateia cutting her hair, Artemisia drinking a potion containing her husband’s ashes, the flight of Cleoia from the camp of Lars Porsenna, and Her-
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Scene from Ancient History, 1939.1.365
silia watching the Sabine games.\textsuperscript{29} These histories of virtuous wives and valorous women, as well as the camerons they adorned, were commissioned by Alvise Barbaro, probably in anticipation of the marriage of his son Almoro to Modesta Valier, which took place in 1699.\textsuperscript{30} The wall painting by Sebastiano Ricci of the Rape of the Sabines was also part of this commission before Alvise’s death in 1698. According to Aikema, the wall paintings by Piazzetta of Mucius Scaevola and by Balestra of Coriolanus were completed between 1707 (when Almoro took possession of this part of the palace) and 1709 (when the Coriolanus was mentioned in a catalogue of Balestra’s works).\textsuperscript{31} Consequently, the theme of marriage was no longer appropriate and the young Barbaro instead chose subjects of valorous men from Roman history.

Sometime in the second half of the 1740s—or, as Aikema proposed, in 1750 to celebrate his appointment as procurator of San Marco—Almoro remodeled the camerons with contemporary stucco decorations and added the soprapporta paintings of virtuous women to complement the ceiling cycle begun by Zanchi fifty years earlier.\textsuperscript{32} Recent scholars agree that the ovals date sometime before Tiepolo left for Würzburg in late 1750.\textsuperscript{33} The monumental forms and cool countenances of his protagonists and the conscientious balancing of compositions seen in the Barbaro ovals relate to such works of c. 1750 as the frescoes of the Palazzo Labia and the Villa Contarini at Mira.\textsuperscript{34} The broad, sharply defined brushstrokes that carefully delineate the folds of garments are typical of this period.

How the four extant ovals relate iconographically has not been determined. The subjects of the Augsburg Tarquin and Lucretia and Atlanta Matronalia Offering Gifts to Juno Regina are secure, but the Copenhagen and Washington pictures still present problems. It is unclear whether the regal young woman in the Copenhagen picture is Lavinia accepting the ring of the supplicant Aeneas or rejecting his proposal.\textsuperscript{35} The depiction of the handsome suitor could well be Aeneas, and the turbaned man presenting the young woman may well be her father arranging the marriage that founded the colony of Rome.
The Washington Scene from Ancient History has been the most difficult subject of the series to interpret. The traditional title of Timoclea and the Thracian Commander dates back only to 1910 and cannot be sustained. Timoclea had been defiled and robbed by a Thracian commander in Alexander’s army. When he asked where she kept her valuables, Timoclea led him to a well and pushed him to his death. Because of her courage and virtue, Alexander pardoned her for the murder of his officer. The Washington picture depicts instead a woman, by her elegant clothing evidently of noble birth, being menaced by a soldier who holds in his right hand a hank of dark hair, certainly not that of the threatened woman. The woman behind her, wearing a crown, does not appear to support the swooning lady but views the scene in a detached manner, or rather, in complicity with the soldier. Aikema’s suggestion that the scene may portray the death of Arsinoe does not seem correct. The seventeenth-century opera Arsinoe is not the source for the picture’s subject, and ancient literature is vague on the figure of Arsinoe. Tiepolo has emphasized the evil of the soldier by hiding his face in shadow and by his menacing gesture of showing the young woman the lock of hair while reaching for his sword. The queen, who stands apart, is also in a half-light; only the young and virtuous woman is shown in the dazzling light that falls on her upward gazing face and bright white dress.

Although four oval compositions of the same size with similar subject matter have survived, there are places for six oval soprapporte in the cameron. While not discounting that two paintings may have been lost, Aikema preferred the explanation that the remaining spaces with carved heraldic eagles of the Barbaro family in the frames contained effigies of Almorò Barbaro and his wife Modesta Valier. Now, however, it can be proved that all six ovals contained similar historical scenes. Two watercolors of the cameron dating to 1852 (figs. 4–5) portray portions of the ceiling with Zanchi’s paintings, the three monumental wall canvases by Balestra, Ricci, and Piazzetta, as well as five of the six soprapporte ovals. Surprising, however, is the fact that among the five paintings depicted in the watercolors, only the
Washington Scene from Ancient History and the Copenhagen Latino Offering Lavinia to Aeneas in Matrimony can be identified. The three other ovals represent kindred compositions evidently with women as the main protagonists. Since neither the Atlanta nor the Augsburg composition is featured in the drawings, one or both of them were not part of Tiepolo’s series. Unlike the Washington and Copenhagen pictures, those from Atlanta and Augsburg do not have a secure Bárbaro provenance. Although the figures in these overdoors are difficult to identify, the composition of one is close to a painting by Giambattista Pittoni (1687–1767), formerly on the art market, Paris, with measurements almost identical to Tiepolo’s paintings.41 Pittoni’s picture depicts Cleopatra at her banquet for Marc Antony as she is about to drop the precious pearl in the goblet of vinegar. The subject of the painting, however, does not accord with a portrayal of virtuous conduct as in the other ovals,42 and a pendant by Pittoni of the Death of Lucretia repeats the subject of the Augsburg painting. Thus, there are two ovals by Tiepolo and two by Pittoni of the same size which were probably not painted for the Palazzo Bárbaro. Evidently, these subjects and their format were popular in Tiepolo’s ambient around 1750. The destination of Tiepolo’s extra oval(s) is unknown, and until the three sepapporte appearing in one of the watercolors are discovered, the iconography and author of all the ovals cannot be deciphered.

Notes
1. Information about the sale of furnishings and works of art from the Palazzo Bárbaro in the 1860s is contained in a letter of 9 February 1924 from Frank Lattimer to B. Burroughs of the Metropolitan Museum (archival envelope, Apotheosis of Francesco Bárbaro, Metropolitan Museum, New York). Lattimer was the cousin of Ralph Curtis, then owner of the palace, and found this information in files assembled at the palace by Mrs. Curtis.
3. According to marginal notations in the Knoedler Fiche copy of the sale catalogue; Cammondo is not named anywhere on the catalogue, but Lugt, vol. 4, no. 51344, lists this as Cammondo’s sale. Féral, named as a painter and authority for the paintings included in the sale, may have been acting as agent for the following, who is said in the prospectus from the Bachstitz Gallery (see note 4) to have purchased the painting at the Cammondo Sale.
4. A prospectus from the Bachstitz Gallery, NGA curatorial files, states that the painting passed to Baron Adolphe’s daughter, who married Baron Eduard von Springer. The Getty Provenance Index reports that Baron Adolphe had no children and that the painting passed to his niece Valentine Noëmi Rothschild, who married Baron Sigismund von Springer in 1911 (letter from Martha Hepworth of 15 March 1993, NGA curatorial files). The painting was already in the collection of Dr. Kranz by 1909 (see next note).
5. Catalogued by Modern, Tiepolo, 1902, 72, in the Kranz collection.
6. Borenius, Italian Paintings of the Aupitz Collection, 12, 67, nos. 49–50. This publication cannot be located, but is cited in the following (see note 7). Borenius 1932, 287, noted that the dissolution of the Aupitz collection in 1932 was necessitated by the Austrian financial crisis of 1931.
8. This exhibition of nine paintings from the Golden Gate International Exposition held earlier that year in San Francisco is recorded in ArtN 38 (1939), 13.
9. See provenance above.
11. 144.5 × 112.7 cm. This painting, originally an oval canvas, has been lined with a rectangular canvas. Leyev 1978, 418–419, correctly identified the subject, which earlier was thought to be Offerings of Gifts by Marc Antony to Cleopatra or the Vestal Virgin Making Offerings to Juno Lucina. See Zafran 1984, 66–67. The latter interpretation comes from the inscription on Giandomenico Tiepolo’s etching after the painting: “Romane e Vergini Vestali.” As Leyev explained, the temple is that of Juno Regina, where twenty-five matrons sacrificed their dowries during the Punic Wars after the temple had been struck by lightning, an unfavorable omen. On the attribution of this painting see note 13.
12. Inv. no. 4201. 140 × 109.5 cm. The subject had earlier been considered the Rejected Proposal. Bell 1987, 159–162, suggested instead the Betrothal of Alexander and Roxanne. Aikema 1987, 150, proposed the title Latino Offering Lavinia in Matrimony to Aeneas.
13. The Pavia version (said to be now in a private collection, Milan) was considered Tiepolo’s original by the following scholars: Pallucchini 1968, 113, no. 190; Zeri in Zeri and Gardner 1973, 56; and Pedroccho in Gemin and Pedroccho 1993, 103, under no. 392. Morassi 1962, 2, called the Atlanta painting an excellent replica of the Necchi canvas. Shapley 1973, 147, called the Necchi painting a copy of the Atlanta canvas. Leyev 1978, 421, n. 1, appears to have accepted both versions. Bell 1987, 159, and Aikema 1987, 150, mentioned only the Pavia version. The Necchi painting is inscribed: “G.B. Tiepolo” and measures 138 × 107 cm. Since efforts to trace the Necchi painting have been unsuccessful, its relationship to the Atlanta version must remain conjectural. A recent examination by the writer of the Atlanta canvas raises questions about its authenticity. The handling of the paint is heavier, the morphology of figures somewhat different, and the brushwork less vivacious than in the Augsburg and Washington paintings. The present writer wonders if this canvas might not be attributable to Giandomenico Tiepolo.
14. 130 × 103 cm. The variation from the Augsburg canvas other than size is the addition of a decorative chain across Lucretia’s chest. See Morassi 1962, 69, who called the
Zanesville painting a workshop replica, for other copies of Tiepolo’s original.

15. Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Inv. 1902-1903. Sack 1910, 150, ascribed the drawings to Giambattista, but the sheets seem to be from the workshop. For the drawings and engravings see Knox and Thiem 1971, nos. 66-67.

16. See provenance. The Washington and Copenhagen paintings have similar frames, supporting their shared provenance.


18. Fontana 1845-1863, 172. Although he finished writing in 1863, Fontana had seen the works described years before. The break-up of the room occurred sometime between 1860, the year of Antonio Barbaro’s death, and 1866, the year his sister Elissa Bassi sold the palace. See provenance.

19. Fontana 1845-1863, 172: “Infinito è poi il lavoro degli stucchi nella suntuosa e magnifica sala, di bello e superbo rocòco, con sopraccoperte alle tavole di verde di Genova. Poiché in mille foglie sono sugli stucchi le girlande e i freggii d’oro intrecciati, e nel mezzo e agli angoli i tableau dorati, e con figure, gli stemmi pure dorati, e bambini di stucco, che i dipinti sostengono delle sovrapposte, opere di Domenico e Lorenzo Tiepolo, essendo altre pittoresche: il Rat- dorati, e con figure, gli stemmi pure dorati, e bambini di stucco, che i dipinti sostengono delle sovrapposte, opere di Domenico e Lorenzo Tiepolo, essendo altre pittoresche: il Rat-to delle Sabine di Luca da Reggio, Muzio Scovel di G. B. Pi- azzetta, il voto d’eftie di Nicolò Renieri nelle facciate; e nel plafone il trionfo di Davide di G. B. Negri, quegli che dipinse la pestilenza sulla scala della Scuola di S. Rocco, e nei qua- tro ovati laterali le Deità simboliche, opere del Langetti, contemporaneo del Zanchi.” See further on in the text the proof that Fontana’s description was accurate.

20. For a photograph of the room see Aikema 1987, 152, fig. 7.

21. Mariuz and Pallucchini 1982, 105, under no. 125. Measurements of two of the oval surrounds taken recently by workers in the palace reasonably approximate the sizes of the paintings: 134×107 and 134×101.5 cm. Two others—165×105 cm and 166×106 cm—are somewhat taller than the existing paintings. The discrepancy in measurements is disturbing but may be due to miscalculation by the restorer or painter. How the paintings fit into the larger spaces is unknown. (Measurements kindly supplied by Patricia Curtis Vigano, letters of 30 April 1993 and 7 June 1993, NGA curatorial files.)

22. Hannegan 1983, 201. The paintings and their subjects were recorded in La Galleria di Minerva published in Venice in 1697.


24. According to information provided by Mrs. Ralph Curtis in 1923, the Tiepolo ceiling painting hung in the “grand room of the piano nobile” (see note 1). This is not the larger grand salon, now referred to as the camerons, but a smaller room on the piano nobile: Aikema 1987, 147, fig. 1, room designated 2. There are errors in the numbering of the rooms in his plan of the Palazzo Barbaro. The correct location of paintings of the plan (fig. 1) are as follows: 1: the camerons; 2: the “grande salone” with Tiepolo’s ceiling painting; 3: the room with Giuseppe Angel’s Diana and Endymion; 4: the sala degli armadi with a ceiling painting by an unknown artist; 5: the room with another ceiling (possibly by Brusaferro, according to Aikema). The writer would like to thank Patricia Curtis Vigano for her kindness in allowing her access to the palace.

who rented the *palaço* in 1852, with an eye to buying it. One of the watercolors depicts the Clary family in the *cameron*. The watercolors belong to Prince and Princess Clary. Photographs and information on the watercolors were supplied by the generosity of Patricia Curtis Vigano, to whom their discovery should be credited.

41. 138 x 107 cm. For this and the pendant described further on in the text see Zava Boccazzi 1979, 185–186, no. 269–270, figs. 170–171. Two other versions belonged to the Baron M. Lazzarone, Nice, and were included in his sale 16–21 June 1951, no. 27 (Witt Microfiche 10518, Witt Library Box 2229). The paintings have been dated from c. 1730 to as late as 1748.

42. Unless, however, one interprets the scene as the sacrifice of worldly goods for love rather than the usual interpretation of profligate living.
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1943.4.39 (540)

**Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III**

1762
Oil on canvas, 181.8 x 104.3 (71 3/4 x 41 1/2)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

**Inscriptions**
In ink on stretcher: "8629E" and "10672"; in pencil on stretcher: "299–5629."

**Technical Notes:** The support is a tightly woven plain-weave fabric of rather coarse texture with thick threads. The primary ground is a red layer that covers the entire surface of the fabric. A secondary yellow layer was applied over the center of the surface, leaving a border approximately 5 cm wide around the edge. Air-path x-ray fluorescence and analysis of cross-sections shows that the red layer consists of red and yellow iron oxides. The yellow layer is in fact two layers of different colored pigments, and appears to be lighter in color under the figures; these yellow layers are a mixture of iron-oxide-based pigments and lead white.

Infrared reflectography revealed loose and infrequent underdrawing with a brush; black and brown paint were used. The paint was applied as a slightly stiff paste that retained the texture of brushstrokes. A quick, vibrant scumbling of the paint is visible, particularly in the sky, and the thick handling of the clouds contrasts with the thinly painted, generally dark areas such as the figures around the edge of the composition. Throughout all stages of work, the artist employed a sketching-in process and scumbling techniques, until fine details and finishing touches were added with a fluid dark paint. X-radiographs reveal minor compositional changes by the artist, most importantly a thick layer of clouds under the greenish gray balustrade on the sides in the lower half of the composition and a rainbow above the figure of Faith. Scientific analysis revealed a limited palette consisting of lead white, vermilion, red and yellow iron earths, bone black, brown umber, ultramarine, terre verte, and very sparing amounts of Prussian blue.

Although the paint is generally secure, there are many small losses and areas of abrasion throughout, as well as several small holes. In 1939 the painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto. In 1987–1990 Teresa Longyear removed discolored varnish and restored the painting.

**Provenance:** Possibly by inheritance from the artist to a niece who married Pagliano, perhaps the painter Eleuterio Pagliano [1826–1903]; possibly purchased in Venice by Edward Cheney [1803–1884],1 London, after 1860 at Badger Hall, Shropshire;2 possibly by inheritance to his brother-in-law, Colonel Alfred Capel-Cure [1826–1896]; by inheritance to his nephew, Francis Capel-Cure [1854–1931], Badger Hall, Shropshire;3 (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence);4 purchased 1935 by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York.5

In September 1761 Giambattista Tiepolo was invited by King Charles III to paint in the Royal Palace in Madrid. Letters from Tiepolo indicate that he had been asked to paint the Throne Room in the newly completed palace, a job that he expected to take two years. After finishing previous commitments at Verona and Strà, Tiepolo departed for Spain on 31 March 1762, carrying with him a *modello* for the ceiling of the Throne Room. All scholars have identified the National Gallery’s *Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III* as the preparatory *modello* Tiepolo carried with him to Spain. Two years later (1764) Tiepolo signed and dated the great ceiling in the Royal Palace (fig. 1).

Tiepolo’s letter of 13 March 1762 describes the difficult task in front of him:

Al presente sonó al fine del Modello della Gran Opera che tanto è vasta; basta solo riflette che è di cento piedi. Tuttavia voglio sperare che l’idea compiuta sarà molto ben adattata et adattata a quella Gran Monarchia; fatica grande certamente, ma per tal Opera ci vuol coraggio.

Early in 1762 the duke of Montealegre, Madrid’s ambassador to Venice, must have seen drawings and perhaps the *modello* in preparation: he noted at the end of January that Tiepolo’s trip to Madrid had been delayed but that in the meantime the artist was occupied in formulating “las grandiosas ideas” for the king. In any case, the *modello* can be dated by the artist’s correspondence most likely to the early months of 1762 before Tiepolo’s departure for Madrid on 31 March.

The theme of the Throne Room ceiling was set out in great detail in Tiepolo’s very complete *modello*, one of his largest oil sketches known. The grandeur and power of the Spanish monarchy—and specifically of the reign of Charles III—is supported
by her virtues and knowledge, praised and aided by the Olympian deities, and represented by her global accomplishments, which include the employment of natural resources and commercial development at home, the subjugation and exploitation of conquered lands, and expansion of foreign trade.⁶ Although many of the figures on the ceiling have only a generalized meaning, their purpose is clear: to impress the visitor seeking audience with the king by the magnificence of the Spanish sovereignty.

Upon entering the room from the Saleta, the viewer is struck first by the allegorical characters around the long, low cornice, which represent the inhabitants, flora, fauna, commercial products, and prosperity of Spain, Asia, and America. Stuccoed figures of river gods hold oval medallions with deities representing the four elements, and two gold grisaille soprapporta ovals at the entrances represent Abundance, and Virtue with Merit. The realistic figures along the cornice lead the eye toward the allegorical and mythological exposition in the clouds above. In the sky at the far end of the room is the figure of Spanish Monarchy, who sits on a throne balanced on the earthly globe and flanked by the statues of Minerva and Apollo (Hercules and Apollo in the modello).⁷ Below at left are representations of the Science of Government, Clemency, Moderation, and Abundance; and Good Counsel, Princely Glory, Humanity, and Temperance. Below at right are Justice, Peace, and Truth; and the virtues Faith, Hope, Charity, Fortitude, and Prudence. These qualities symbolize the characteristics of the monarchy and of Charles III, to whom the inscription, an elegiac couplet, on the pyramid is dedicated: “ARDUA QUAE ATTOLLIS MONUMENTA/ ET FLECTIER GNANIMUM.” (The monuments that you raise, you renown, Charles, for magnanimity).⁸ Above the entering visitor, Apollo, Neptune, Jupiter, Minerva, and other gods guide the monarchy to further greatness.⁹

No contract or other documents exist to explain the meaning of the figures on the ceiling. A decade after completion of the Throne Room Antonio Ponz wrote that the fresco represented the grandeur, power, religion, and qualities of the Spanish Monarchy with the provinces of Spain and the Indies with people carrying their commercial productions.¹⁰ In 1829 Francisco José Fabre gave identities to most of the figures in the fresco and related their meaning to the concetto as a whole.¹¹ In 1981, Jones, basing her analysis on the identifications of Fabre, gave a more detailed reading of the ceiling and identified the literary sources for Tiepolo's figures in the sky in Cartari and Ripa.¹² Recently Checa intelligently suggested that the ceiling represented the generic qualities of the monarchy, its benefits, and the peaceful government of the Bourbons, especially of Charles III.¹³ As will be explained, Fabre's identification of the figures along the cornice as the Spanish provinces cannot be upheld, because the figures have only a generalized allegorical meaning. Jones' interpretation of the entire ceiling as "the Bourbon Monarchy as the author of Spain's new prosperity" is correct in its broad outline, but her proposal that the message of the ceiling was altered due to the change in economic and political forces in Spain between 1763 and 1764 cannot be sustained. A comparison of the finished ceiling with the modello shows that all the basic concepts of the fresco were laid out before Tiepolo left Italy in March 1762. Tiepolo did not change the allegory or the personifications, but embellished them and added forms to fill out the spaces and improve the composition. Tiepolo's alterations were based on artistic rather than political considerations and on further information about Spanish costumes and products he received once he was in Spain. The lengthy discussion that follows is the first systematic attempt to explain the figures in detail in both the modello and the ceiling; it will justify Tiepolo's alterations in the context of the artistic task before him as well as respond to the criticisms of the ceiling as the product of an exhausted artist in his declining years.

The main protagonist of the ceiling is Spanish Monarchy (1 in fig. 2), whose crowned figure appears in the modello seated on a throne. Also in the modello on either side stand statues of Hercules with his club (to her right: 2) and Apollo with his lyre (to her left: 3). The small lightly sketched figure at Monarchy's lower right is unidentifiable (4). At her feet at the viewer's right is Justice holding her sword and the scales (5). In the group below Hercules sits a male nude and behind him a woman (6). To his right is the drapery and leg of another person. The old man crowned in laurel and holding a book upright in each hand is Counsel (7). Another figure crowned in laurel and a second without attributes (8) recline at the base of the statue of Hercules, while the figure seen...
from behind with the cornucopia represents Abundance (9). Next to her, another reclining figure with no attributes, seen from behind, also looks up at Hercules (10). The group beneath the statue of Apollo includes Virtue carrying a wreath in her hand (11), another figure with a sketchy round object in her raised left hand (12), and a court of additional female figures (13). Behind this entire tier appear palm trees and a backdrop of vegetation. Above Monarchy’s throne fly left hand (12), and a court of additional female figures no attributes, seen from behind, also looks up at Herdance (9). Next to her, another reclining figure with an anchor visible (20). Above them flies a putto with a wreath (21) to indicate that the virtues represented bring glory and honor to the monarchy. To the left a figure (19) holds a ring and leans toward Generosity, while an unspecified winged woman sits behind her holding an unidentified object (18). Reclining with her back to us is Hope, the top part of her anchor visible (20). Above them flies a putto with a wreath (21) to indicate that the virtues represented bring glory and honor to the monarchy. To the left of these virtues cloud carries another group representing Faith with her cross and chalice (22), Fortitude in blue with her column (23), Charity suggested by the heads of a woman and child (24), Prudence with her snake and mirror (25), and winged Victory carrying a palm branch (26). Other figures may be sketchily indicated at right.

In the fresco Tiepolo made some alterations to this section of the composition to clarify what was merely suggested in the modello. Spanish Monarchy is further symbolized by the castle on which she leans. Jones has noted the addition of the small statuette behind her right shoulder, which she proposed represents the legitimacy and ancestry of the monarchy. Other changes include the substitution of the figure of Minerva for Hercules and the addition of Peace embracing and kissing Justice. A new figure, the Science of Government according to Fabre, has been placed at the base of the statue of Minerva. Abundance now holds a sheaf of grain, and the figure next to her holding an olive branch with the fasces and helmet at her feet has been identified as Clemency. Counsel has been moved lower near the Glory of Princes.

In the group of Virtues, Hope with her anchor, moved from the group at left, replaces the figure of Fortitude, now at Victory’s right, and Charity becomes more visible. In the group with the Glory of Princes, Tiepolo refined the positions and changed the attributes of figures: for example, Glory of Princes turns toward us and the figure that was Hope in the modello now holds a jug and can be identified as Temperance. Humanity, crowned with roses and holding flowers and a golden chain, replaces the figure with a ring. He also added the inscription on the pyramid/obelisk in praise of Charles III.

Jones believed the reason for some of these changes between modello and ceiling was due to the conclusion of the disastrous war with England, which ended in February 1763, a subsequent change in the political atmosphere, and the need to emphasize peace instead of power. Thus, for her Hercules has been replaced by Minerva, who stands for the wisdom seen below her, and Peace has been added to embrace Justice. In addition, numerous putti carry olive branches. If, however, Hercules was to be the ruler of the virtues below him, as Jones suggested, with the substitution of Minerva these allegorical representations would probably have been different in the preliminary study. The Spanish Monarchy was said to have been descended from Hercules and his presence may have been considered for that reason alone. In addition, a drawing of Minerva and Mars made subsequent to the modello indicates that during the execution of the ceiling Tiepolo was considering replacing Hercules and Apollo with Minerva and Mars, suggesting that various gods could be placed at the side of Spanish Monarchy to denote a certain quality of the reign. Consequently, these feigned statues do not reign over the Virtues below them and do not reflect current affairs as Jones contended. Like the addition of further attributes such as the olive branches, the supernumeraries on the ceiling that fill the vast expanse of space clarify rather than alter the original theme. If Tiepolo began the ceiling in 1762 as he had calculated he would, and was in the midst of painting in 1763, then the political changes taking place at court in 1763-1764 could not have had an influence on the fresco’s thematic development. Also, in spite of Spain’s defeat by England, Charles III worked at rearming his country. His main goal was a strong defense of Spain and its colonies.

The other half of the sky was more radically transformed and embellished between modello and ceiling. In the sketch, working clockwise from above Neptune, are flying figures in two groups, some of which appear to be Winds (27–28). Above the ship’s mast is a cluster of winged figures (29–31), one of
Figures in the sky
1. Spanish Monarchy
2. Hercules
3. Apollo
4. unidentified figure
5. Justice
6. nude male with female
7. Counsel
8. two females, one with laurel
9. Abundance
10. reclining figure
11. Virtue
12. female with round object
13. court of female figures
14. assorted putti
15. Fame
16. Glory of Princes
17. Generosity
18. winged woman
19. figure holding a ring
20. Hope
21. putto with wreath
22. Faith
23. Fortitude
24. Charity
25. Prudence
26. Victory
27. Winds
28. Winds
29. winged figures (Winds)
30. winged figures (Winds)
31. Aeolus
32. Thetis
33. Vulcan
34. Mars
35. attendant with conch shell
36. Minerva
37. Jupiter
38. Hercules
39. Ceres (or Ariadne)
40. putto with wreath
41. putti with torches
42. Heresy
43. Vice
44. Vice
45. Vice

Figures around the cornice
A. figures in oriental dress
B. groom leading a horse
C. seated woman
D. kneeling figures with horses
E. putto with gold chain
F. Painting
G. Poetry
H. woman reclining
I. capped figure
J. two standing figures
K. reclining woman
L. reclining woman
M. woman with sheaf of grain
N. woman with a stick
O. Geography
P. figure with bolts of cloth
Q. seated woman
R. reclining woman
S. woman with tree trunks
T. woman with lemon tree
U. East Indies
V. figure offering small vessel
W. turbaned man with quiver
X. Turkish merchants
Y. Pillars of Hercules
Z. Christopher Columbus
AA. two Indians and a turbaned figure
BB. two figures with cornucopia
CC. Neptune and his retinue
DD. American Indians
EE. Neptune's horses
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which must be Aeolus (31). Below the ship’s mast, the nude Thetis carries a large shell loaded with the riches of the sea (32), accompanied by the bearded Vulcan (33) with his hammer, the helmeted Mars (34) holding a shield, and an attendant blowing a conch shell (35). The wheel suggests Thetis’ marine chariot. To the left of this group are Minerva (36) and Jupiter (37), whose attributes are fully delineated in the fresco. Above them to the left sit Hercules with his club (38) and Ceres or Ariadne with a sheaf of grain in her hair (39). Hercules appears twice in the sketch in which Tiepolo was working out the composition. As noted above, this repetition was eliminated in the ceiling. Following this group is the dramatic destruction of the vices by the light of reason, represented by putti with torches (41). The putto carrying a wreath (40) again indicates that the destruction of Vice is a meritorious act. Heresy is identified by her sagging breasts (42), whereas the other Vices as yet lack attributes (43–45).

Tiepolo further clarified his divine company in the fresco. The groups above Neptune have become Time (or Saturn), with attendant figures, and the winged Zephyr with his lover Flora, who holds a basket of flowers. Crossing on the rainbow is Hesperia (the ancient name for Spain), connecting the two sides of the earth that are under her influence. Thetis and her attendants have been joined by her husband Oceanus, and Mars has been replaced by an attendant with a shield made of a turtle shell. Thetis’ aquatic carriage led by attendants precedes her. Above, Aeolus has now been given the most prominent position of the deities, ruling over the Winds that carry Spain’s ships to new discoveries. Mercury appears near Spanish Monarchy, to whom he indicates the activities of the gods in her favor. Hercules has been replaced by Bacchus, and the goddess with him is now identified as his bride Ariadne. To the left of the group of Vices, to whom more attributes are given, important figures have been added. Apollo with his lyre appears in the guise of the radiant sun god who banishes the darkness of the Vices. Mars, who had formed part of Thetis’ retinue in the sketch, sits on a cloud to Apollo’s right with a female figure who may be Venus.

The scenes along the length of the cornice are divided into two: those around Spanish Monarchy represent the people and products of Spain, while those below the protective deities illustrate the conquered territories and their treasures as well as Spain’s trade with the world. Along the two ends of the cornice are more representations of Spain (below the deities) and subjugated peoples honoring Charles III (below the scene of Spanish Monarchy). The vast foreign domains of the cornice are connected by a rainbow, not yet conceived in the sketch. Fabre’s identification of the cornice figures as the Spanish provinces is incorrect, but it must be noted that he emphasized that they did not carry coats of arms to distinguish them and that his interpretation was only a personal attempt at identification. Tiepolo’s representations of the characteristics of Spain are more general than Fabre would have us believe. Kagan, in a new interpretation, has pointed out that many of the physical properties of the figures and their agricultural and commercial products are characteristic of many of the regions of the Spanish peninsula.

The subject of the cornice, implied in the modello, is fully developed in the fresco. The short cornice below Generosity represents the peoples conquered by Spain offering gifts and paying tribute to Charles III. Here Tiepolo altered his typically oriental figures (A) to the two dark-skinned figures wearing Andean hats and capes in the fresco, of which he probably had first-hand knowledge only after his arrival in Spain. Facing outward in the sketch, these figures now participate in the scene to the right. In the sketch a groom leads a horse (B) and behind him there is a tent and brightly robed figures with vaguely Eastern features who offer gifts of Arabian horses (D). Enriched in the ceiling, this scene now includes a more developed horse rearing in the opposite direction. Kneeling figures have been added in front of the groom and display captured Moorish weapons. The Arabian horses (D) have been moved between the rearing horse and the tent, in front of which dark-skinned figures appear with large barrels. The female figure seated at the lower right is little changed from the modello (C) and is probably a personification. Another soldier, perhaps representing the conquering armies, is shown with the flag of Spain. The homage of the subject peoples of the Spanish empire is directed to this flag, and thus to Charles himself. Above this section of the cornice float a putto with a golden chain (present in the modello, E) and a wreath and scepter, indicating the honor accruing to Charles through conquest and the maintenance of empire.
The figures on the conch shell to the right were correctly identified by Fabre as the Fine Arts. Painting with herpalette (F) and laurel-crowned Poesy with her trumpet (G) are recognizable by their attributes in the sketch; Sculpture with her mallet and Architecture with appropriate implements were added in the fresco.

Counterclockwise along the length of the cornice are more figures representing the commercial and agricultural products of Spain. Differences between modello and fresco are ones of adjustment, enrichment, and increased direct knowledge of Spanish customs. In the Washington sketch a woman reclines next to a mountain (H), followed by a caped figure seen from behind (I). To their right are two standing figures with mountains behind them above the cornice (J). They are followed by three reclining women (K, L, M), the last holding a sheaf of grain. In the fresco a man wearing a red cap with a pipe next to snow-capped mountains has been added to the left of the first reclining figure, now depicted with a cornucopia of fruit and flowers. Tiepolo changed the representation of the subsequent figures by dressing them in sixteenth/seventeenth-century costumes and adding the faithful dogs. The following figures appear as they do in the modello (K, L), but their attributes are elaborated. One wears a crenellated tower on her head and carries a cornucopia with fruit and in her left hand a scepter. The figure with a sheaf of grain in the modello (M) now leans against her. To their right are alabaster and marble blocks and to her right is an olive branch. Behind them a woman holds a branch draped with red cloth. It is possible that this entire group represents inhabitants and characteristics of the kingdom of Castile (represented by the figure with the crenellated tower), the northern region of Spain that was united with the kingdom of Aragon by Ferdinand and Isabella. The figure at left may wear a Basque hat and the figure in black may be a cleric.

Across the room on the opposite cornice, figures lack specificity and may be a general evocation of the success of the pastoral, agricultural, scientific, and commercial endeavors of Spain that Charles hoped to achieve during his reign. Tiepolo again elaborated what he had suggested in the modello. Here at right a woman holding a stick and with indistinguishable objects on the ledge in the sketch (N) holds a cornucopia in the fresco. She leans against Geography with a globe (O), who faces the figure of Spanish Monarchy in the modello but has turned toward the viewer in the painting. To their right sits a figure with bolts of cloth (P) in the sketch but with two other figures, several bolts of cloth, and a ram and ewe added on the ceiling. There is nothing to the left of these figures in Tiepolo’s modello, but in the fresco he painted another gathering, the only case in which the artist added an entire group not even suggested in his study.

On the short cornice below the deity section of the ceiling, in the modello Tiepolo placed a seated woman (Q) and another leaning against her (R). In the fresco she carries at least three crowns. Next to them are peasants as well as a young boy in Renaissance costume by an architectural base on which lie a scepter and a royal cape of red brocade and ermine. No one has noted or explained the inscription “VII. P.E.” beneath the figure with the three crowns. To the right of this group sits a figure with trunks of trees (S) and another who holds a lemon tree (T). The positions of the figures are altered in the fresco, and one holds a line of fish, which dangles as stuccoed relief over the cornice. Kagan has explained this section of the cornice as possibly representing the kingdom of Aragon. The three crowns signify the old kingdoms that constitute Aragon: Aragon, Valencia, and Catalonia. Consequently, it is possible that all the regions of Spain are indicated in the fresco by virtue of their belonging to the two ancient kingdoms of Aragon and Castile.

Along the cornice on the deity half of the ceiling, Tiepolo again clarified what had been suggested in the modello. The artist’s conception of the East Indies and the New World are much more elaborate than his characterizations of Spain. This is probably due to the fact that he had portrayed the continents numerous times before beginning with his ceiling in the Palazzo Clerici, Milan (1740), and most recently at the Residenz in Würzburg (1751–1753). His repertoire of models for these figures would have been large, whereas he had only the written program sent to him in order to invent and visualize the characteristics of the Spanish peninsula.

In the modello a woman who is probably the personification of the East Indies (U) appears as a half-dressed native carrying a sheaf of grain and riding a camel. Behind her is a tent full of porcelain and in front of her camel are Chinese jars. Next to the tent another native (V) holds a small vessel. To the right, a turbaned kneeling man with a quiver on his back.
ITALIAN PAINTINGS

Tiepolo enriched this portion of the cornice in the fresco by the addition of figures on both sides of East India that represent the peoples and customs of the Orient. In the fresco, a reclining man wearing a striped caftan holds a long pipe, after whom comes a group of veiled women and Chinese men. East India carries a larger plant than in the sketch and inside the tent are two cloth merchants. The native with the vessels is now represented by both a man and a woman; the man with a quiver has been replaced by several men. The subsequent group of a reclining female figure with plants, farmers, and a boulder may be allegorical figures added to suggest fecundity. Next, the pillars of Hercules of the modello have been replaced by two ostriches, but the pillars reappear in altered form in the scene with Christopher Columbus.

Opposite this colorful scene is the most complicated of the entire ceiling, an intricate depiction of Columbus presenting America to the Spanish Monarchy. Tiepolo developed this section far beyond the first idea of the modello in which Columbus (Z), surrounded by figures bearing offerings, faces Spanish Monarchy with the riches of the New World displayed on the cornice beneath his ship, indicated by piles of colorful feathers, a bale of cotton, and two figures with a cornucopia (BB). Also on his ship are more American Indians and a sailor (AA). Blue and white flags, representing the Order of Charles III, are draped over the decorative corner shell. Neptune (CC), with his aquatic steeds (EE), guides Columbus’ ship toward America, which is represented by American Indians in native headdress with more riches and overflowing cornucopia (DD). Embellished and extensively altered in the fresco, the scene becomes one of high-intentioned genre elements as Columbus, turned toward his American treasures, presents them to Spanish Monarchy. The deck of the ship has been eliminated to display more treasures. The banners and flags aid in pointing toward the cache of American Indians, slaves, and the enormous riches of America, which now include an animal skin, a bobcat chained above the enormous bales, an alligator being carried below, and a cast of extras. As in the modello, Neptune, accompanied by numerous sea nymphs, sea gods, and the riches of the sea, triumphantly leads Columbus toward a group of Indians representing America. Neptune now faces the throne of the king in the room below as if pointing out to him what Columbus displays to Spanish Monarchy. Comical details of a monkey who looks up from below the cornice and a figure climbing the fallen mast enliven the scene. The figure lifting the drape from the shell at the corner adds another realistic genre element. Here also the pillars of Hercules reappear, but are broken and toppled, perhaps indicating that the limits of the old world no longer exist. More blue and white flags have been added in the fresco.

The stuccoed river gods holding the gold medallions were conceived by Tiepolo before he left Italy as indicated in the modello, refuting Gerstenberg’s proposal that they were invented by Robert Michel (1720–1786), the French sculptor who executed them. Although only unidentifiable figures are indicated in the medallions in the preparatory sketch, the inclusion of the figures of gods representing the Elements was certainly projected from the outset. Tiepolo may have decided on the opulence of a completely gilded wall once he arrived in Spain to set off his personifications around the ledge, but even from the beginning he intended gilding along the decorative molding at the top of this structure, which is colored to resemble gray stone in the modello.

The main theme of the complicated program was not Tiepolo’s own, although portrayal of the Elements contained within it repeats concepts employed in some of the artist’s earlier fresco cycles, and the new popular characteristics of Spain seem to have been his visual invention. Sánchez Cántor suggested that Martín Sarmiento (1695–1772), the Benedictine monk who wrote the programs for some of the sculptural decoration in the Palacio Reale, may have been responsible for that of the Throne Room and some of the other painted ceilings. Sarmiento, however, was an adviser to Ferdinand IV, who died in 1759. Since the theme is specific to the glorification of the Spanish monarchy in the guise of Charles III, and since the new king brought his own trusted advisers from Naples, it is unlikely that Sarmiento was involved. The general program may have been sent to Italy in late 1761; and it has been suggested that Tiepolo consulted Count Felice Gazzola, the king’s agent in Venice, on some of the specific attributes for Spain. The subject chosen strengthens those in the other main public rooms of the palace, which include...
themes extolling the virtues of the Spanish rulers as heirs to the Roman emperors and the triumphs of the Spanish monarchy. As a prelude to the Throne Room (but painted after it) the Apotheosis of the Spanish Monarchy depicts a similar allegory to that of the Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy, except that it extols Spain in general and not in the person of Charles III.

After arriving in Spain Tiepolo realized that he needed to make adjustments to the composition to accord with the measurements of the Throne Room. In his letter of 28 September 1761 he had asked for the measurements of the room, but may not have received the exact height. The National Gallery modello is not proportionally consistent with the ceiling for which it is preparatory: the proportions of the ceiling are 2.7:1, whereas those of the modello are approximately 1.74:1. Either Tiepolo had been given the incorrect length of the room or he utilized a standard-size canvas. In fact, the additions to the ceiling are almost all along the length of the cornice and the sky. Critics of Tiepolo’s fresco who have suggested that the artist’s powers were declining because of the emptiness of the central space and the repetition of earlier figural compositions, failed to take into account the proportions of the long, low room that challenged the painter. In a letter of 11 February 1761 regarding the commission for the ceiling of the Palazzo Canossa in Verona, Tiepolo specifically requested the height of the room he was to paint as well as the principal entry door. This letter suggests that the artist carefully planned the proportions of his fresco compositions according to the height of the room.

Tiepolo indeed looked for inspiration in his earlier successful ceiling in the Palazzo Clerici of 1740 because that low, narrow room required the same kind of ceiling composition. Unlike earlier painters who adapted one ceiling compositional type to differing situations, Tiepolo adjusted his composition to the requirements of the space. In the very tall ceiling in the Guard Room of the Royal Palace, for example, the artist filled the interior space with foreshortened figures spiraling upward. The height is sufficient for the viewer to take in the whole composition at once. At the Palazzo Clerici and in the Throne Room, the visitor would be unable to adjust his eyes to such foreshortened forms. What he sees easily instead are forms nearer his eye level above the cornice. These figures lead the eye toward an airy space that contains more figures at either end of the long room. The viewer does not need to bend uncomfortably backward in order to take in portions of the composition, for in these ceilings he is not expected to grasp the entire composition at once but to view it sequentially. If Tiepolo repeated certain forms here that he had used previously at Würzburg and elsewhere, he did so because of the proposed subject and because certain allegorical figures were expected to be understood by their accepted attributes. Rather than exhibiting diminished powers, in the Throne Room ceiling Tiepolo faced successfully the daunting challenge he had noted before he left Italy and certainly found the courage he sought to conquer it.

Three extant pen drawings by Tiepolo are preparatory to the Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy: two studies for Neptune in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, and a sheet with Faith, Hope, and Charity in the Princeton University Art Museum. Because in each case the solution in the ceiling is closer to the oil sketch than it is to the drawings, scholars have assumed correctly that these sheets preceded the National Gallery modello. Three chalk drawings exist that followed the modello and preceded the ceiling. One is for the standing figure wearing an Andean hat with his arms crossed in the section of the subjugated peoples. The second is a study of statues of Minerva and Mars, which Tiepolo had envisaged as Hercules and Apollo in the sketch but which became Minerva and Apollo in the final version. Another sheet, in red chalk, is a drapery study close to the turbaned man dressed in yellow in the section of the East Indies. A drawing in pen and wash for one of the overdoors also follows the modello, because the composition has been worked out on the sheet. Another large sheet in pen and ink, formerly in the Orloff collection, Paris, the design of which was etched in reverse by Lorenzo Tiepolo, has been linked to the section of the ceiling with the obelisk and the Glory of Princes and Generosity. It is known now, however, that this composition portrays a lost ceiling by Giambattista painted for Saint Petersburg before 1762. Tiepolo did skillfully re-use the motif for the Madrid Throne Room.

Molmenti published an oil sketch, formerly at Gallerie Cailleux, Paris, painted on paper and laid down on canvas, of the portion of the modello with Spanish Monarchy and the figures below. He called this a bozzetto for the Throne Room ceiling, but
from reproductions it appears to be a poor copy of the National Gallery painting. Another oil sketch, in the collection of José Ramon de Urcola, Madrid, portrays almost exactly a section of the ceiling representing East India and the fall of the Vices. From reproductions the style of this painting suggests that it may be a bozzetto by Tiepolo that follows the modello. If so, this sketch would have been painted when Tiepolo was in Spain, and far along on the design, as the artist left a blank space at left for the stuccoed cornice shell.

Notes
1. Sack 1910, 223, gives this information from Francis Capel-Cure, who had inherited Cheney’s collection. Sack gives only Pagliano’s last name.
2. Waagen 1857, 173, noted that Cheney had a collection of nineteen sketches for ceilings executed for churches in Venice, and 171, that Cheney acquired most of his collection while resident in Venice. On Cheney see Knox 1960, 4–5.
3. Sack 1910, 139, 223, lists Francis Capel-Cure as the owner.
5. A typed notation in the Kress records, NGA curatorial files, states that the painting was acquired in 1935 without stating from whom.
6. The new Royal Palace was begun in 1738 and painting began in the 1750s. A letter of 26 September 1761 from the duke of Montalegre, then Spanish ambassador in Venice, to Leopoldo di Grigorio, marchese di Squillace (known in Spain as Esquilache), the king’s minister in Madrid, discusses a previous letter of 7 September to Count Felice Gazzola, the king’s agent in Venice, to negotiate with Tiepolo on the king’s behalf to come to Spain, and the request that Gazzola speak with Tiepolo about painting at the Spanish court. A letter of 25 September from Montalegre to Tiepolo, who was working in Verona at the Palazzo Canossa at this time, asks that the artist come immediately. Tiepolo’s reply of 28 September to Montalegre accepts the commission, asks for measurements of the throne room, and says that he must finish his commitments before departing for Spain. Letters published in Battisti 1960, 78–79.
7. A letter of 22 December 1761 from Tiepolo to a patron mentions that the artist will have to do but one room in the palace, and that he believed that he would return in two years and could work for the patron after that (Molmenti 1909, 26). Molmenti suggested that the recipient of the letter was the writer Giuseppe Farsetti, but Catherine Whistler argued convincingly that it was probably Francesco Algarotti (letter of 16 October 1993, in NGA curatorial files). In the letter Tiepolo mentioned the patron’s brother, and he knew Algarotti’s brother, Bonomo. Also, there were no works by Tiepolo mentioned in Farsetti’s collection at his death. See Vigni 1956, 363–364, for the order in which Tiepolo painted the rooms of the palace.
8. Tiepolo’s letter of 28 September 1761 requests the measurements of the room (see note 6) and mentions the works he must finish. One assumes that he was soon thereafter given measurements as well as the subject requirements, especially since Montalegre’s letter of 30 January notes that he is occupied at the work.
9. “Tiepolo F. 1764” beneath the scene with Christopher Columbus.
11. Letter of 30 January 1762 to the marchese di Squillace: “pues se hallaba todo ocupado en concretar las grandiosas ideas que ha concebido para servir dignamente a Su Majestad, y desempeñarse le mejor que pueda” (Molmenti 1909, 41, n. 15).
12. The National Gallery painting was previously called the World Pays Homage to Spain, a title first used for the Throne Room ceiling by Sack 1910, 223, no. 528. The entire world is not represented, only those areas conquered or belonging to Spain. Morassi, Tiepolo, 1935, 35, called the subject of the ceiling the Apotheosis of Spain or of the Spanish Monarchy. The subject of the apotheosis instead is represented in Tiepolo’s ceiling of the Saleta, in which the Spanish Monarchy is actually being escorted to heaven, the accepted depiction for an apotheosis.
13. Shapley 1979, 1: 445, mistook these figures for Hercules in the modello and Minerva and Hercules in the ceiling.
14. Prof. Paul Pascal has kindly provided the translation of this elegiac couplet, which he calls “very elegant and correct” (letter of 2 August 1993 in NGA curatorial files).
15. There has been some question as to the original location of the throne. Levey 1986, 261, agreed with Knox 1980, 1: 75, n. 1, that the throne was probably at the end of the room as one entered instead of in its present position. He believed that the king would not have placed the vanquishing of evil above his head. Against this theory, however, is the fact that the throne is placed in the center of the long wall as one sees in most throne rooms of the period and earlier. In addition, the room is part of an enfilade in which doors are placed at both ends: it would seem odd to have the throne block the doorway. Moreover, the figure of Neptune directly faces the king pointing out to him the greatest glory of the monarchy, the discovery of America at left. Columbus, too, points out his treasures to both Spanish Monarchy and to the king. Consequently, when entering from the king’s left, the visitor is first confronted by Spanish Monarchy in the ceiling and her realms around the cornice; turning toward the king the visitor then sees royal power vanquishing evil above the throne. Catherine
Whistler agreed that the throne is in its original position (letter to author, 16 October 1993, in NGA curatorial files).

22. Ripa 1992, 470, described Virtue as a winged figure bearing a laurel wreath, a spear, and with the sun emblazoned on her chest. In the fresco, this figure, identified by Fabre 1829, 107, as Virtue, clearly has the last two attributes, but holds a ring instead of the laurel wreath.
23. Ripa 1992, 163–164, described the Glory of Princes as a woman with a pyramid in her right hand, but Tiepolo always painted her with what looks like a truncated obelisk. Here she also holds a scepter.
24. Ripa 1992, 508–509, described Generosity with her right arm bare, which she holds high carrying riches in order to signify her generosity. Tiepolo here shows her with her right breast uncovered and riches in her right hand. Fabre 1829, 113, called this figure in the ceiling Magnanimity, perhaps because the inscription on the obelisk refers to Charles III's magnanimity.
25. Suggested by Eric Garberson. In his program for the library ceiling at the monastery of Sankt Florian, Austria, Daniel Gran included putti dispersing symbols of honor, glory, and abundance to show that the learned and virtuous who follow the lessons of the ceiling suffer no want and achieve the highest honors: published in Tietze 1911–1912, 20. An Austrian, Gran was trained in Italy and took the personifications for this program directly from Ripa.
26. Some of Tiepolo's virtues differ from Ripa but are common eighteenth-century representations. For these figures see Ripa 1992, 378 (Faith), 415–417 (Hope), 48 (Charity), 368 (Prudence), 142, 74 (Strength and Constancy), and 482 (Victory).
27. Jones, “Tiepolo,” 1981, 220. It is possible that Tiepolo was also thinking of the figure of Nobility, who is shown carrying a statue of Minerva in her hand. This figure, however, is not winged.
29. Fabre 1829, 108.
32. See the explanation of these figures in Jones, “Tiepolo,” 1981, 224.
33. The drawing, in the Collection of John Rowlands, London, is discussed below in the text and in note 80.
35. In the modello, an owl is suggested near Minerva with large antlers and Galicia, portrayed by various shepherds and mountain people in regional costumes and a white bull to indicate the cattle and pastures typical of the region.
36. Fabre 1829, 111.
38. Fabre 1829, 110–111.
40. The figure with his head bowed (43) can be identified as Idleness (Ripa 1992, 334, "Otio") and the figure with the snake (45) is probably Sin (Ripa 1992, 341–342).
41. The male figure appears to wear a helmet and shield and should be Mars, but the female figure is clothed, suggesting that she may not be Venus, although Fabre identified her as Venus accompanied by Cupid (Fabre 1829, 112).
42. Fabre 1829, 130, n. 6.
43. Consultation at NGA, 13 January 1993.
44. According to Fabre 1829, 117–118, this entire short section of the cornice represents the regions of Cordoba, famous for her horses and Moorish crafts, and Seville, identified as the seated female figure.
45. According to Gerstenberg 1992, 154, this is the flag of the United Kingdoms of Spain, but Eric Garberson has identified it correctly as that of Charles III. For a comparison with the coat of arms of Charles III, see El Palacio Real 1975, 148.
46. Fabre 1829, 117.
47. According to Fabre 1829, 119–120, these figures represent Catalonia, Aragon, the Fidelity of Spain, New Castille, and Granada.
48. This man and the one to the right wearing a large-brimmed black hat and cape were said by Fabre to portray Catalonia. He identified the mountains as the Pyrenees. He identified the next costumed figures as Spanish Fidelity and the following figures as Castille and Granada.
49. This has been suggested by Richard Kagan.
50. This figure in black wears a hat and cape typically seen in Madrid at the time of Charles' ascension to the throne. In 1766 Charles' minister, the Italian marchese di Squillace, ordered these costumes banned since the identity of the wearer was difficult to discern. A riot ensued and the garments continued to be worn; the people called for the foreigner's ouster, to which Charles was forced to acquiesce. On the riots, caused also by the rising cost of bread, see Lynch 1989, 262–265, and Hull 1980, 108–115.
51. According to Fabre 1829, 126–127, the first is Valencia, the "garden of Spain," the next "Geography," and the third Extramadura.
52. Fabre 1829, 125–126, thought that these next figures represented Leon (a woman with a block of stone [the Sierras] and in front of her on the ground a deer's head with large antlers) and Galicia, portrayed by various shepherds and mountain people in regional costumes and a white bull to indicate the cattle and pastures typical of the region.
53. Fabre 1829, 123–124, identified the woman with the crowns as Asturias and the reclining old woman as Santander. He explained the boy as the Asturian and Leonese nobility and the sepulcher as the restoration of the monarchy in the eighth century after the Saracen invasion.
54. Catherine Whistler has suggested sensibly that the inscription may refer to late eighteenth or early nineteenth century restoration work, and that the initials could be those of one of the aspiring court artists employed as restorers (letter of 31 January 1993, NGA curatorial files).
55. Fabre 1829, 124, suggested that in the fresco both figures stand for Murcia, famous for its lumber used for shipbuilding and for its citrus groves.
56. This is the only program known in which the regions of Spain are represented in an exposition of its natural and manufactured products. Reference to regions of Spain in the Throne Room, however, is not new. Richard Kagan has pointed out that maps of the cities of Spain hung in the old Throne Room, the Sala Grande, that had been destroyed by fire in 1734 (oral communication with writer 4 January
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Between them.

Turkey to China.

three Basque provinces.

but this seems unlikely since Lorenzi worked in Tiepolo’s area of the fresco depicts the Philippines (colonized by Spain), the Indian Ocean, the Pacific, and the trade routes between them.

Fabre believed that this comprised all the Orient known to the Europeans from the nineteenth century, without, however, offering documentary proof. 

No documents relate to the ceiling program, and in his autobiography Sarmiento did not list it among his projects: Sarmiento 1952, 30–32, for work of these years, and 16 and 22 for projects for Ferdinand.

Catherine Whistler also believed that Sarmiento was not Charles III’s adviser since the king “ordered drastic changes to the decorative program of the Royal Palace after his arrival” (letter of 31 January 1993, NGA curatorial files). Irene Cioffi has also noted that Sarmiento would not have invented such a program (letter of 4 March 1993, NGA curatorial files). See also Cioffi 1992, 245.

Levey 1986, 256, suggested that Tiepolo consulted Gazzola. Gazzola may well have been the conduit of the Spanish ideas sent directly from Spain to Tiepolo.

For reproductions of these see El Palacio Real 1975. Checa 1992, 162, pointed out that it is impossible to know if there was a total program for the entire palace, if the paintings were executed under four monarchs over a period of fifty years.

This later fresco is certainly an apotheosis, because the figure of the Spanish Monarchy is being crowned by Mercury as she floats upward on clouds.

See note 8.

The dimensions of the ceiling are approximately 11 × 26 m. Shapley 1979, 1: 445, had noticed that the Throne Room was longer in proportion than the modello and the figures smaller, but did not see any significant changes from sketch to fresco.

Differences in proportions occur between other modello and the completed frescoes of Tiepolo. See, for example, the modello (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth) for the Palazzo Clerici, Milan: Barcham 1992, fig. 22 for modello, and fig. 13 for the ceiling.

Pallucchini 1960, 96, and most recently Levey 1986, 256, who noted that Tiepolo’s invention was not original and that the modello was a “near perfect anthology of all Tiepolo’s favorite devices and groupings, assembled without any overt drama.” Gerstenberg 1952, 154, like some others, incorrectly saw the influence of Mengs’ classicism on the ceiling. There is some debate as to whether the Kimbell bozzetto is actually related to the Clerici ceiling or is for an entirely different commission.

di Canossa 1988, 69: “Lei per tanto è pregata dar ordine all’ Architetto il dovermi trasmettere l’ altezza della sala com’altro che resti segnata distintamente il principale ingresso della med.ma per non fallare il punto cosa essenzialissima. Quanto più presto mi giungeranno tali esatte notizie tanto più sollecitamente mi darò l’ onore d’ inviarle modelli…”

Morassi, “Tiepolo,” 1955, 36, noted that one took in the details a little at a time.

Critics often accuse Tiepolo of repetition while ignoring the fact that most artists re-used accepted models and often repeated compositions.

See quotation above in text.


Gibbons 1977, 197, no. 633, with previous bibliography.


Collection John Rowlands, London. Knox 1980, 1: 242, M.250; 2: pl. 258. The figure at right appears to be carrying a sword, not the lyre of Apollo. Knox believed that this drawing preceded the National Gallery modello.


On this composition see 1939.1.100 and accompanying notes.

First attributed to Tiepolo by Molmenti 1925, 475–479. Known to the writer in a reproduction only. Shapley 1979, 1: 447, confused this work with the oil sketch in the collection of José Ramon de Urcola mentioned below in the text.

Alternatively, the sketch could be a copy of the ceiling. Its quality appears very high, indicating that if it is a copy it is by Giandomenico. There is some difficulty in separating the work of Giambattista and Giandomenico in the Spanish period.
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Madonna of the Goldfinch

c. 1767/1770
Oil on canvas, 63.1 x 50.3 (24 7/16 x 19 15/16)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a rather coarse, loosely woven plain-weave fabric. The ground consists of a thin, smooth layer of deep, rich yellow-orange. In the base layers the paint was applied as a slightly stiff paste and thus retains the texture of the brushstrokes. Thinner paint was applied over this with freer handling, as in the dark red glaze over the Madonna’s mantle and for some linear details. These details are often drawn with black paint. X-radiographs show changes to the lower part of the composition as discussed in the text.

The original tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is visible on all four edges. Losses and abrasion are scattered throughout, mostly in the lower section where the blue undertone is visible. The painting was relined by Stephen Pichetto in 1941. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting restored during the 1941 treatment and in 1991–1992 by Jane Tillinghast.


The Madonna of the Goldfinch has disturbed scholars since its publication in 1904. Some have considered it a genuine painting by Giambattista Tiepolo, while others have dismissed it from his oeuvre, assigning it to his son Giandomenico or to a studio assistant.6 Another version of the subject (fig. 1), once with Jacques Seligmann & Co., New York, and untraceable since its sale at Parke-Bernet in 1948,7 has complicated the issue of the authenticity of the Washington picture. All writers accepted the Seligmann painting as autograph, and x-radiographs and examination with a stereomicroscope of the Madonna of the Goldfinch prove that the lost Tiepolo was the primary version (fig. 2). In spite of this, the National Gallery’s painting appears to be a very late work by Giambattista.

Those arguing against the Tiepolo attribution cite the handling of the Virgin’s hands as well as her “superficial” expression.8 The Madonna’s left hand barely cradles her right, which does not grasp the Child’s drapery as does the left hand in the Seligmann version. In addition, the x-radiographs and microscopic studies show that the artist began with the Seligmann composition, which has an identical color scheme.9 In the first version the Child is held by the Virgin’s left hand, and her right arm and hand are invisible. The Child holds the goldfinch by a string and sits against some rolled-up swaddling clothes, while his mother inclines her head slightly downward. The hand holding the string is visible in the x-radiographs of the Washington painting. In this second version the Madonna’s head is slightly raised as her son holds her mantle. He is now gently cradled in her arms by both hands.

Tiepolo painted numerous altarpieces and small devotional canvases of the Madonna and Child throughout his career, but the Seligmann and Washington Madonnas come closest to works painted in Spain.10 The voluminous white scarf partially covering the Madonna’s forehead is seen in the Annunciation, formerly in the collection of the duke of Luna-Villahermosa, Madrid, dated by Morassi c. 1762–1770.11 Closest stylistically to the Madonna of the Goldfinch, however, is the Immaculate Conception (Museo del Prado, Madrid) for San Pascual Baylon, Aranjuez, datable to 1767–1769.12 Not only are the overall tonality and drapery similar, but several of the cherubs closely resemble the infant Christ in the Washington painting. The application of paint in short, dry dabs rather than in smooth, fluid strokes is characteristic of these late paintings for San Pascual Baylon, a trait that appears in the Washington painting. In these works detail is suppressed in favor of a generalized conception of form. In addition, the right hand of the Virgin is the mirror image of the left hand of the Saint Joseph in Saint Joseph with the Christ Child (Detroit Institute of Arts), also for San Pascual Baylon.13 None of the above peculiarities of

1985 NGA: 388, repro.
1993 Gemin and Pedrococ: 192, 200, 486, no. 516a, repro.
1993 Longyear: 65, 67–69, 76, 78, repro. figs. 43, 44.

1943.4.40 (541)
Tiepolo’s Spanish altarpieces appears in Giandomenico’s work: the eyes of his Madonnas are large and watery, the forms of his figures outlined with definitive dark lines, and his drapery described with long, wet strokes.14

If the Washington Madonna of the Goldfinch is an authentic late work by Giambattista, the question remains as to why he changed the composition from the earlier version. X-radiographs of Tiepolo’s paintings suggest that once he began painting he altered very little. Probably because he often painted in fresco, a medium in which last-minute changes are impossible, the artist worked out his compositions both in oil and in fresco in numerous drawings and in modelli, precluding the need for many pentimenti on the canvas. Although he repeated some motifs, he did not repeat entire compositions exactly. Perhaps in this case, late in life, he was asked for a Madonna and Child similar to one he had just completed. He may have copied it closely to aid in his adjustment of the composition, which eventually gives the Christ child a more babylike mien and changes the Madonna’s pious gaze to one of motherly affection. The popularity of the image is confirmed by the existence of a painting of the Holy Family by Lorenzo Tiepolo (present location unknown) in which the son copied the motif of the Madonna with a similarly draped scarf and the young baby carrying the goldfinch.15

Writers have noted that the hieratic poses of the Madonna and Child are based on earlier models. Bellini and Sassoferrato have been mentioned,16 but one can also see reminiscences of Raphael’s pious yet human Madonnas. By the mid-eighteenth century the diffusion of the small, intimate devotional image of the Virgin and Child was ubiquitous in Italy, but the affectionate interaction of Mother and Child predominated over the kind of iconic image presented in the Seligmann and Washington paintings. Perhaps the strict Catholicism of the Spanish capital...
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Madonna of the Goldfinch*, 1943.4.40
influenced Tiepolo in his compositional choice. Likewise, the emerging classicism fostered by the art of Anton Raphael Mengs (1728–1779) may have finally affected the artist in these last years.¹² Mengs was the preferred artist of Charles III, whom Tiepolo attempted to please in his deeply moving and picturesque altarpieces for Aranjuez.¹³ Consequently, the criticism voiced by modern writers that Tiepolo’s image of the goldfinch is false and that he misunderstood its meaning is incorrect. In such an atmosphere, Tiepolo would not have chosen a bird symbolic of the Crucifixion and Resurrection had he not known its meaning.¹⁴ He is one of the few artists of the eighteenth century to portray the goldfinch with the Christ child, reinstating a theme seen primarily in the fifteenth century.²⁰

Of the myriad drawings by Tiepolo of the Madonna and Child, only one pen study (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) can be considered preparatory to the Madonna of the Goldfinch.²¹ The Madonna, wearing a smooth scarf that drapes like those in the late paintings, holds the Christ child against her head. The head and tail of a bird can be distinguished in his arms. The face of an angel or Saint John can be seen at left. The drawing may be one of many kept by the artist for reference when considering such subjects.²² A chalk drawing of the Madonna in the Prado, Madrid, previously attributed to Giambattista or Giandomenico as a study for the Seligmann or Washington painting,²³ has been convincingly attributed to Lorenzo Tiepolo by Thiem as a copy of the National Gallery picture.²⁴

Notes

1. According to Venturi 1904, 64, Martha Hepworth of the Getty Provenance Index (letter of 15 March 1993, NGA curatorial files) noted that some of del Drago’s paintings came from Spain: the Mantegna Sacra Conversazione, now in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, was given by Maria Cristina, Queen Regent of Spain, to her daughter on her marriage to Filippo, Principe del Drago in 1856.

2. According to Sack 1910, 216, the painting was briefly in Hamburg in 1905 before passing to Maier.


4. Sack 1910, 216, placed the painting with this dealer, but does not mention that it was owned by Steinmayer and Bourgeois.

5. According to notations in the Kress records, NGA curatorial files.

6. First published as Giambattista by Venturi 1904, 64, it was called an imitator of Tiepolo by Molmenti 1909, 310–311 (with a distant recollection of Sassoferrato), but considered “eine Perle tiepolesker Kunst” by Sack 1910, 216, no. 477. Morassi 1962, 67, first called it a work by Giandomenico. He was followed in his attribution by Pallucchini 1968, 134, under no. 298, while Shapley 1973, 152–153, and Shapley 1979, 1: 457–458, called the painting studio of Giambattista. See Shapley 1979, 1: 457 n. 2, for other opinions on the painting’s authenticity.

7. Notable Paintings 1948, lot 38, with provenance and bibliography. See also Morassi 1962, 67, and Pallucchini 1968, under cat. 298. Martha Hepworth of the Getty Provenance Index has found no further trace of the painting (letter cited in note 1).


9. The colors of the Seligmann painting are described in the 1948 sale catalogue, lot 38. Repro. in color on the cover of IntSt 94 (December 1929).

10. For reproductions of the Madonna and Child paintings by Tiepolo see Morassi 1962, pls. 75–84.

11. Morassi 1962, 22 and pl. 34.


13. Morassi 1962, 10 and pl. 196. This painting is a fragment of one of the altarpieces for Aranjuez. The cherub in another fragment of the same painting (Morassi 1962, 35 and pl. 199) is also close to the Christ child in the Washington painting.

14. See, for example, his Stations of the Cross in the Prado, Madrid, one of which is dated 1772. Mariuz 1971, pls. 232–239. It should be noted too that the Madonna of the Goldfinch is not included in Mariuz’ catalogue of Giandomenico’s works.

15. Formerly in the collection of C. Delppe, Barcelona: Precerutti Garberi 1967, 36, fig. 19.


17. The writer does not see Mengs’ influence, however, on any of Tiepolo’s frescoes in the Royal Palace, as has been asserted by, among others, Gerstenberg 1952, 154.

18. Tiepolo’s paintings were removed almost immediately and replaced with paintings by Mengs and others. See Whistler 1986, 325–326.

19. As suggested by Friedmann 1946, 62, and Pressly 1992, 16. Pressly noted that the bird’s wings are clipped in Tiepolo’s painting, a possible misunderstanding of the symbolism. The bird with clipped wings may have been the only one available as a model and Tiepolo may not have considered the omission important.

20. See Friedmann 1946 for the history and meaning of the goldfinch in art.

21. Gernsheim 48 217; see Macandrew 1980, 186, no. 1806C. Another sheet, formerly in the Rudolf Collection (Gernsheim 3587), shows the Christ child in the Virgin’s arms holding a string.

22. A series of five pen-and-ink drawings of the Madonna and Child, possibly from the 1750s, is in the Museo Civico, Bassano: Magagnato 1956, 60–61, Inv. Riva 575–579, repro. Another was formerly in the C. R. and A. P. Rudolf Collection, London (Gernsheim 3597).
23. Inv F.A. 707: Mena Marqués 1990, fig. 274. Knox 1980, i: 232, no. 184, attributed the drawing to Giambattista, connecting it with the Seligmann or a larger painting. Mena Marqués 1990, 142, called it a study for the National Gallery picture.

24. Thiem 1994, 340, recognized that the drawing must be a copy of the National Gallery painting since the shading is carefully controlled and portions of the finished picture are missing, such as the Child, with gaps left for them. The figure of the Madonna in the drawing comes closer in pose and expression to the Washington than to the Seligmann painting. The writer would like to thank Christel Thiem for bringing the drawing to her attention.
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Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat

c. 1755/1760
Oil on canvas, 62.2 x 49.3 (24 1/2 x 19 3/8)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave fabric; the weave is very coarse, open, and unusually uneven. The ground is basically red under the dark tones and gray under the lighter tones, except for red under the white-gloved hand. The paint was applied in a rich consistency with a strong evidence of the brushstrokes and a general concern with the texture of paint. The application was both wet-over-dry and wet-into-wet in the top layers, especially in the face. Additional texture was produced by using the butt end of the brush to scratch into the wet paint. This was done exclusively to emphasize the folds in the black cloak and does not appear elsewhere. These "incised lines" create an impasto and reveal the red ground; they are visible to the naked eye, but are much more dramatically evident in x-radiographs.

X-radiographs also reveal several artist's changes. The fan was originally open. Changes in the contours of the open fan suggest that it was thoroughly worked up before being changed. The position of the fingers was altered to accommodate the change in the way that the hand held the closed as opposed to the open fan. Originally a mask sat on the right side of the hat, not the left, and was painted out when the fan was changed. In x-radiographs the figure's right eye appears in deeper shadow than it does on the surface. The figure may have been looking into the open fan, whereas she now looks outward.

The tacking margins, originally unpainted, have been opened and incorporated into the painted surface. The original dimensions were about 5 cm smaller in each direction. The open weave of the fabric may have caused the pitting in the paint surface, an effect perhaps accentuated by excessive pressure during a lining. There are minor losses and abrasion scattered throughout. The varnish is thick and somewhat discolored. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1948.

Provenance: Luigi Pisa, Florence, by 1937; 1 (his sale, Circolo Artistico, Palazzetto del Da Ponte, Venice, 5–9 September 1938, no. 318, as Alessandro Longhi). Itálico Brass, Venice. 2 (Schaeffer Galleries, New York); sold 21 May 1948 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York. 3


The styles of Giambattista and Giandonemico Tiepolo are sometimes almost indistinguishable, and it is often difficult to determine whose hand was responsible for certain paintings. No group of works has been more frustrating to apportion between them than the numerous bust-length portraits and head studies of young women and bearded old men. 4 Scholars have been and will continue to be divided on their attributions of these canvases, because analysis of the works is based solely on stylistic criteria. Complicating the issue is the proliferation of versions and copies of many of the pictures. 5 The Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat is one such painting, which has been passed back and forth between father and son since Itálico Brass first recognized its Tiepolesque qualities. 6 Scholars accepted the attribution to Giambattista until Morassi changed his
mind and listed it as by Giandomenico. Most other writers agreed with the new attribution, but recently the pendulum has begun to swing back in favor of Giambattista’s authorship.

Those who favor an attribution to Giandomenico of the Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat have compared it to his many representations of Carnival scenes of similarly dressed women. The picture has been most closely associated with Giandomenico’s Departure of the Gondola (Wrightsman Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), in which men and women, masked and unmasked, wear costumes like that in the Washington picture. A woman at right, her mask sitting in her hat, holds a fan against her chin somewhat as does the young lady here. Another argument in support of Giandomenico’s authorship has been the supposedly weak structure of the face and hands, but this assertion, and generalizations about the brushwork as typical for Giandomenico, are not convincing.

Justification for ascribing the painting to Giambattista has been equally vague and comparisons have not always been persuasive. Goering, for example, in championing Giambattista, found analogies with paintings that are now considered to be by Giandomenico. Yet Pallucchini’s comparison of the treatment of the gloved hand with that in Giambattista’s Portrait of a Procurator (Galleria Quirini-Stampaia, Venice) is compelling. Both show a nervous speed of brushwork associated with Giambattista’s technique. Equally convincing is a comparison of the handling of the features with those of Giambattista’s half-length figures of women. Rather than the large, watery eyes and puckered lips of Giandomenico’s females, the young woman here has the clear, carefully constructed eyes and broad lips more typical of Giambattista. Moreover, the garments of Giambattista’s figures are more tightly constructed than the sometimes disorderly brushwork and openly modeled drapery characteristic of Giandomenico. Convincing comparisons of these traits can be made between the Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat and Giambattista’s Young Woman with a Parrot (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) and the Blessed Laduina (Collection Stanley Moss, New York).

Dating and destination of the Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat are also difficult to determine. The monochromatic quality of the picture precludes discussing the palette in chronological terms, but the sureness of the rapid and skilled brushwork in the glove, fan, and cloak suggest a mature Tiepolo after 1750 and probably in the second half of the decade. Barcham connected the painting with a group of half-length portraits that Tiepolo executed for Empress Elizabeth of Russia in 1760. The fantasy portraits he believed to belong to this series—the Woman with a Mandolin (Detroit Institute of Arts), the Woman with a Parrot (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford), and the lost Woman with a Fur—are of varying sizes, but all are larger than the Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat. In addition, her dark clothing would have contrasted sharply with the gaily colored paintings in Detroit and Oxford. Without further evidence, the identity of the portrait, its date, and destination will remain a mystery.

The young woman in the Washington painting is dressed in a typical Venetian eighteenth-century Carnival costume worn by the upper classes. She wears a black bautta, a garment consisting of a short cape of black lace and a hood of black silk that covered the head and chin. This was worn over a three-quarter-length cape known as a tabarro, which could be of various colors, including black. Here the black
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat, 1952.5.77
lace of the bautta disappears against the black tabar- 
no. Her hat is a tricorn, or tricorn. Her mask is the 
white object perched on the left side of the hat; it is 
the type called a larva, which had a long nose and 
covered only the top half of the face. The costume 
consisting of the bautta, tabarro, and larva was worn 
by both men and women at Carnival time. Even 
with their masks in their hats they were considered 
to be disguised.

Giambattista certainly intended to portray a mys-
terious and haunting individual with her personality 
hidden at Carnival time. X-radiographs reveal the 
care that the artist put into the composition (fig. 1). 
At first he painted the young woman more coquet-
tishly, with fan open. Balancing the large white area 
of the fan at left was the mask lying in the hat at up-
per right. When Tiepolo chose the more enigmatic 
pose with the closed fan, he transferred the mask to 
the other side of the tricorn. Typical for Giambat-
tista are the ruffles that are carefully delineated in 
rapid succession and the dragging of the brush 
downward for the vertical folds, but unusual in his 
ouvre and ingenious in technique is his use of the 
blunt end of the brush to give texture and indicate 
the lace of the bautta, relieving what would other-
wise appear to be a flat and monotonous black gar-
ment.

Giambattista Tiepolo painted few portraits, but 
in each one he carried the genre forward by some 
new compositional invention. In the Portrait of Anto-
nio Riccobono (Accademia dei Concordi, Rovigo) he 
enlivened the scholar’s pose by placing him in con-
trapposto, stopped in the midst of study and turning 
toward the viewer. In the Portrait of a Procurator, 
Tiepolo placed the richly robed magistrate on a step 
above the viewer so that he is seen in a slight di sotto 
in su perspective, thus elevating his already exalted 
status. The Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat, whether por-
trait or genre picture, continues this penchant for 
originality. The material of the three black garments 
is subtly differentiated, as are the contrasting whites 
of the glove, fan, and mask. Discriminating touches of 
red in the fan and pink on the face and the lively 
brushstrokes on the tabarro and gloved hand ani-
mate the quiet, triangular composition. These color 
and compositional inventions add to the mystery 
and allure which place The Young Lady in a Tricorn 
Hat among Tiepolo’s most popular pictures of this 
type.

Notes
1. Catalogue de la Collection Pisa 1937, 1: 114, no. 749; 2: 
124. A handwritten notation on the back of an old photo-
graph (photographic archives, NGA), reads “Pisani Collection 
1932.” This information has not been independently 
corroborated.
2. According to Morandotti 1941, 43 (listed as Alessan-
dro Brass); Goering in Thiemé-Becker 33: 154; and Morassi 
1943, 28.
3. The purchase from Schaeffer Galleries recorded in a 
typewritten notation, Kress records, NGA curatorial files.
4. On the paintings and versions of bearded old men, 
which were etched by Giandomenico as after his father, see 
Knox 1970.
5. For some of these paintings see Morassi 1962, pls. 
227. Before Goering’s publication the painting was attrib-
uted to Alessandro Longhi, but was recognized by its 
owner, Italo Brass, as Tiepolo. His and Goering’s attribu-
tion was to Giambattista Tiepolo. Only Arslan 1947, 
185, veered from a Tiepolo attribution to tentatively sug-
gest Jacopo Amigoni (1682–1752), an idea that has justly 
been ignored. Morassi 1958, 186, noted the difficulty in 
separating the hands of father and son, especially in this 
painting.
7. Borenius 1939, 193–194, called the painting a master-
piece by Giambattista. Morassi 1943, 28, accepted the Gi-
ambattista attribution, but in 1958, 180, he gave the work to 
Giandomenico and kept it as such in 1962, 67.
8. Pallucchini 1968, 126–127, no. 252, returned the 
painting to Giambattista, but Shapley 1973, 154, and 1979, 1: 
440–441, agreed with Morassi’s assessment. Chiarini, Le 
portrait, 1982, 100, no. 47, and Barcham 1992, 118, consid-
ered the painting to be by Giambattista (although Barcham 
feared the painterly handling also suggested Giandomenico). 
Although Mariuz did not include the painting in his 1971 
monograph on Giandomenico, he has stated that he be-
lieves the painting to be by him (letter of 10 March 1993, 
NGA curatorial files). He admits a measure of doubt, how-
ever. Pignatti 1989, 309, and Gemini and Pedroco 1993, 137, 
no. 905, favored Giambattista’s authorship.
9. For some of these pictures see Mariuz 1971, pls. 
81–88 and 189–201.
10. By Morassi 1958, 180; Fahy 1973, 275–276; and by 
11. Morassi 1958, 180, and Shapley 1973, 154, and 1979, 1: 
440–441.
12. Goering 1939, 226, attributed a portrait of a young 
woman in Cleveland and the Alexander and the Family of Dar-
ius in Detroit to Giambattista and compared them with this 
painting. Those works are universally accepted as paintings 
by Giandomenico. See Mariuz 1971, pls. 35 and 227.
13. Pallucchini 1960, 93. For a reproduction see Palluc-
chini 1968, pl. XXXIII. Earlier, Michael Levey claimed this 
painting for Giandomenico’s oeuvre. See Levey 1961, 140– 
141. Catherine Whistler kindly pointed out this article to the 
author.
14. See, for example, the portraits of women in Cleve-
16. Compare the brushwork, for example, with that of 
the Apollo and Daphne (1952.5.78) or the Portrait of a Procu-
rater (Galleria Querini Stampalia, Venice, see note 13) of the same period.

17. Barcham 1992, 118. In a letter of 15 December 1760 Tiepolo mentioned these portraits a capriccio.

18. The Woman with a Mandolin measures 91 x 74 cm; the Woman with a Parrot 70 x 52 cm; and the Woman with a Par 72 x 53.5 cm. For reproductions of the first two see Pallucchini 1968, color pls. L–L1.

19. On similar Venetian costumes see Morazzoni 1931, pls. XLV–LII, and Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 4: pls. 185–188. Possibly the hint of pinkish red from the ground layer is meant to suggest a pink dress underneath. Fahy 1973, 269, and Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 4: pl. 186, considered the entire costume a bautta and did not discuss the tabarro underneath. A black bautta over a black tabarro is worn by figures in Giandomenico’s Departure of the Gondola in the Wrightsman Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Fahy 1973, fig. 1) and in the Oil Seller by Pietro Longhi, in the Ca’ Rezzonico, Venice: Pignatti 1974, no. 119, color pl. XLVI.

20. Most writers have called the young lady’s costume a domino, but this is an incorrect translation of bautta. In English the meaning of domino is inexact, referring to hoods worn by priests and garments derived from them. In Italian, the domino is a floor-length cape. This was not popular in Venice in the eighteenth century as noted by Jan van Grevenbroch (1733–1805) (in van Grevenbroch 1981, 3: 91). Eighteenth-century Venetian paintings of women in Carnival costume almost always show them in the three-quarter-length tabarro with a bautta and a tricorn.

21. Fahy 1973, 269, mistook this kind of mask for a moretta, the black (or, less often, white) oval mask that covers the entire face. See Morazzoni 1931, pl. L, for the moretta and pl. XLVII for an example of the larva sitting in the tricorn. For an actual eighteenth-century bautta see exh. cat. Venice 1988, 306, no. 313, repro. Among writers on the National Gallery painting only Levi Pisetzky 1964–1969, 4: 326, noted that the young lady has a mask in her hat.


23. Pallucchini 1968, color pl. XXXI.
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1952.5.78 (1157)

Apollo Pursuing Daphne

c. 1755/1760

Oil on canvas, 68.5 x 87 (27 x 34 1/4)

Samuel H. Kress Collection

Inscriptions
Lower left, “Gio B Tiepolo”

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave, slightly coarse fabric of medium weight. The ground is a relatively thick, yellowish beige color, and analysis by polarized light microscopy shows it to be a mixture primarily of earth pigments.1 No underdrawing is visible with infrared reflectography, but the composition seems to have been laid out with sketchy lines of red paint still visible behind Apollo’s head and elsewhere. In broad color areas, such as the flesh and draperies, the paint application is thick, dry, and blended with some texture created by the short brushstrokes. Details and overlying shadows were dragged wet-into-wet over these larger areas as fine lines of color or as partially blended strokes of color in which the texture of the brushstrokes remains visible. X-radiographs show extensive and often confusing artist’s changes. Thin dry scumbles or smooth thin layers were applied over these and their texture allowed to show through. The clearest changes are seen in the large, light area behind Daphne’s head, which may have been a mass of drapery or a branch; in the position of Daphne’s right arm, which may have been higher; the raising of Daphne’s left knee and in her left leg, which is now shown as a tree trunk; in the forms of the clouds; and over Apollo’s left shin, where a bit of drapery was painted out.

Cusping is present on the top, bottom, and left edges. The paint was severely flattened during a lining. Scattered small losses are concentrated around the edges and in Daphne’s back. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting restored by Catherine Metzger in 1992–1993.


Throughout his career Giambattista Tiepolo painted small cabinet pictures of mythological themes, which proved extremely popular. In these works he based the iconography on the best-known episodes from ancient literature, but his conception
of the stories was varied and original. The myth of Apollo and Daphne as depicted by Tiepolo comes directly from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Daphne, the beautiful nymph and follower of the goddess Diana, was pursued by the sun god Apollo. Cupid, avenging a taunt from Apollo, had struck him with the golden arrow of love and the nymph with the leaden arrow, which caused her to repulse the advances of all suitors. Fleeing Apollo, Daphne reached her father, the river god Peneus, and begged for help, recalling that he had already granted her permission to remain a virgin. Immediately, she was turned into a laurel tree. Apollo in his continuing love claimed the laurel as his own. Wreaths of laurel would forever adorn his head, lyre, and quiver, as well as crown conquering emperors and heroes.

Tiepolo drew and painted several versions of the Apollo and Daphne story. A fresco in grisaille in the Palazzo Archinto, Milan, of 1730-1731, and a painting in the Louvre, Paris, of the early- to mid-1740s, include the same protagonists as the Washington painting—Apollo, Daphne, Cupid, and Peneus—but are arranged differently. The Milan fresco, a narrow rectangular composition, shows Daphne fleeing to the right toward Cupid in the sky and looking back at her pursuer. This conventional interpretation recalls most paintings of the subject from the fifteenth-century onward. Both a pen-and-wash drawing from the 1730s, depicting only the figures of Apollo and Daphne (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), and the later painting in the Louvre depend for inspiration on Bernini’s (1598-1680) famous sculptural group. A grisaille fresco, executed with Giandomenico’s help, for the Casa Panigai at Nervesa of 1754 (now Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) also recalls Bernini but portrays the nymph before her transformation, separated from Apollo by a cloud, and with Cupid gazing up from below. The Washington *Apollo and Daphne* is unique among interpretations by Tiepolo and earlier artists. The sun god, dressed in gold and adorned with his radiating aureole, rushes up a mountain path to discover the seated Daphne transforming before his eyes. The forward thrust of Apollo’s finger and upraised leg seem to propel Daphne backward in a composition of excited movement. Cupid takes cover from the wrath of Apollo that will shortly ensue. Peneus, taking an active role in protecting his daughter, remains firmly rooted in order to stop the ardent pursuer. The off-center composition, typical of Venetian art, was used

Fig. 1. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Venus and Vulcan*, c. 1755/1760, oil on canvas, Philadelphia Museum of Art, The John G. Johnson Collection
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Apollo Pursuing Daphne*, 1952.5.78
by Tiepolo in other mythological paintings but never with the dramatic or emotional intensity achieved here.  

Scholars have been unanimous in their praise of the *Apollo and Daphne*, which is signed but not dated.  

There is also general agreement on a date in the second half of the 1750s based on the freedom and fluidity of the brushstrokes. Similar in style is the *Apollo and Marsyas* (Royal Museum of Fine Arts, Copenhagen), in which analogous sketchy strokes delineate forms and an overall luminous tonality predominates. Also comparable stylistically and compositionally are the frescoed stories from the Sala della *Gerusalemme Liberata* in the Villa Valmarana, Vicenza, dated 1757.

In 1910 Sack published the *Apollo and Daphne* with its pendant *Venus and Vulcan* (Philadelphia Museum of Art, fig. 1) citing their common provenance. The paintings, of similar dimensions, balance compositionally with the two female nudes facing each other and with one scene set in luminous outdoor sunlight and the other indoors near Vulcan’s fiery forge. The brilliant red drapery of Peneus and Vulcan accentuate the rhythm between the works. Sack contended that the two paintings were *soprapposte*; the canvases appear to have been painted as small cabinet pictures.

Some scholars have suggested incorrectly that the *Venus and Vulcan* is not autograph, and confusion as to its technique implied to others that the paintings are not a pair. A chalk drawing in the Kupferstichkabinett, Dresden, reproduces figures from both paintings, indicating that they were together in Tiepolo’s shop. Another chalk drawing of Daphne and Peneus (National Museum, Warsaw) is certainly a preparatory study by Giambattista for the *Apollo and Daphne*. Here Tiepolo had not yet decided the position or nature of the lower half of Daphne’s left leg and did not include it in the drawing. X-radiography of the painting shows some unreadable *pentimenti* in this section, suggesting that Tiepolo came to the final solution of the tree trunk for Daphne’s leg while already in the course of painting.

2. In his introduction to the sale catalogue, Plach explained that Gaell began collecting pictures in 1849 and made his first large purchase at the sale of Baron Samuel von Festetics, Artaria, Vienna, 11 April, 2 May and following, 1850. The painting does not appear in the Festetics catalogue, which was kindly checked for us by Elspeth Hector, head of the library at the National Gallery in London.

3. According to Kress 1951, 158.

4. The sale catalogue describes the painting as "appartenant à Mme D." Kress 1951, 158, lists a Mme Delaney as the next owner after Kann. A marginal notation in the Knoedler Microfiche copy of the catalogue gives the purchaser as Fort, apparently a dealer.

5. Lauth’s ownership is recorded only in Kress 1951, 158. He may have been the seller in the subsequent sale.

6. Shapley 1973, 149, and 1979, 1: 449, misidentified the owner as M.G., who included only porcelain in this sale.


9. Morassi 1962, 25, pl. 239, and 38, pl. 237, respectively.

10. For a list of paintings with the theme of Apollo and Daphne see Pigler 1974, 2: 27–29. For a discussion of the treatment of the myth of Apollo and Daphne in literature and art see Giraud 1968, and especially Stechow 1965 for numerous reproductions of the theme in art.

11. Inv. no. 1856, 80. Shapley 1973, 490–50, no. 44, repro., noted the similarity of the drawing with Bernini’s sculpture.


13. Giraud 1968, 523, and pl. 20–21, noted that Tiepolo’s conception was near to that in a painting by Carlo Maratta (1625–1713) in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Brussels. Maratta’s version follows the traditional representation of the theme but adds numerous woodland nymphs. The figure of Apollo with his dominant halo approaching from left does extend his arm toward Daphne as in Tiepolo’s painting.

14. See, for instance, his paintings of Danaé (c. 1736, University Museum, Stockholm: Morassi 1956, col. pl. IV and 1962, 49) and the Apollo and Marsyas (c. 1755–1760, Statens Museum fur Kunst, Copenhagen: Morassi 1962, 10 and pl. 249).

15. According to exh. cat. Birmingham 1978, 78, no. 18, Teresio Pignatti expressed the solitary opinion that the *Apollo and Daphne* and its pendant *Venus and Vulcan* (discussed below in text) were the work of Giandomenico Tiepolo.

16. Only Vigni 1951, pl. 76, implied a date of 1743–1750, and Knox 1960, 50, under no. 44, called the painting very late. The paintings of the 1740s are not as fluid as this work, and there is not the whipped quality to the rock formations that one sees in Tiepolo’s paintings made after he arrived in Spain. On this see the entry for *Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel*, 1939, 1100.

17. Morassi 1962, 9–10, and pl. 249. Morassi 1952, 92, saw the stylistic connection between the paintings, noting that they could have been part of the same commission if the Copenhagen painting were not so much smaller.

18. Morassi 1952, 92, also believed that Tiepolo used the same model for the figure of Apollo in both the Washington painting and the Villa Valmarana fresco in the Sala dell’Olimpo, but the figures of Apollo in all Tiepolo’s representations tend to look alike.

Notes

1. Barbara Berrie, Analysis Report of 18 December 1992, NGA curatorial files. Air-path x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy also suggests that ultramarine was used in the sky.
The paintings both appeared in the Gsell collection after 1849 but were separated after his sale in 1872. (See provenance.) The Philadelphia painting, which is reproduced in color in Pallucchini 1968, color pl. 11(sic), measures 68.5 x 87 cm. Dimensions of the remaining painted surface are 67 x 84 cm. For provenance and literature on the Venus and Vulcan see Sweeny 1966, 75; for measurements see the letter of 29 September 1992 from David Skipsey, assistant conservator of paintings, Philadelphia Museum of Art, to Eric Garberson (NGA curatorial files).

For a history of opinions before 1967 see Sweeny 1966, 75. Literature before the conservation treatment of the Philadelphia picture by David Rosen in 1950 stated that the paintings were both oil on canvas. Notes on the treatment are sketchy and only mention that the painting was transferred to a “new canvas.” In exh. cat. Birmingham 1978, 28, no. 18, it was indicated that the Venus and Vulcan was paper laid down on canvas. See also a letter of 6 July 1978 from Irene Konefal, Johnson Collection, to Fern Rusk Shapley noting that this error was made by a conservator in 1968 (NGA curatorial files). A letter of 7 August 1979 from Konefal to Shapley (NGA curatorial files) noted that the present conservator saw no evidence of paper but suggested that the painting had been transferred from wood, probably due to the wrinkling of the surface. These errors were repeated by Shapley 1973, 148-149, and Shapley 1979, 1: 449.

In the letter to Garberson (see preceding note), Skipsey stated that there is no evidence to indicate the material of the prior support before the transfer.

The only evidence now to argue against the pairing of the two paintings is the difference in ground layers. The Washington painting has only one ground layer consisting of a light tan color, whereas the Philadelphia painting consists of a ground of deep red under a cool umber layer in the darker areas and a buff color in the lighter areas (letter from David Skipsey as above). This discrepancy does not prove that the paintings are by different hands or studios involved. Perhaps a prepared canvas was readily at hand and another had to be prepared and was done differently.

21. Inv. 1899.47. First published by von Haden 1927, 2: pl. 186, as a study for the ceiling of the Guard Room in the Royal Palace, Madrid, to which it does not correspond at all. Knox 1980, 229, M.131, attributed the sheet to Giambattista as a study drawing for the pendants, but there are reasons to believe that this is a copy of both paintings by Giandomenico Tiepolo. Reproduced exactly from the painting are Cupid hiding behind Venus’ drapery, but without the drapery, and Apollo, cut off below the knee; from Venus and Vulcan are the figures of Venus, the blacksmiths, and the dove. A sketch of the lower part of a man’s leg does not relate to either painting.

22. Inv. 190766. Mrozinska 1958, 45-46, no. 43, attributed the drawing to Giambattista but added “Si può pensare a uno studio condotto nella bottega del pittore.” Knox 1980, 271, no. M.490, called this a study by Giambattista for the Washington painting.
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1956.9.16 (1417)

Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels

c. 1735/1745
Oil on canvas, 41.4 x 33.8 (16 1/4 x 13 3/4)
Gift of Howard Sturges

Inscriptions

White paper label on stretcher, “Consign no. — Sperling, Date./ Lot no., Remarks.”

Technical Notes: The support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric with a very open, uneven weave. The ground is a moderately thin, dark red layer. The paint was applied fluidly in moderately thick layers overall and the brushwork is evident throughout. The shadows are painted more thinly, allowing the ground to show through. The dark outlines were applied last.

Remnants of the tacking margins are visible as is modest cusping, indicating that the original dimensions have not been altered. The quilted appearance of the surface is the result of the canvas weave having been accentuated during a lining prior to acquisition in 1956. Numerous losses and areas of abrasion are scattered throughout, but are concentrated at the right. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored by Marie von Möller in 1989-1990.

Provenance: (Thomas Humphrey Ward, London).1 (Kleinberger Galleries, New York), by 1932.2 (Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, 3 December 1942, no. 34); purchased by Victor Bacchi.3 Howard Sturges [d. 1955], Providence, Rhode Island.

Exhibited: New York, Kleinberger Galleries, 1932, Italian Baroque Painting and Drawing. XVI, XVII, XVIII Centuries, assembled by the College Art Association, catalogue unpaginated and unnumbered.4 Springfield, Massachusetts, Museum...
The attribution of Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels to Giambattista Tiepolo was first advanced by Valentiner in 1932 and has been accepted by most scholars, even though the small bozzetto is not widely published. Mariuz, however, proposed Tiepolo’s son Giandomenico as the author. The subject of the canvas seems secure, but dating has ranged from the 1730s to c. 1760.

In attributing the Saint Roch to Giandomenico, Mariuz claimed that it was a preliminary study for the ceiling representing the Glory of Saints Benedict, Scolastica, Faustino, and Giovita in the church of Saints Faustino and Giovita (also called San Faustino Maggiore), Brescia, executed between 1754 and 1755. The figure of Saint Giovita in the Brescia composition has a foreshortened upper body and head similar to Saint Roch in the Washington bozzetto, but he stands rather than sits on a cloud. The style of the Saint Roch comes closer to the bozzetto (Kunsthalle Bremen) for this fresco, which was painted by Giambattista, than it does to the ceiling by Giandomenico.

The subject of the National Gallery bozzetto indicates that it has no connection with the Brescia fresco. Saint Roch is identified by his pilgrim’s staff from which hangs a scarf or purse; his wide-brimmed hat may be the nondescript object below the staff. The subject was a familiar one in Venice and for Tiepolo, who in the 1730s painted a number of small devotional paintings of the saint, which Molmenti claimed were made for individual members of the confraternity of San Rocco, Venice. It has been suggested that the Washington Saint Roch recalls this series, but there is little stylistic relationship between this freely painted ceiling study and the more carefully executed devotional images.

As with many of Tiepolo’s bozzetti unconnected with documented paintings, the Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels is difficult to date on stylistic grounds alone. The fluidity of paint and nervous quality of brushstrokes suggest a date in the 1750s, but the thick application of paint, vivid colors, and strongly sculptural forms point to an earlier period in the artist’s career. A comparison with securely documented bozzetti executed between 1730 and 1745 suggest that the present work is not later than these years. Similar colors and excited brushwork occur in the sketches for the cathedral in San Daniele del Friuli, dated by Morassi c. 1730–1735; The Virgin Hearing the Prayers of Saint Dominic of c. 1737 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York); the Miracle of the Holy House of Loreto for the church of the Scalzi, Venice, 1743–1745 (British Rail Pension Fund, on loan to the National Gallery, London); and the Discovery of the True Cross for the church of the Cappuccine, Castello of 1740–1745 (Accademia, Venice). Other comparisons, however, show that the Saint Roch should be dated to a period between 1735 and 1745. Not until the late 1730s did Tiepolo begin to employ such deep di sotto in sù foreshortening in individual figures in his ceiling compositions. The wild hair and sketchily indicated features of the angel at right became hallmarks of Tiepolo’s more mature style beginning in the 1740s. Also, in the sketch for the Scalzi ceiling (1734–1745) Tiepolo employed the same foreshortened gesture of the praying saint, which might indicate that he was then experimenting with this intensely foreshortened figure.

A bozzetto of another Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels in the Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, has been connected with our painting based on its similarity in size, format, subject, and composition. The Yale painting has been dated by Pallucchini to c. 1760 because of the sketchy quality of execution, and, more recently, by both Knox and Brown to c. 1742. It is likely that the Yale Saint Roch may date as early as the Washington painting, in spite of the thinly applied paint, linear definition of contours, and less volumetric forms. On the other hand, it was not unusual for the artist to reuse figures and compositions, with some variation, for analogous subjects throughout his career.

An autograph pen-and-wash drawing in the Princeton University Art Museum of a di sotto in sù figure with his face hidden and his arms raised in prayer is the type of sheet Tiepolo used in preparation for the saints in the Scalzi ceiling and in the Washington painting. Its date and relation to either work, however, is uncertain. A chalk drawing in the Museo Correr, Venice, of the raised praying arms of
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Saint Rock Carried to Heaven by Angels*, 1756-9.16
Saint Roch lacks the vitality of Giambattista’s study sheets and may be a copy of the painting by Giandomenico for reuse in his fresco in Brescia.  

Notes
3. According to a marginal notation in the copy of the catalogue held by the Frick Art Reference Library. The sale included works from several collections and the catalogue does not list the sellers of individual lots.
4. The one available copy of the catalogue bears the incomplete date of October 10th to 22nd. The College Art Association has no records relating to this exhibition (letter from Rose Weil, 6 January 1978, NGA curatorial files). The title page acknowledges the assistance of, among others, A. Everett Austin, director of the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford since 1927. A letter dated 22 March 1932 from the College Art Association to Austin discusses an exhibition of this title for the “upcoming season,” which would be Fall 1932. Jean Cadogan, curator of European Art at the Wadsworth Atheneum, kindly provided a photocopy of this letter (letter of 1 December 1992, NGA curatorial files). The College Art Association exhibition is also listed in the catalogue of the Springfield Museum exhibition held in October 1933.
5. Valentiner’s manuscript opinion (NGA curatorial files) gives the painting to Tiepolo in his “developed style.” Teresio Pignatti’s manuscript opinion of 29 November 1963 (NGA curatorial files) also attributes the painting to Tiepolo, but as a late work.
6. Mariuz 1971, 111. See below in the text. It must be noted, however, that the painting appears in neither catalogue raisonné of Giambattista’s work by Morassi 1962 nor Pallucchini 1968, perhaps suggesting that these scholars did not accept the work as genuine.
7. Morassi, “Some ‘modelli’,” 1955, 10, fig. 11. A chalk drawing for this saint by Giandomenico is in the British Museum, London: Knox 1980, 1: 283, M618; 2: pl. 219, and for the fresco pl. 245. It is apparent from the fresco and Giandomenico’s own preliminary drawing that he misunderstood the pose in his father’s bozetto. The face and arms of the saint are much more foreshortened than the lower part of the body, whereas the foreshortening of the saint in Giambattista’s sketch is proportionally consistent throughout.
8. Absent only are the plague wound on his thigh, which would have been difficult to include in this di sotto in su perspective, and his faithful dog, who was not carried to heaven with him.
9. Molmenti 1909, 268, connected these paintings with the Scuola di San Rocco, without, however, any documentary evidence for the commission. For reproductions see Pallucchini 1968, 96, nos. 77A–R. The cult of Saint Roch was very strong in Venice, because it was supposed that his relics were carried there in 1485. The Scuola di San Rocco was constructed in order to house these relics (Vauchez in BiblSS 11: 270).
12. For these bozetti see Morassi 1962, 47, and pls. 40–41 (for paintings in the Duomo, Sacristy, San Daniele dei Frutti); Levey 1986, 113, fig. 108 (for the British Rail Pension Fund painting); Morassi 1962, 8, and pl. 94, 54, and pl. 122 (for the New York painting, which was then in a private collection, and the Accademia painting, respectively).
13. See the development, for example, in the deep shortening of the figures from the frescoes in the Villa Loschi a Biron of 1744 (Pallucchini 1968, 99, no. 90), to Santa Maria dei Gesuati, Venice, of 1737–1739 (Pallucchini 1968, 103, no. 122), to the Palazzo Clerici, Milan, of 1740 (Pallucchini 1968, 105, no. 132), and to the Scalzi frescoes of 1743–1745 (Pallucchini 1968, 109, no. 152).
Bernard Aikema has pointed out that Francesco Fontebasso painted a ceiling roundel of Saint Roch in Glory in the sacristy of San Rocco, Venice, in 1749, and that possibly Tiepolo’s bozetto might have been an earlier study for the ceiling, which, however, was never executed (letter of 11 October 1993, NGA curatorial files). Aikema was following De Vito Battaglia 1930, 115–120. For Fontebasso’s painting see Magrini 1988, 193–194, no. 178, and fig. 118. See also Brown 1993, 206.
16. Drapery and features are comparable to the Scalzi sketch.
17. Inv. 48–849. Gibbons 1977, 1: 192, no. 609; 2: fig. 609. Knox 1964, 11, no. 34, stated that this figure relates to the Villa Pisani, Strà, but no comparable figure can be found in that fresco.
18. Inv. 7450, Gernsheim 82605. The contours follow exactly those of Saint Roch, suggesting a ricordo rather than a preparatory drawing. Knox 1966, 6–7, no. 9, repro., and Knox 1980, 1: 131, D11, believed the sheet to be a study by Giambattista for the Scalzi ceiling.
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1960.6.36 (1588)

**Bacchus and Ariadne**

c. 1743/1745

Oil on canvas, 213.4 × 231.8 (84 × 91 ¼)

Timken Collection

**Technical Notes:** The support is a fairly coarse plain-weave fabric. The ground is yellowish red in color. The paint was applied fairly broadly and thickly with some areas over others, although there is no extensive, considered layering structure. The figural elements were drawn in with loose and expressive brushwork. X-radiographs (fig. 1) reveal many parts drawn directly on the canvas with fluid strokes. Other areas—the mountains and sky, for example—were painted with numerous short, brushy strokes that produce areas of texture rather than linear outlines. Some areas show a lack of finish or incorrect drawing, such as the foot of the putto at upper left and the legs of the putto at lower right next to Bacchus. X-radiographs reveal that the original composition included a ledge along the bottom edge of the canvas with griffins gripping balls at either end. A column entwined with acanthus leaves and an entablature closed the right side of the composition, and probably also the left. These elements were painted out before the crouching figure of Rhea at lower left was added, apparently at a later date; there are also remnants of a darker layer over this figure.

Extensive damage, including numerous complex tears and holes, is visible in x-radiographs. The inpainting and areas of overpaint are often crude and have discolored. The varnish is extremely discolored. The painting was relined and the discolored varnish layers thinned during treatment in 1960, probably by Francis Sullivan.

**Provenance:** Possibly painted for a palace in Venice.¹ Probably Francesco Artaria (1744–1808), Como and Venice; from 1798 Villa Giròla, near Blevio; by descent to Domenico Artaria, inventoried in the Villa Giròla c. 1829;² by descent to August Artaria [d. 1893], who upon the sale of the villa in 1870 took it to Vienna, where it remained in the warehouse of the family firm, Artaria & Co., until rediscovered in 1900;³ sold 1911 via an unknown dealer in Berlin to (Charles Sedelmeyer, Paris);⁴ purchased 1927 by (Galerie Van Dijck, Berlin-Amsterdam-New York), sold 1927 or 1928 to a private collector, New York;⁵ probably identical with the following. William Robert Timken [1881–1959], Croton-on-Hudson, New York, and following Mr. Timken’s death, New York City.⁶

**Exhibited:** Athens, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia, 1967–1971.

*Bacchus and Ariadne* belongs to the same commission as two other paintings: the *Triumph of Amphitrite* in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden (fig. 2), and the *Juno and Luna* in the Sarah Campbell Blaffer Foundation, Houston (fig. 3). Vertical dimensions of the three paintings are similar,⁷ and they were together as early as c. 1829.⁸ The original location of the paintings may well have been the staircase of a Venetian palace as most scholars have maintained based on a lost letter written by Tiepolo from Madrid on 7 August 1764:

Molti anni sono ho servito il N.H. di Lei padre di buona memoria per li disegni delli quadri che doveano andere nei scaloni del palazzo di V.E. e sono stato retribuito di tale mia fatica.

Hora siccome devo qui lavorare molti soffitti del genere che ho in allora disegnati, sarei a pregare V.E. ove non fossero necessari per il momento di voler favorirmi in prestitio il cartone della gloria di Anfitrite che al più presto lo restituìro. Se V. E. si degnasse di concedermi un tale favore potrebbe far consegnare il disegno a mio figlio D. Giuseppe il quale ne farà una ricevuta e lo spedirebbe costi colla prima nave.⁹

The addressee of the letter is not known but scholars have assumed that he was Venetian since Tiepolo’s son Giuseppe lived in the city. The letter has been used by scholars not only to determine the location but also to indicate the date and authorship of the paintings. If the document indeed refers to the present cycle, the recently discovered ledge, griffins, and architecture begin to make sense as do the compositions of the *Juno and Luna* and *Bacchus and Ariadne*.

X-radiographs of the *Bacchus and Ariadne* (fig. 1) have revealed that the original composition consisted of a ledge along the bottom on which the leopard rested and over which his tail lay. At left and right long-necked griffins with breasts enclose the design. Along the right edge are climbing acanthus leaves and a Doric entablature with a volute above. The trees at right and the figure of Rhea at left were added to cover the architectural elements and are not part of the original design or subject. Similar architectural elements in grisaille were revealed in the *Juno and Luna* when it was conserved shortly after
The ledge along its bottom edge is the same as that in Bacchus and Ariadne, and the griffin at right leans on a disk like that at left in the Washington painting. Recent conservation of the Triumph of Amphitrite has revealed similar grisaille architectural elements which help to explain those seen in the x-radiographs of the Washington painting. There, griffins at the lower corners resemble sea creatures. At the upper corners hanging entablatures with decorative volutes, leaves, and shells enclose the composition. A similar hanging entablature must be that seen at right in x-radiographs of the Bacchus and Ariadne.

When the three pictures were repainted to cover the grisaille elements is a matter of conjecture. It is likely that when they were removed from their original site or when they were removed to Vienna in the late nineteenth century they were overpainted to cover up the elements intended for a specific space. The trees at right in the Bacchus and Ariadne appear to date earlier than the figure of Rhea. This foliage may have been added in a restoration about the time the paintings arrived at the Villa Giròla around 1800. From about 1870 the paintings were rolled up in the warehouse of Artaria & Co., Vienna; after their rediscovery in 1900 they were conserved by Victor Jasper. The figure of Rhea was possibly added at this stage since its style appears to be late nineteenth century. The paintings were already in poor condition after having been rolled up; there are numerous losses and abrasions evident in all three. Since many of these losses are at the sides of the Washington painting, it is possible that further architectural elements are missing from the entire series. Consequently, efforts to locate the placement of the pictures in the original palace on the basis of the elements cannot be done.

Fitting the paintings into the unusual setting of a staircase and its architectural surround would have required the artist to make accommodations to fit.
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Bacchus and Ariadne, 1960.6.36
the space. The figures in *Juno and Luna* face the viewer’s right and those in *Bacchus and Ariadne* face the viewer’s left, indicating that *Juno and Luna* may have been at left and *Bacchus and Ariadne* at right of a staircase with the *Triumph of Amphitrite* on the landing at center. The visitor would first have seen the *Triumph* upon entering and slowly taken in the flanking paintings as he walked up the staircase. The very slight *di sotto in su* perspective in all three paintings also conforms to a staircase location. One would have seen the compositions from below and upon approaching them probably come to eye level with the lower ledges of the pictures. Canvases by Sebastiano Ricci painted in 1712–1714 for the staircase of Burlington House, London, include surrounding architectural elements in grisaille similar to those in Tiepolo’s paintings, an indication that it was not an unknown practice to accommodate paintings to a stairway setting by the addition of such monochrome devices.

In addition to location, the subject matter and the number of canvases in the group are open to question. According to Modern, the series included four paintings as allegories of the four elements: *Bacchus and Ariadne*, Earth; *Triumph of Amphitrite*, Water; *Juno and Luna*, Air; and *Venus and Vulcan*, Fire. This theory is supposedly supported by an inventory of the Villa Giròla made c. 1829, which implied to some scholars that a fourth painting existed. The inventory placed the *Triumph of Amphitrite* on the first floor, room no. 1, and the “other pieces that formed the ensemble of the room in part on the upper floor and in part in the little room on the first floor, room no. 8.” Scholars have interpreted this statement to mean that there were more than three paintings, but since only three locations are mentioned, there may have been only three paintings listed in the inventory. If the series included only these three pictures, its interpretation as a representation of the elements comes into question. But, examination of the iconography of each painting suggests that the four elements were indeed the series’ theme. If a fourth painting existed, presumably of dimensions similar to Amphitrite, one of the oblong canvases may have been placed on a wall at the top of the staircase opposite the stairs.

Tiepolo did represent the four elements as minor grisaille decoration, but this is the only case in which he devoted a major series to the subject. There was no rigidly established iconography for the depiction of the four elements in Italian painting. Various deities or allegorical figures could be used to represent elements according to the whim of the patron or artist, and often the four elements became synonymous with the four seasons. The figure of
Venus was most appropriate for Water, but Amphitrite (as chosen by Tiepolo), Neptune, or some other sea deity was also suitable. Air might be illustrated either by Jove, as the king of heaven, or by Juno, his queen. However, the former could also represent Fire, by the force and power of his thunderbolts, and the latter could depict Earth, whose soil was sown with the seed of her husband. Tiepolo’s choice of Juno and Luna for Air was dependent on Cartari’s interpretation, in which Juno and Luna were interchangeable. As Juno she rides a chariot while as Luna she is dressed in black and red. The black indicates that her light comes from reflection of other light, and the red indicates the different qualities of the weather. She holds a ring of clouds, suggesting rain, within which is the moon. Jove, whose eagle flies above Luna, and Mercury complete the composition at upper right. Fire was most often represented by Vulcan at his forge, with or without Venus, yet this too was variable. As noted above, Jove was sometimes chosen but so was Pluto, as the god of the underworld.

Although Ceres and Flora could represent the fecundity of the Earth, Tiepolo chose the often depicted story of Bacchus and Ariadne for this element in his series. According to ancient myths, Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, king of Crete, was abandoned on the island of Naxos by her lover Theseus, whom she had saved from the Minotaur by giving him a thread to lead him out of the labyrinth. Naxos was the sacred island of the god Bacchus. There he came to Ariadne’s rescue, married her, and crowned her with gems that were turned into a constellation of stars (Corona Borealis) at her death. Tiepolo followed the traditional iconography of Bacchus as described by Cartari. His head adorned with grapes and grape leaves of the harvest, he sits on a wine cask and holds a cup of wine. The garland of ivy denotes either his eternal youth or occult, licidinous, or other natures. He carries the thyrsus with which to stir the wine. Below rests a tiger, symbol of his trip to India, one of the places where he taught cultivation of the vine. It is said that upon his return from India he found Ariadne stranded on Naxos. Some of his attendants drink wine or play with vines while others celebrate the wedding with garlands and music. The winged putto may be Cupid sent by his mother Venus, who had promised Ariadne an immortal lover after her abandonment by Theseus. In the middle ground, a satyr carries another putto on a donkey. The rustic houses in the background indicate that the scene takes place on a bucolic island. Ariadne reclines against a rock draped in her wedding silks and wears a bejeweled armband, a typical Tiepolo motif, which might suggest her royalty. The wheat in her hair and reeds in her arm are common symbols that associate her with the earth and harvest. Together, she as a mortal and Bacchus, because of his cultivation of grape vines, are appropriate to represent Earth. If Bacchus and Ariadne represent the fruit of the Earth, then the Washington, Dresden, and Houston paintings were indeed meant as a series of the elements. It is also possible that the paintings in their emphasis on heat and moisture suggest the importance of the elements for the procreation of earth and man.

The compositions and figural style of the three canvases accord with Tiepolo’s works of c. 1743–1745, which would place the paintings long before the artist’s letter (“molti anni sono”). Especially close are some of the classicizing works that Tiepolo painted for Francesco Algarotti and his German clients in these years, such as the Triumph of Flora (1743–1744, Museum of Fine Arts, San Francisco) and Maecenas Presents the Arts to Augustus (1743–1744, Hermitage, Saint Petersburg). The Triumph of Amphitrite harks back to paintings by Poussin (1594–
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Bacchus and Ariadne is Tiepolo’s Finding of Moses (1743–1744, National Gallery of Australia, Melbourne), inspired by Veronese (1528–1588), who was one of Algarotti’s favorite artists and whom Tiepolo emulated closely during this period. Apollo and the Muses (c. 1745, formerly Crane Collection, New York), in which the god sits on a rock in the same pose as that of Bacchus in the Washington picture, also dates to this time. The erudite subjects and eclectic compositions suggest that the three paintings were probably executed under Algarotti’s influence and possibly commissioned by a person of similar interests with an admiration for cinquecento Venetian painting.

Tiepolo’s letter is ambiguous about the authorship of the pictures, stating only that he made the drawings for them. At least one scholar has used this remark as evidence that the paintings are entirely workshop products. Tiepolo’s comment about having designed the paintings may, however, also be interpreted as indicating his authorship as the “inventor” of the compositions as well as the executor of the design. Therefore, attribution must be based on stylistic analysis and comparisons.

Published opinions concerning the three pictures have, on the whole, favored Giambattista’s authorship, although views about the quality of each work have varied. Modern first published the paintings in 1902 with enthusiasm for the entire group. Sticotti and Molmenti were less impressed, the former rejecting all three paintings and the latter accepting only the Triumph of Amphitrite. The two scholars did concede that the paintings issued from Tiepolo’s shop and were based on his designs. Later writers endorsed the works as autograph, although Morassi saw the Washington painting as superior to the Blaffer picture, and Pallucchini indicated the possibility of collaboration in the Blaffer work. In a letter to Shapley in 1973, Hannegan returned to the view that the Bacchus and Ariadne is a shop work of c. 1740, probably by Giovanni Raggi (1712–1792/1794), a Bergamasque artist active in Tiepolo’s shop from the mid-1730s until 1741. Autograph works by Raggi do not accord with the style of this painting; his morphology is different and his handling of drapery is smoother than Tiepolo’s in spite of the influence of the latter’s compositional format.

The larger problem of collaboration in Giambattista’s studio remains unresolved. According to Knox, throughout Tiepolo’s career only six artists, besides his quadratura collaborators, are recorded as having worked in his studio: his sons Domenico and Lorenzo; his brother-in-law, Francesco Guardi (q.v.); Giustino Menescardi (c. 1720–c. 1776); Francesco Lorenzi (1723–1787); and Giovanni Raggi. The styles of Domenico, Lorenzo, and Guardi are well known and certainly not evident here, whereas several of the other heads lack convincing modeling; the staccato strokes for the sea background are also pedestrian. In the Bacchus and Ariadne, Ariadne is a characteristic Tiepolo form, but the figures of the satyr and putto on the donkey lack the graphic virtuosity of other Tiepolo paintings. It seems certain, however, in comparing drapery color and facture as well as facial morphology with the Triumph of Amphitrite that the Washington and Dresden paintings are by the same hand. Until the Bacchus and Ariadne is treated and the overpaint removed, however, attribution of the work to Tiepolo must remain cautious. And, until more is known about Tiepolo’s workshop, it is difficult to evaluate the intervention by assistants in the entire series.

Tiepolo portrayed the couple of Bacchus and Ariadne several times in his career. In each case Bacchus is proffering the crown of stars to his bride, but the other examples are ceiling paintings and depict the pair in the heavens as appropriate to their placement above the viewer. In the Palazzo Labia, Venice, the subject is a single painting on the ceiling, whereas in other cases the god and his consort appear with other deities in the heavens.

Although drawings have been connected with the Triumph of Amphitrite, no preparatory sheets relate directly to the composition of Bacchus and Ariadne. A landscape drawing in the Museo Civico, Trieste, however, does portray a building with a classical pediment and tower much like that at the far left in the background of the Washington painting. Studies like this must have been used by the painter throughout his career when an appropriate backdrop was necessary.

The influence of Tiepolo’s series of elements on his later work in Spain is not clear. His 1764 letter
suggested that he wanted only the cartone of the Triumph of Amphitrite for similar work he was producing. Some elements of this painting reappear throughout his career, as on the Throne Room ceiling of the Royal Palace, Madrid, but that composition was created in 1762 and completed in 1764. Nothing specific from the Triumph of Amphitrite composition is found in his subsequent ceilings of the Guard Room or the Antechamber. We are left with the conclusion that either the cartone never arrived in Spain, Tiepolo chose not to use it, his Spanish painting(s) based on it is (are) lost or never executed, or the letter, after all, does not refer to the present group of paintings.

Notes
1. See text for discussion of this possibility.
5. Posse 1927-1928, 372 is the most complete source for this part of the provenance. The prospectus from Van Diemen is preserved in NGA curatorial files.
7. The three paintings are similar in height, and the Luna is comparable in width to the Washington painting. This and the identical provenance indicate that the Luna and the Bacchus were pendants to the wider Amphitrite. The Amphitrite measures 213 x 442 cm; the Juno 213 x 231 cm. In 1910, when Sack wrote about the Amphitrite, the dimensions were given as 188 cm in height. The extra 25 cm had been folded over and the painting was later restored to its original height. When the painting was conserved in 1988, this strip, which was a later addition, was removed and a similarly sized strip was added to finish the composition. It is known that the fabric was meant to be this height because the putto flying upward was cut off at mid-body, something Tiepolo would not do. The removed strip was not original because the architectural elements were missing from it. The new strip was inpainted with a reconstruction of the architectural elements and the entire putto. The author would like to thank Günther Oihlof for his explanation of the conservation treatment.
8. See provenance. All three paintings remained together in the Artaria collection and at Sedelmeyer Galleries until 1927. The Washington and Blaffer paintings remained together until 1980 when under the terms of Lillian Timken’s bequest Juno and Luna went to the Metropolitan Museum, New York, and the Bacchus and Ariadne to the National Gallery, Washington. The Juno and Luna was deaccessioned from the Metropolitan Museum in 1980, and purchased from Colnaghi & Co., London, by the Blaffer Foundation soon thereafter. For provenance of the Blaffer painting see Pignatti 1985, 190. The Amphitrite was sold by the Sedelmeyer Galleries, Paris, to the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, in 1927. It was taken to Russia in 1945 but returned to Dresden in 1956. See Posse 1927-1928, 370, and Morassi 1962, 11.
9. The entire letter is published in Urbani de Gheltof 1879, 24–25. In that year the letter was part of the Alberti collection, Bologna. It has not been traced since. Although one must be cautious in reading Urbani de Gheltof, the letter appears to be authentic. In his reference to "molte soffitti del genere," Tiepolo was probably not suggesting that he had made ceiling paintings in Venice, but that he was to do ceiling paintings in Spain of similar subjects as those in Venice.
10. This is the date the painting was sold from the Metropolitan Museum. By the time it was purchased by the Blaffer Foundation, discolored varnish had been reduced during a conservation treatment.
11. It is unlikely that the original site was the Villa Giróla near Blevio from which the paintings were removed to Vienna in 1870 since an inventory of c. 1829 (see below in text) placed the pictures in different rooms. As argued by others and the present author, the original site was likely that mentioned in Tiepolo’s 1764 letter cited above. The paintings were probably removed from the original site after c. 1798 and certainly by the time of the Villa Giróla inventory of c. 1829. (See provenance.) Pedrocchi in Gemin and Pedrocchi 1993, 45, recently suggested that the series was painted for the Villa Giróla, but did not give his reasons.
13. A layer of dark paint has been found over the figure of Rhea. (See Technical Notes.)
15. Daniels, Sebastiano, 1976, figs. 165–168. Eric Garber- son pointed out the existence of these paintings.
16. Published in Modern, "Les peintures," 1902, 477, who said that the inventory belonged to the years between 1820 and 1835 and was probably compiled in 1829.
17. For example, the elements were represented in gold grisaille in the Throne Room ceiling of the Royal Palace, Madrid (1762–1764).
18. For a list of the four elements in painting see Pigler 1974, 2: 507–511; for the four seasons see Pigler 1974, 2: 511–519. For example, Francesco Albani’s series of the elements (Galleria Sabauda, Turin) is also representative of the four seasons: Puglisi 1983, figs. 90–93. Giulio Carpioni’s prints of the elements employ allegorical female figures instead of deities: Pilo 1961, pls. 187, 191, 198, and 204.
19. Writers and artists confused many of these water nymphs with Amphitrite when referring to sea nymphs in general. Since there are no specific attributes of Venus in Tiepolo’s painting, it has been assumed that she is Amphitrite. On Venus and Amphitrite as representative of the element of Water see Dempsey 1966, 338–343. On Amphitrite see especially 340, n. 7.
20. Cartari 1571, 172; on the different gods who could represent the elements see Cartari 1571, 216–217.
22. On Luna see Cartari 1571, 122–124.
24. On the story of Ariadne and the changes to her myth in ancient literature see Webster 1966, 22–31, and Hartmann.
27. Bacchus has also been associated with Fire. According to Cartari 1571, 426, one of his attributes was the white poplar, which is seen here in the background, and since it grew on the banks of Acheronte, marked him as a god of the Underworld. The smoke (or incense) rising from behind the putto on the tiger is unexplained.

It was not altogether inappropriate for the nineteenth-century (or twentieth-century) restorer to have added the figure of Rhea, who was considered the Great Mother, that is, the Earth. On Rhea see Cartari 1571, 202–205. Other names were also given to the Earth Mother such as Ope, Cybele, Vesta, and Ceres.

28. The paintings have been dated consistently by scholars to c. 1740. Only Sack 1910, 203, nos. 408–410, suggested 1738–1740.
32. Sticotti 1906, 193.
34. Sticotti 1906, 193; Molmenti 1909, 280, rejected all but the Amphitrite. Molmenti noted that he was in agreement with Wilhelm Bode and Gustave Frizzoni in accepting the Amphitrite.
35. Morassi 1943, 22; Morassi 1962, 36; Pallucchini 1968, 106, nos. 136–138; Sack 1910, 203; Posse 1927–1928, 373–375; Wilhelm Bode in 1927 (authentication on back of photo, a copy of which is in NGA curatorial files); Cailleux 1970, 88; Shapley 1979, 1: 454–455; and Bailey 1992, 95–96, accepted the works without hesitation.
37. Details about Raggi's collaboration with Tiepolo are sketchy. Raggi became enamored with Tiepolo's style when the Venetian was painting in the Duomo at Bergamo in the 1730s. After leaving Tiepolo's studio in 1741, Raggi's style developed in its own direction. For a biography and catalogue of paintings, see Fernando Noris in I pittori bergamaschi 5, 3: 17–74.
38. A painting such as the Saint Grata Showing her Father Lupus the Flowers Grown from the Blood of Saint Alexander (Sotheby's, London, 19 April 1989, lot 22, repro.), although executed in Venice between 1735 and 1737 when Raggi worked with Tiepolo, suggests a hand entirely different from that of the Bacchus and Ariadne. The painting, for the Benedicteine nuns of Santa Grata, Bergamo, is documented.
40. See, for example, Lorenzi's painting of The Virgin Appearing to San Lorenzo Giustiniando in the Duomo, Verona, in which Tiepolesque forms are rendered in a stiff, planar manner. Alinari photo 59689; NGA photographic archives.
41. Palazzo Labia: Morassi 1962, pl. 265. A bozzetto of Bacchus and Ariadne in the clouds, possibly for a ceiling with other deities, was once in the Eckstein Collection, London (Morassi 1962, pl. 161). Bacchus and Ariadne are part of the Olympic deities of the Throne Room ceiling in the Royal Palace, Madrid.
42. A pen-and-ink drawing in the British Museum, London, may or may not be connected with the marine figures at left: Posse 1927–1928, 374, repro. Modern, "Les peintures," 1902, 479, published a drawing from the Museo Civico, Venice, that he believed to be a study for Amphitrite's pointing arm, but the musculature on the sheet suggests that it represents a male arm. Another drawing from the Museo Civico, Venice, which he said was a drawing for Amphitrite's head, is not connected with the painting (Modern, "Les peintures," 1902, 481). A painted sketch, once called an autograph bozzetto, is in the Museo Civico, Trieste, and is a copy of the bozzetto that appeared recently on the art market: exh. cat. London 1990, no. 31.

Posse connected a drawing in the Kupferstichkabinett, Dresden, with the series as a study for the supposed lost Venus and Vulcan. The drawing is related instead to the Washington Apollo Pursuing Daphne and the Philadelphia Venus and Vulcan (see 1952.5.78, note 20).
43. It has been suggested incorrectly in exh. cat. Chicago 1938, 39, no. 71, and Shapley 1979, 1: 455, that a drawing of Bacchus and Ariadne by Giambattista, formerly in the collection of Philip Hofer, and now in the Lehmann Collection, Metropolitan Museum, New York, is a study for the Washington painting.
44. Rizzi 1988, 72–73, no. 17, repro.
45. For example, a similar building appears in the background of Rinaldo Enchanted by Armida (Art Institute of Chicago): Barcham 1992, 82–83, no. 18, repro.
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Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers

1725/1730
Oil on canvas, 261.4 x 365.8 (102 7/8 x 144)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support consists of four lengths of a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric joined with three vertical seams. There are two ground layers: a warm ocher-colored layer over a white layer. The upper ground layer is visible between some contour boundaries and in the helmet in the left foreground. The entire painting was executed simultaneously, although the wooden staves were apparently added last. The paint was applied in a creamy consistency that retained the fluid brushstrokes without producing high impasto. A wide range of opaque to glazed paints was employed. Thin brown lines were added over the paint to emphasize contours. Small adjustments in contours and overpaint/underdrawing reveals no underdrawing; however, several lines were drawn in a dry medium on a dry underlayer to position the flag pole at the right side.

Cusping is visible on both sides and the bottom, and is presumed to be present along the top edge. There are numerous small tears throughout the upper section, with a horizontal tear of 53 cm and a vertical tear of 77 cm at the right edge. The impasto is slightly moated. The extensive inpainting in the sky has whitened. The varnish is moderately discolored. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored by Mario Modestini in 1950–1951.


Since its appearance in an American private collection in the early twentieth century, Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers has been accepted by all authorities as an authentic work by Giambattista Tiepolo. In 1935 Lorenzetti first proposed that the female figure in the painting could be Zenobia. In 1965 Panofsky conclusively identified the subject and interpreted Queen Zenobia’s exhortative gesture. In 1973 Shapley connected the canvas and its two pendants (Cariolo, Milan: A Hunter on Horseback and A Hunter with a Stag, figs. 1–2) with another large painting in Turin (Galleria Sabauda: The Triumph of Aurelian, fig. 3) and recognized the works as an early commission for the Zenobio family recorded by Vincenzo da Canal in his biography of Tiepolo’s teacher Gregorio Lazzarini, completed in 1732. More recently Knox related a third canvas of similar proportions in Madrid to the group (Prado: Queen Zenobia Before Aurelian, fig. 4) and attempted a reconstruction of the Zenobio commission. Although the five pictures must certainly be those recorded by da Canal as having hung in the Ca’ Zenobio in Venice, which still stands on the Rio dei Carmini, one must reevaluate the various dates proposed for them as well as their original location.

The story of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, is related in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Zenobia had fought alongside her husband Odaenathus against the Persians and together they captured Mesopotamia and much of the east. After her death, she continued as regent (266/267 until A.D. 272) for their sons Herennianus and Timolaus but was challenged by the Roman emperor Aurelian for having usurped power. After her defeat by Aurelian (represented in the Prado Zenobia Before Aurelian), Zenobia was led in golden chains to Rome (represented in the Turin Triumph of Aurelian) where she ended her days as an admired Roman matron. According to the Scriptores, Zenobia was even braver than her husband, had shared his love of hunting, and endured in battle the same hard life as her troops. Aurelian praised Zenobia’s courage and respected her even in defeat for having consolidated imperial power in the eastern empire. In the Washington painting, Tiepolo depicted the Palmyrene queen as she is described in the Roman text: attired in the robes of Dido and displaying a diadem on her head. In the painting Zenobia is closely portrayed “in the manner of a Roman emperor...her arms were frequently bare.” Knox suggested that Tiepolo also stressed Zenobia’s connection with Minerva and Bellona by representing her in the pose of War as described by Ripa. In the guise of a Roman general, Zenobia, holding her royal scepter, leans against a column as she addresses her troops, probably before the final battle. The composition has its origin in the adlocutio portrayed on Roman coins and relief sculpture, that is, the ceremony of the emperor standing on a dais speaking to his soldiers before battle. Nevertheless, as first noted by Knox, Tiepolo appropriated this cer-
Fig. 1. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *A Hunter on Horseback*, 1725/1730, oil on canvas, Milan, Cariplo

Fig. 2. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *A Hunter with a Stag*, 1725/1730, oil on canvas, Milan, Cariplo

Fig. 3. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *The Triumph of Aurelian*, 1720/1725, oil on canvas, Turin, Galleria Sabauda
mony not from ancient art but from Peter Paul Rubens’ (1577–1640) learned interpretation of it in his *Decius Mus Addressing His Legions* (1616–1618). Tiepolo copied both the position of the commander on the raised platform and several of the attentive soldiers at right. He changed the Roman standards in Rubens’ original to reflect his interpretation of eastern battle standards. Tiepolo would not have known the large tapestry cartoons for the complete Decius Mus cycle, because they were already in the collection of the prince of Liechtenstein at the end of the seventeenth century. Tiepolo may have known a set of the tapestries, which were in reverse of the cartoons, but he certainly must have seen Rubens’ preliminary oil sketch (National Gallery of Art, Washington, fig. 5) or a copy. Tiepolo may have looked also at one of the many historical books describing the culture and customs of the Romans. He is known to have made designs for book illustrations of antiquities, for example, and was certainly current with the archaeological treatises of the day.

Zenobia’s outstretched arm with index finger pressed against the thumb recalls Quintilian’s description of one of the common gestures of appeal in oratorical speech. Whether Tiepolo’s source for Zenobia’s rhetorical entreaty is visual or literary is unknown: the gesture is seen in other eighteenth-century paintings.

The valiant Zenobia was often discussed in European literature in the Renaissance and became popular again in the late seventeenth century with the rediscovery of the city of Palmyra. She was the subject of several operas, including *La Zenobia* by Mat-
teo Noris, performed in Venice in 1666, and Zenobia, Regina de’Palmireni by Antonio Marchi, performed in 1694 at the theater of Santi Giovanni e Paolo. She was the heroine of Zenobia in Palmyra by Pietro Metastasio, which was staged throughout the eighteenth century both in Vienna and Venice. Depictions of the Zenobia story are rare, however, in eighteenth-century Venetian art. In 1697, or before, Antonio Zanchi (1631–1722) chose the Triumph of Aurelian for the central image on the ceiling of the cameron in the Palazzo Barbaro; in four additional canvases he portrayed other Roman heroines. In 1705–1707 Andrea Celesti (1637–c. 1711) repeated the theme in fresco on a ceiling of the Villa Rinaldi, Casella d’Asello.

Neither Zanchi’s nor Celesti’s painting appears to have had any iconographic or stylistic influence on Tiepolo’s presentation of the Triumph, which, like his Zenobia Before Aurelian, is dependent on his early formulas for horizontal history paintings. In these, movement spreads across the canvas from right to left creating rhythmic stops until the action comes to a climax.

The fact that Tiepolo executed a series of paintings with the entire history of Zenobia (which no other artist had done) indicates that the commission was indeed special and likely chosen by the Zenobio for an important event. In his life of Lazzarini, finished by 1732, da Canal related that Tiepolo painted “Una sala in cà Zenobio compartita in varie storie, una delle prime sue fatture.” The existence of five paintings of similar height—three depicting the various episodes of the Zenobia story with the heroine dressed in identical attire, and two others with the same provenance as one in the first group—indicates that this is indeed a series. The unusual subject matter, the coincidence of the heroine’s name, and the fact that da Canal mentioned paintings in Ca’ Zenobio have led scholars to identify the paintings with this commission. That Tiepolo would have been given this project early in his career may have been due to an introduction to the Zenobio family by his teacher Lazzarini, who had worked in the palace c. 1700.

Knox suggested that the commission probably related to celebrations for the marriage of Alvise Zenobio to Alba Grimani in 1718. What better way to honor the bridegroom than by glorifying the heroine of the same name? Zenobia was respected and glorified both for her valor and dignity, qualities admired in ancient Rome and in eighteenth-century Venice.

Until Shapley’s association of the National Gallery Zenobia with the Zenobio commission, scholars dated the painting variously from the mid-1720s to 1740. The terminus ante quem for the series must be 1732, the date of da Canal’s manuscript, but Knox and Shapley differed on the interpretation of da Canal’s statement “delle prime sue fatture.” Although there are evident differences in style between the Madrid and Turin pictures and the Washington and Milan paintings, Knox advanced the dating of 1717 for all five pictures and supported his dating of the series in Tiepolo’s youth with da Canal’s statement and with a supposed commission for the celebration of Alvise Zenobio’s marriage. Stylistic comparisons of the series with datable Tiepolo paintings, however, argue for the placement of the Madrid and Turin canvases earlier than the Washington and Milan triptych.

It is possible that Tiepolo’s Zenobio commission, like some others in his career, was not completed all at once. The earliest painting of the series must be the Madrid Zenobia Before Aurelian. The fractured lighting, pastel colors, broken figural contours, and awkward horizontal composition filled with numerous small figures can be found in other paintings dated just before and after 1720, and the dramatic, foreshortened prisoners, recalling Piazzetta, are akin to other early works. The Triumph of Aurelian may have closely succeeded the Zenobia Before Aurelian. Like Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers, the Triumph has been associated stylistically with the series of Roman history paintings for the Ca’ Dolfino at San Pantalon, Venice, of the late 1720s. The dramatic figure of Aurelian moving through space in his chariot with his soldiers turning at his approach reflects the drama of those paintings, yet the cooler tonalities and less substantial forms suggest that it dates somewhat before the Ca’ Dolfino series. In fact, recent comparisons of morphological traits with Tiepolo’s earliest frescoes suggest that this painting, too, belongs to Tiepolo’s youthful period. Although Tiepolo’s early chronology is still not well known, stylistically both the Madrid and Turin paintings fit well with others dated by scholars in the late 1710s and early 1720s.

The Washington and Milan paintings, on the other hand, appear to date around the time of the Ca’ Dolfino series, as most writers have suggested. Like that series these canvases contain crystalline light, saturated color, voluminous forms, and the bold, in-
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers*, 1961.9.42
telligible compositions of Tiepolo’s early maturity. In addition, the model for Zenobia differs from the queen found in the Madrid and Turin canvases. Scholars have remarked on the similarity of the turning horse in the Hunter on Horseback with one in the Ca’ Dolfin Conquest of Carthage (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York). Like other Tiepolos of the mid- to late 1720s—and unlike the Madrid and Turin canvases—the action has stabilized into a dramatic monumentality. Da Canal also listed the Zenobi room immediately prior to his mention of the Ca’ Dolfin series, even while he stated that it was one of Tiepolo’s earliest works. A drawing in the Museo Correr, Venice, with studies of standards and banners illuminates the problems of dating in Tiepolo’s oeuvre. Certain banners and standards studied in the drawing appear in the Triumph of Aurelian and Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers, as well as in the Conquest of Carthage and a later fresco of the Martyrdom of Saint Victor in Sant’ Ambrogio, Milan (1737). Tiepolo reused designs kept in the studio over a number of years.

How can one reconcile da Canal’s statement of the Zenobia series as an early commission with the stylistic evidence of chronological disparity among the canvases? It seems certain that da Canal saw the finished series before 1732, otherwise, he would not have described it as a room “compartita con varie storie.” In such a short account of Tiepolo’s work, and because several of the paintings were early, it may have been logical to credit the entire series to the artist’s early career. Tiepolo’s popularity seems to have been meteoric from his youth, and numerous commissions from various patrons both in and outside Venice followed quickly upon each other. Possibly Tiepolo interrupted his painting for the Zenobio to work on another project and returned some years later to complete it. His frescoes at Udine, for example, also undated, may have caused the hiatus. Although Tiepolo is praised for having worked quickly, he not only juggled a number of projects simultaneously, but he was also often out of Venice, thus delaying the completion of certain commissions.

As it is impossible to date precisely the Zenobia series, it is also not possible to place the paintings in any single room in the Zenobio palace, and it is conceivable that they may not have been executed for this palace. According to Knox, the paintings hung in a room of the piano nobile in the northwest corner of the building. His reconstruction was predicated on the assumption that the National Gallery painting had been reduced at the sides from a larger composition and that the Cariplo paintings had been cut from another large canvas of the Royal Hunt with Zenobia as the central figure. However, this theory of four large historical canvases cannot be supported by the evidence. The canvas of the Washington Zenobia shows cusping on both sides and the bottom, indicating that it is a complete composition. Cusping is visible also along the right edge of the Hunter on Horseback, the painting that would have formed the left side of Knox’s hypothetical Royal Hunt.

As compositions, the Hunter on Horseback and the Hunter with a Stag appear to be complete in themselves, suggesting that with the Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers they were meant to form a triptych. The three paintings in Washington and Milan seem to be a self-contained unit portraying as its subject the strength and courage of Zenobia. Her prowess at the hunt is shown in the pendants, and she takes on the commanding presence of a general in the central canvas. However, as Knox has pointed out, the source of light is different for the Cariplo and Washington canvases, suggesting that they did not hang together. Their original location may have been in the room proposed by Knox or in another room in the northeast corner of the piano nobile, which consists of walls of varying lengths with each punctuated by window(s) or door(s). Here, the Milan and Washington “triptych” (combined length 623 cm) could have fit on the longest wall (658 cm) across from the principal entrance, but this would have left no wall long enough to accommodate the Madrid painting (493 cm). The Madrid painting could have hung on this long wall, while the Turin (402 cm) and Washington (365 cm) paintings would have hung on an adjacent (472 cm) and on an opposite wall (449 cm). The Milan pendants (combined length 258 cm) would then have hung on the wall along the canal (310 cm). Unfortunately, no cornices remain to aid in reconstructing the original placement of the canvases, and any reconstruction with the material available is purely hypothetical. If Tiepolo’s Zenobia series was not intended for the Ca’ Zenobio on the Rio dei Carmini, it may have been painted for another Zenobio residence, but there are no documents to verify this. There is the slight possibility that da Canal or his editor may have mistaken the Ca’ Zenobio for another palazzo, as...
happened with the Palazzo Baglione, Massanzago. Until further documents pertaining to the Zenobio family and to the structures of their numerous residences come to light to aid in a reconstruction of the circumstances of the commission, the reasons for the apparent disparity in date among the paintings and the exact location and number of canvases in the series will remain unresolved.

Notes
1. See text.
2. The last male Zenobio, Alvise, died in 1817, leaving the palace to his sister Alba, who died in 1837. Renovations to the palace began in 1844, at which time a number of art works were apparently sold: Fontana 1845–1863, 299.
3. According to an unsigned statement, probably by Count Barozzi (NGA curatorial files). Suida 1950 gave the date 1909; Lorenzetti 1935, 388, gave the date as 1909. On the Villa Grimani-Vendramin Calergi see Preceruti Garberi 1968, 61–63. The villa passed from the Grimani to the Vendramin Calergi in 1740. Upon her death in 1894, the last member of this family, the widowed Countess Valmarana, left the villa and its contents to the Istituto delle Sordomute, which she founded, run by the Suore Canossiane. The archive of the villa was destroyed shortly after 1900, according to Brunelli and Callegari 1931, 135–137. Lorenzetti 1935, 388–389, concluded that the painting had been brought from another site.
6. Lorenzetti 1935, 389–390. He, however, appeared to favor the Founding of Rome, as this was the subject communicated to him by the owner (Ledyard Blair), perhaps derived from an old oral tradition.
8. Da Canal 1732, 34. Shapley 1973, 451, and 1974, 193–195. Shapley noted that Sack (1910, cat. 224) had already suggested that the Turin painting was probably to be identified with the Zenobio commission. Because of the identical provenance of the Carpile paintings (from the Villa Grimani-Vendramin Calergi in Noventa Padovana and eventually to C. Ledyard Blair), Morassi 1943, 20, and others had connected them with the National Gallery Zenobia.
11. Zenobia appears to wear a fringed oriental-style dress under her military garb.
13. Knox 1979, 414, had earlier suggested that Zenobia was represented in the guise of Strength according to Ripa. He recently corrected this analogy, suggesting instead that she is close to Ripa’s representation for War (letter of 11 February 1994, in NGA curatorial files).
14. Panofsky 1965, 198, and pls. 40.1 and 40.2, reproduced the paintings together, but Knox 1979, 413, made the connection between them.
15. On the Decius Mus cycle see exh. cat. New York, Liechtenstein, 1985, 338–355. On the National Gallery painting and its classical sources (mainly the relief of an adlocutio on the column of Trajan), as well as other versions and copies, see Eisler 1977, 104–106. The only print known of this composition, after the painting in the Liechtenstein collections, is by the Viennese brothers Andreas (1700–1740) and Joseph (1683–1740) Schmutzer. Although numerous examples of the tapestries were made in the seventeenth century, Tiepolo certainly did not look at the composition in reverse.
16. Among other book illustrations, Tiepolo made designs for Scipione Maffei’s Verona illustrata (Verona, 1732) and for a réédition of Francesco Medioarbò’s Imperatorum Romanorum Numismata (Milan, 1730). On Tiepolo as a book illustrator see Pedrocco 1985, 64–76.
17. Quintilian, The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian 4: 293: “One of the commonest gestures consists in placing the middle finger against the thumb and extending the remaining three: it is suitable to the exordium, the hand being moved forward with an easy motion a little distance both to right and left, while the head and shoulders gradually follow the direction of the gesture.”
18. Although Zenobia uses the index instead of the middle finger in her rallying speech to her soldiers, the same gesture appears in Donato Cretti’s Christ in the House of Martha and Mary (Ospizio, San Giovanni in Persicato, Bologna, noted by Shapley 1973, 144, n. 6): Roli 1967, pl. 39.
20. Knox 1979, 410. For the Palazzo Barbaro painting see Hannegan 1983, 205, fig. 3. On the subject matter of this series see here, 1939.1.365.
21. There is also a drawing by Zanchi of Zenobia Before Aurelian in the Uffizi, Florence. For the Uffizi drawing see Mariolina Oliveri in I pittori bergamaschi 4: 591, no. 191, repr. 697.
22. The only non-Venetian painting of Zenobia known to the author is a canvas by the Neapolitan Paolo de Matteis (1662–1728) of Zenobia Before Aurelian in the Bode Museum, Berlin (Inv. 456, photo in NGA curatorial files). There is a painting in the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg, attributed to Poussin, of a different Queen Zenobia (of Armenia). See Rosenberg and Prat 1994, 265, cat. 79.
23. For the Celesti painting see Preceruti Garberi 1968, figs. 274–275.
24. Da Canal 1732, 34.
25. The Turin painting measures 263 x 402 cm, the Madrid painting measures 261 x 493 cm, and the Milan paintings measure 262 x 148 cm and 262 x 110 cm. The Hunter with a Stag, the narrower painting, has been enlarged by approximately one-third along the right side. The provenance of the Milan and Washington paintings from the Villa Grimani-Vendramin Calergi at Noventa Padovana might suggest that they were made for that building. Lorenzetti
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1935, 389, however, has shown that they were probably placed in the villa much later.


25. See Fontana 1845–1863, 298–300, and Knox 1979, 410–413, for information on the Zenobio family, the palace, and the marriage.

26. Lorenzetti 1935, 391, and 1942, 53, dated the painting between the 1710s and 1720s; Morassi, Tiepolo, 1958, 16, suggested 1730–1735; Pallucchini 1968, 100, no. 97, advanced the date to 1735 or after; Rizzi, Dipinti, 1971, 58, under no. 28, believed the painting to date as late as 1740; Shapley 1973, 143, and Shapley 1974, 196, with the da Canal report placed Zenobia before 1732 and compared it with the Ca’ Dolfin paintings of c. 1725–1730; Knox, in a letter to Shapley of 13 December 1974 (NGA curatorial files), agreed with Morassi’s dating of 1730–1735; Knox 1979, 413, took da Canal literally and dated the entire series to 1717. Levey 1986, 52, dated the series after the Ca’ Dolfin pictures. Recently, Gemin and Pedrocchi 1993, 236–237, no. 51, suggested the date 1722–1723 for the entire series.

27. Knox 1979, 413–414, admitted the stylistic difference among the paintings but justified dating the Washington painting early by stressing Tiepolo’s borrowing of soldiers from Rubens’ Deius Mass Addressing His Legions. He believed that only a “rapidly developing” youthful artist would have borrowed so directly. Tiepolo, however, copied a horse and rider from a Van Dyck school painting in an etching for his Capricci, usually dated c. 1733. See Santifaller 1975, 331. On this image see also note 33. In his several versions of the Death of Iphigenia (starting in the late 1720s), Tiepolo appropriated compositional elements and individual forms from either the print or a painting of the Sacrifice of Polyxena by Gerard de Lairesse (1641–1711). See Hanneken 1985, 135–131. More work on Tiepolo’s sources would probably yield other such direct copyings by the artist throughout his career.

28. As, for example, his Madonna del Carmelo (Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan), commissioned in 1721 and completed in 1727. See Barcham 1989, 39, for a discussion and bibliography on the painting.

29. Such as A Warrior Before a Judge (Joresco Collection, Chicago, Pallucchini 1968, 86, no. 7, repro.) and Jurgatha Before the Roman Consul (Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, Pallucchini 1968, 89, no. 30, repro.). Morassi 1950, 196, first published the Madrid painting with the title Continence of Scipio and dated it c. 1722–1725.

30. Such as the figure of Isaac in the Sacrifice of Isaac (Chiesa dell’Ospedalotto, Venice) of 1716 (Pallucchini 1968, 86, no. 3, repro.). For a later dating of this painting see Alcione 1982, 339–382.

31. One painting in the Ca’ Dolfin series is dated 1729. For the Ca’ Dolfin paintings see Pallucchini 1968, 91, no. 48. Levey 1986, 52, without regard to Shapley’s and Knox’s discoveries, agreed with Morassi 1962, 51, and Pallucchini 1968, 95, no. 64, in dating the Turin painting after the Ca’ Dolfin paintings. Morassi dated the Turin canvas c. 1728–1732.

32. Mariuz and Pavanello 1985, 109, compared figures in this painting with those in the Villa Baglione, Massenzago, of c. 1719–1720. There is some difficulty in discussing the style of both the Madrid and Turin paintings due to their state of conservation. On the Turin restoration see Tardito Armerio [1982], 76–87. Michela di Maceo, who brought the preceding book to the writer’s attention, also kindly discussed problems of the restoration.


34. Rizzi, Dipinti, 1971, 58, and Santifaller 1975, 311, noted the similarity to an early etching by Tiepolo of a soldier near a horse from the Capricci. See also note 27 above. An attempt to date the paintings on the basis of an undated etching is ill advised, especially since Tiepolo repeated certain stock figures such as this one.

35. Inv. 7371 recto, Gernsheim 82 569. Knox 1980, 1:141, D.107, pl. 310 (as Giandomenico). See also the print by Giandomenico of Roman standards and trophies (Knox 1980, 1: pl. 309), which reproduces the banner at right in the drawing. The drawing is most likely based on studio props, but the manipulation of the forms in the two paintings shows that Tiepolo improvised and enlarged upon his models. The standard with helmet and eagle is found only in the Zenobia, the waving standard in the Triumph of Aurelian and the Martyrdom of Saint Victor, and several standards in the Conquest of Cartagin. See also the print by Giandomenico of Roman standards and trophies (Knox 1980, 1: pl. 309), which reproduces the banner at right in the drawing. The drawing is most likely based on studio props, but the manipulation of the forms in the two paintings shows that Tiepolo improvised and enlarged upon his models. The standard with helmet and eagle is found only in the Zenobia, the waving standard in the Triumph of Aurelian and the Martyrdom of Saint Victor, and several standards in the Conquest of Cartagin.

36. See, for example, the drawing of praying hands used for frescoes by both Giambattista and Giandomenico, discussed in 1966 9.16, note 17.

37. The projects in Udine, dated by scholars in the 1720s, consist of frescoes in the cathedral, the castello, and the Arcivescovado. See Pallucchini 1968, 91–93, nos. 45, 47, and 50.

38. The Carmini ceiling, for example, lasted throughout the 1740s. One painting is dated 1744 and another 1749. The latter date was revealed in the recent cleaning by Ottorino Nonfarmale. See also Pallucchini 1968, 107, no. 144.


40. See technical notes above.

41. In addition, an “old copy” of the former was sold at Palais Galliera, Paris, 7 December 1967, lot 157, 187x126 cm.

42. A late nineteenth-century cameo that reproduces the primary figures of the Washington Zenobia suggests that the force of Tiepolo’s image was appreciated (private collection, cameo with the initials “VC.” Photograph in NGA curatorial files).

43. Letter of 2 December 1993 to author in NGA curatorial files. Light comes from the right in the Carpiolo canvases and from the left in the Washington painting.

44. For Knox’s reconstruction see Knox 1979, 414, in which he placed an enlarged Zenobia Addressing Her Troops and the Zenobia Before Aurelian on the west wall (1035 cm), the Triumph of Aurelian on the south wall (440 cm) across from the windows facing the canal, and the so-called Royal Hunt on the east wall (440 cm).

45. Aikema 1986, 167–171, has shown that three paintings by Tiepolo thought to form a triptych were actually divided with the two narrower paintings on one wall and the oblong painting on an adjacent wall.

46. The height of this room is 440 cm, high enough to hold the paintings easily. The writer would like to thank the architects Vincenzo Lucchese and Dario Zanverdiani for having drawn accurate plans of this and several other rooms in the Ca’ Zenobio for the present entry (plans in NGA curatorial files).


48. The Zenobio family was one of the richest in Venice, with numerous holdings in Venice, their native Verona, and elsewhere. On the patronage of the Zenobio in the seven-
teenth century, and especially that of the Ca' Zenobio, see Aikema 1979, 209–218.

49. A small tondo by Tiepolo of Justice and Peace, now in San Lazzaro degli Armeni, Venice (Morassi 1962, 56, fig. 215), was transferred from the Ca' Zenobio to the island in the last century. Its small size indicates that it must have graced an antechamber or small stairway ceiling and, in spite of its similarity in date to the Washington painting, is unconnected with the Zenobia cycle.
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Tiberio Tinelli
1586 – 1638

Tiberio Tinelli studied initially with Giovanni Contarini (c. 1549–1604), Titian’s closest follower, and then with Leandro Bassano (1557–1620), nephew of the more famous painter Jacopo da Ponte, called Bassano. He was thus thoroughly trained in the language of late Renaissance painting in Venice. The work of this school was characterized by the reuse of compositional formulas and techniques from earlier Venetian masters such as Titian (c. 1488–1576), Tintoretto (1518–1594), and Veronese (1528–1588).

In his best works Tinelli liberated himself from the strict formalism of the prevailing style in Venice by referring both to the Caravagesque naturalism of Nicholas Regnier (Nicolo Renieri, 1591–1667, active in Venice from 1635) and to Anthony van Dyck’s (1599–1641) sophisticated vision of the cultured aristocracy (Van Dyck was in Venice in 1622). Tinelli was influenced also by the more painterly inflections and the lush coloring of the Genoese artist Bernardo Strozzi (q.v.), who executed many portraits in Venice after taking up residence there in the 1630s. From these components Tinelli produced a manner notable for its painterly refinement and relaxed elegance. The attraction of Tinelli’s synthetic and romanticizing vision led to his becoming the preferred portraitist of the nobility as well as of intellectuals and writers in Venice. He was praised by contemporary critics, such as Carlo Ridolfi and Marco Boschi- ni, for his ability to rival nature, and for “adding grace and greater nobility to similitude” (Ridolfi).

He was also highly valued by foreign rulers, such as Carlo I, duke of Mantua, and Leopold de’ Medici, and by foreign virtuosi such as the collectors Basil Fielding and Paolo del Sera. One mark of Tinelli’s esteem was demonstrated by del Sera, who in his will left Tinelli’s Portrait of Giulio Strozzi (Uffizi, Florence) to his patron, the great connoisseur Leopoldo de’ Medici. According to his early biographers, Tinelli was also appreciated and praised by such artists as Guido Reni (1575–1642) and Pietro da Cortona (1596–1669). In 1630 Tinelli was knighted by Louis XIII, who tried without success to bring the artist to France as a court portraitist.

Tinelli wrought a profound change in the art of Venetian portraiture. Though nothing is known of his shop or school, his particular vision of the informal aristocratic portrait became the dominant language of northern Italian artists through the time of Ghislandi (q.v.). It was seriously challenged only by the heroic idealization that was Giovanni Battista Tiepolo’s (q.v.) contribution to portraiture.
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1946.6.1 (887)

**Lodovico Widmann**

Probably 1637
Oil on canvas, 206.1 x 137.5 (81 1/2 x 54 1/2)
Gift of Samuel L. Fuller

**Inscriptions**
Lower left: *Tinelli.* (not original)

**Technical Notes:** The support consists of three lengths of fabric, all of the same coarse twill-weave, sewn together with a horizontal seam 55 cm from the bottom of the painting and a vertical seam 23 cm from the left edge. The thin ground layer is red, which was allowed to remain visible throughout, especially at the bottom. The sky was painted over an off-white underlayer. The paint was applied in layers with strong evidence of brushwork and is generally thin, especially in the sky where it has the appearance of a wash. Impasto is evident only in the whites.

Losses and abrasion are scattered throughout, especially in the dark areas at the bottom. The signature, applied over already abraded paint, is not original. The varnish is moderately discolored. The painting was relined, discolored varnish was removed, and the painting was restored in 1946–1947, probably by Francis Sullivan or Stephen Pichetto.

**Provenance:** Lodovico Widmann [1611–1674], Venice. Private collection, probably in Germany [as Murillo]; discovered 1922 by (August Mayer, Munich) and sold to Samuel L. Fuller, New York [as Tinelli].


**Although this painting is not described in the Widmann inventories that have so far come to light,** it can be identified as Tinelli’s portrait of Lodovico Widmann (1611–1674) described by the Venetian historian Carlo Ridolfi. According to Ridolfi, Tinelli painted portraits (no longer extant) of Lodovico’s father Giovanni and brother Giovanni Paolo, as well as one of Lodovico “in full-length in a landscape, leaning on a pedestal holding a staff, and dressed in travelling costume . . . .”

The identification of the sitter as Lodovico Widmann is further confirmed by an engraving probably after Tinelli’s portrait (fig. 1). It is inscribed with the sitter’s name and age, 26. Lodovico would have been 26 in 1637 or possibly still in 1638. A probable date of 1637 for the National Gallery of Art’s portrait can thus be deduced.

In both style and content, *Lodovico Widmann* may be regarded as a singular statement of Tinelli’s contribution to aristocratic portraiture in Venice. The portrait is typical of his mature style as exemplified by another work from this period, the signed and dated portrait of Marc’ Antonio Viaro of 1637 (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford). In both pictures Tinelli has conveyed a maximum amount of information through the inclusion of attributes. However, his major preoccupation was to give an impression of the spontaneity of the encounter of the sitter and viewer, and to further characterize the subjects by the aristocratic sprezzatura with which they comport themselves. To this end, Viaro appears to have been interrupted at his desk, while Widmann seems merely to be at his ease in the Roman campagna.

More than any of Tinelli’s other works, *Lodovico Widmann* demonstrates the extent of Anthony Van Dyck’s influence on Tinelli. Tinelli may have relied for a prototype on a Van Dyck such as the *Portrait of the Abbé Scaglia* (The Viscount Camrose Collection). Tinelli’s debt seems evident not only in the informality of the pose but also in the painterly execution of the face and drapery. Most important, the notion of the full-length figure standing in a landscape is unthinkable without the precedent set by Van Dyck; it was in the 1620s and early 1630s that Van Dyck’s
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painterly style and graceful presentation of sitters became the dominant language of aristocratic portraiture in Europe.

Lodovico’s character as a consummate gentleman is signified by his dress and posture, and by his passion for antiquities, examples of which are shown in the foreground and in the ruins behind him, and for the hunt, alluded to in the background. Because Lodovico is shown in traveling costume and surrounded by ruins and antiquities, it is also likely that the portrait commemorates a trip to Rome. The statues at his feet clearly belong to him and were perhaps acquired on the trip to Rome. He may even have sponsored an archaeological excavation there.

Such an image, which illustrates Lodovico’s social and cultural attainments, would have played an important part in the ambitious family’s self-presentation. Indeed, Tinelli’s portrait, emphasizing both the sitter’s noble rank and taste, occupies a most important place in the history of Widmann patronage. The Widmann family was foremost among a type of patron new to Venice at that time: merchant nobility from the mainland who, having bought their way into the Venetian nobility, devoted much of their vast resources to conspicuous display. Originally from the imperial province of Carinthia, the Widmann family had been active as merchants in Venice since the sixteenth century. In the early seventeenth century Giovanni Widmann and his sons Lodovico and Paolo were ennobled in Austria, and in 1646 they were admitted to the Venetian nobility upon payment of 100,000 ducats for the Republic’s war against the Turks in Crete. They were the wealthiest among the new nobility and were richer even than many older Venetian noble families.

In keeping with their increasingly elevated social station, the members of the Widmann family sought to distinguish themselves in their art and architectural patronage. Lodovico’s father, Giovanni, limited his patronage mainly to architecture and commemorative sculpture. Lodovico, the son responsible for the administration of the family’s lands and fortune, continued his father’s projects and emphasis on public manifestations of the family’s wealth and status. Like Venetian aristocrats of his own generation, however, Lodovico supplemented the commissioning of palaces and tombs with self-conscious activity as an amateur of painting. During the 1660s he was the major promoter of a group of artists who formed an emergent vanguard of Venetian taste. An inscription of 1667 dedicating a print to him emphasizes his wise patronage and sound judgment of painting.

Little explicit evidence exists for Lodovico’s activities as a patron at the time this portrait was painted. During the reconfiguration of the family’s palace at San Canciano in the 1630s, he oversaw the construction of the main ceremonial rooms and probably also the commissioning and collecting of important works for their decoration. That Lodovico was also a major collector during these years may be inferred from later sources. An inventory of 1659 shows that his collection comprised not only Venetian “old masters”—as one would expect in a family whose immediate concern was to demonstrate allegiance to their adopted city—but also diverse foreign and Italian “modern” artists whose presence was unusual in Venetian collections of this time. Because the collection seems primarily composed of artists who were active in the 1620s and 1630s, it is probable that it was formed at that time. If this is so, the immediate acquisition of such “foreign” artists reflects a new attitude toward art, typified in Venice only by aristocrats of very refined taste.

The patronage of such local artists as Tinelli, who practiced the modern manner then current in Europe, was further proof of such advanced taste. Tinelli returned the compliment by giving Lodovico the air of a worldly and aristocratic virtuoso. Lodovico’s portrait also furnishes an important document for the emerging role of such patrons in seventeenth-century Venice.

Notes
1. According to typed extracts (NGA curatorial files) from a letter by August L. Mayer of the Alte Pinakothek to Samuel Fuller, probably written in February 1922. Mayer’s authentication of the painting on the back of an old photograph (NGA curatorial files) is dated Munich, 26 February 1922.
2. Mayer 1924, 470, stated that the painting aroused much interest at the Mostra della pittura italiana del Sei e Settecento (Palazzo Pitti, Florence) in 1922. As Shapley 1979, 1:460, n. 4, observed, the painting is not included in the catalogue and may only have been discussed in Florence or shown in a dealer’s rooms. A letter of 17 July 1924 from J. H. McCall of Duveen Brothers to Samuel Fuller states that the painting was not exhibited in Florence (copy in NGA curatorial files).
4. The attribution is secure, even though the authenticity of the signature is called into question on the basis of technical evidence, for which see technical notes above.

5. Ridolfi (1656) 1664, 280: "Il Baron Giovanni Vid- 

man, & i Conti Gio. Paolo e Ludovico suoi figliuoli, l'uno 
sino a' ginocchi, l'altro in piedi in un paese, appoggiato ad un 
piede nello, con bachetta in mano, vestito da viaggio, in cui 
un movimento, anchorché l'occhio ingannato ne rimane."


7. The engraving most likely commemorates Lodovico's elevation to the barony of Paternian and Som- 
mereggi in 1639, recorded by Rösch-Widmann 1980. 6. Since 
Tinelli died in 1612, the age given in the inscription is prob- 
ably that of the sitter when the portrait was painted, rather 
than when the engraving was made. Safarik and Milantoni 
1989, 163, also refer to this engraving but give Lodovico's 
birthdate as 1612, and thus a date of 1638 for the Washing- 
ton portrait. Levey 1983, 23–24, has noted that the falling 
band of Flemish bobbin lace worn by Widmann dates from 
the 1630s.


9. For this work see exh. cat. Washington 1991, 272–273, 
no. 70, repro. Although Titian's portraits, such as the three-
quarter-length Benedetto Varchi (Kunsthistorisches Muse- 
um, Vienna), may have inspired both Tinelli and Van Dyck, 
it is clear that Tinelli followed Van Dyck's innovation in 
adapting this pose to a full-length format. For Titian's por-
trait, see Wethey 1969–1975, 2: 146, no. 108, pl. 83.

10. Magani 1989, 24. However, there is no independent 
documentary confirmation of such a trip.

11. The Venetian author Giuseppe Martinioni, writing 
in 1663, noted that the Widmann collection included anti-
tique statues: Sansovino 1663, 376. It was not unusual for 
Venetian nobles to have collections of antiquities, but the 
Widmann were not among the most prominent collectors of 

12. That virtuosi did conduct excavations in Rome is sug-
gested by the fact that the Farnese specifically refused to al-
low persons to dig on their lands: Haskell and Penny 1981, 

13. For the Widmann family history see Rösch-Wid-
mann 1980 and Magani 1989. On the "new families" in gen-
eral, see Davis 1962, 106–116.

14. For Giovanni's commission to the young Baldassare 
Longohe to reconstruct the family palace at San Canciano, 
possibly while it was still under the ownership of the Serot-
ti family, see Bassi 1976, 261, and Magani 1989, 13–16. Gio-
nanni's testament also provided for the decoration of a fam-
ily chapel in San Canciano, purchased from the troubled 
Polverini; the decoration was carried out for his heirs by an-
other young artist, the Bolognese sculptor and intellectual 


16. In 1657 he began the family's grandiose country 
house in Bagnoli: Magani 1989, 24–28, who convincingly 
gives the house to Alfonso Moscattelli. In 1661 he rented for 
his own residence one of the most impressive Venetian vil-
las of the sixteenth century, Ca' Trevisan on the island of 
Murano, a move that expressed his desire to emulate the 
greatest sixteenth-century patrons: Rösch-Widmann, 1980, 
10. This villa was decorated by Paolo Veronese, and most 
probably designed by Daniele Barbaro. Its associations thus 
recalled the golden age of Venetian art. For the villa, see es-
pecially Bassi 1976, 528–543.

Giovanni Coli (1636–1768), Filippo Gherardi (1643–1704), 
and the Cavaliere Giuseppe Diamantini (1621–1705).


19. Magani 1989, 16. These included stange, galleria, and 
scala a bovolo.

20. Sansovino 1663, 376, considered the family's collec-
tion to be of an extraordinary nature.

21. Pieter van Laer (II Bamboccio; 1599–c. 1642), Claude 
Lorrain (1600–1682), Nicholas Poussin (1594–1665), 
Sébastien Bourdon (1616–1671), Giovanni Liss (c. 
1597–1631), Domenico Fetti (q.v.), Francesco Albani 
(1578–1660), Guido Reni (1575–1642), Guercino (q.v.), and 
others. Many of the artists were active in Rome, and the 
composition of the collection reflects Roman rather than 
Venetian taste. The inventory is published in Magani 1989, 
33–38.

22. For general considerations of seventeenth-century 
collecting in Venice see Savini-Branca 1964 and Pomian 
1990, 65–120. For a more positive assessment of the modern 
manner in Venice, and of the importance it held for con-
temporary collectors, see Merling 1992, especially 97–123.
Little is known about the life and career of Anton Maria Vassallo. It is assumed that he was born around 1620, though some have suggested a date as early as c. 1610. The principal source on Vassallo's early life and training remains the Genoese biographer Raffaele Soprani, who writes that Vassallo was born into a family of successful silk merchants and began his education in grammar school. Although he was encouraged to pursue further studies, Vassallo persuaded his father to allow him to take up painting. His first teacher was Vincenzo Malò (c. 1605–c. 1650), a Flemish artist who had studied with David Teniers the Elder (1582–1649) and Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640). Malò arrived in Genoa around 1634 and remained there through the mid-1640s. From Malò, Vassallo quickly learned the rudiments of drawing and painting.

Stylistic affinities and shared subject matter suggest that Vassallo studied the works of his compatriots Sinibaldo Scorza (1589–1631) and Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione (1609–1664). He may even have studied in their studios, as Scorza was in Genoa from 1627 to 1631, while Castiglione left for Rome only in 1632 and was again in Genoa from c. 1639 through the late 1640s. From Scorza and Castiglione, as from his teacher Malò, Vassallo would have learned to paint in veristic detail. Having these three artistic models might also explain why Vassallo moved so deftly between compositions with small figures and those with nearly life-size figures.

Although he is now regarded primarily as a painter of mythological scenes and still lifes, most of Vassallo's earliest known works were altarpieces, as, for example, Saint Francis with Three Female Saints, dated 1648, for S. Gerolamo in Quarto (now Palazzo Bianco, Genoa). Vassallo continued to receive important public commissions throughout his career, such as the Martyrdom of Saint Marcello Mastrilli for the Convento di Carignano (now private collection) in 1664. Soprani also mentioned that Vassallo painted a great number of portraits. Although many are recorded in contemporary inventories, no portraits by Vassallo are currently known.

Modern viewers are often attracted to Vassallo's mythologies and poetic interpretations of pastoral themes. In these Vassallo brought together the elements of Flemish and local traditions that became the hallmarks of his own style: beautiful color, a lyrical quality appropriate to the subject matter, and extreme verism in still lifes and animals achieved with a rich variety of brush work that communicates textures. Among the best known are Apollo as Shepherd (private collection, Genoa) and the Fable of Latona (Palazzo Reale, Genoa).

Related to the mythological and pastoral themes are a growing number of still lifes that have been attributed to Vassallo only in the last forty to fifty years, such as Putti, Animals, and Copper Basins, and Copper Basins and Fish (both in private collections, Genoa). Like Malò and Scorza, Vassallo is now known to have created both history paintings and genre scenes.

The circumstances of Vassallo's early death are as unclear as those of his youth. According to Soprani, the artist fell gravely ill and was encouraged by his doctors to move to Milan where the climate might be conducive to a recovery. He died there between 1664 and 1673. There were no known students and no children to receive his artistic legacy. The closest heir to Vassallo's style is Giovanni Agostino Cassana (c. 1658–1720), whose still lifes repeat many of the same subjects and motifs. The problem remains, however, where and when Cassana, who was born to Genoese parents in Venice, would have studied with or learned from Vassallo.
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The Larder

Probably c. 1650/1660
Oil on canvas, 220.2 × 163.2 (90 1/4 × 64 1/4)
Samuel H. Kress Collection

Technical Notes: The support is a loose, uneven plain-weave fabric, prepared with a warm red-brown ground. The background was sketched in first with reserves left for the still-life composition, which was worked up in layers wet-over-dry, and with scumbles and glazes, although some passages were painted wet-into-wet. The paint consistency varies from liquid and thin to moderate impasto in the highlights. X-radiographs reveal that the design was executed precisely with no artist's changes.

The tacking margins have been removed, but cusping is visible on all four edges. There are small losses scattered throughout and some minor abrasion, which is concentrated in the lower quarter. Discolored varnish was removed and the painting was restored by Mario Modestini in 1948.

Provenance: Cardinal Joseph Fesch [1763-1839], Rome, after 1815; (his sale, Palazzo Ricci, Rome, 17 March 1845 and following, no. 1009, as Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione); bought by (Alessandro Aducci). Reginald Cholmondely, 2 bought by (Alessandro Aducci). 5

Exhibited: Wrexham, Wales, 1876, no. 2 (as Velázquez). London, Royal Academy, 1879, no. 162 (as Velázquez). London, Guildhall, 1901, no. 133 (as Velázquez). 7 London, Grafton Galleries, 1913-1914, Exhibition of Spanish Old Masters in Support of National Gallery Funds and for the Benefit of the Sociedad de Amigos del Arte Espanola, no. 6 (as seventeenth-century Spanish, possibly Francisco Herrera the Younger). New York, National Academy of Design; Tulsa, Philbrook Art Center; Dayton Art Institute, 1983, Italian Still Life Painting from Three Centuries, no. 35. Frankfurt am Main, Schirn Kunsthalle, 1992, Kunst in der Republik Genn a1528–1815, no. 68, color pl. 68.

Before Roberto Longhi correctly identified The Larder as the work of Anton Maria Vassallo in 1948, it had been attributed both to Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione and to Velázquez (1599–1660) or the Spanish school. 8 Longhi's attribution has been universally supported and The Larder is now considered the pinnacle of Vassallo's genre and still-life production.

Vassallo was known from Raffaele Soprani's biogra-
(Giovanni Rosa, 1591–1638), and Vassallo’s teacher Vincent Malô, among others.\(^{18}\) The Larder embodies a full assimilation of the Flemish tradition, from Pieter Aertsen (1507–1575) to Frans Snyders, both of whose works Vassallo could have seen in Genoa. The immediate proximity of Roos and Malô in Genoa makes them especially important to Vassallo. In pictures such as Roos’ David and Abigail (Offering of the Gifts of the Earth);\(^{19}\) private collection, Genoa, for example, a banked still life screens off the left foreground of the painting. At the same time, Vassallo remained receptive to the compositional and aesthetic choices of his Genoese contemporaries, particularly Sinibaldo Scorza and Castiglione. In Scorza’s Orpheus Enchanting the Animals (Zerbone Collection, Genoa) as well as his innumerable animal “portraits,” still-life elements fill the foreground, nearly obscuring the ostensible subject.\(^{20}\)

The compositional arrangement of The Larder also owes something to Vassallo’s older compatriot Castiglione. The types of Castiglione’s compositions that best correspond to Vassallo’s Larder are those of the Voyage of Jacob and the Sacrifice of Noah (such as the one in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art). Here Castiglione pushed the paired animals and the household goods into the foreground and moved the sacrifice into the far-right background.\(^{21}\) In the same manner, Vassallo placed the still life of both live and dead animals, vegetables, vessels, and cookware in the foreground while the cook is seen radically foreshortened near the fire and window of the back room of the kitchen, at the farthest point from the spectator. Her role, and any possible narrative association that Vassallo may have intended, are entangled in the obscure and ambiguous space she occupies.\(^{22}\)

Scholars have consistently dated Vassallo’s still lifes to his mature years. Since there is only one signed painting in the artist’s career (1648), and since the influences from Castiglione and others suggest a later dating for Vassallo’s still lifes, it seems plausible that The Larder probably also belongs to his maturity, possibly in the 1650s.

Although the attribution and visual sources of The Larder are clear, there is less certainty regarding the iconography of the picture. In general terms, it belongs to the category of the kitchen still life as exemplified in the works of the Flemish and Genoese artists already mentioned. In her essay on still-life painting in Liguria, Griseri traced the historical roots of this genre in northern Italy and advanced new interpretations. Among the possible meanings she offered for the abundant kitchen still lifes are that of “status symbol,” or indication of wealth and commercial diversity. Griseri also saw in Aertsen’s kitchen still lifes, for instance, a connection between nature presented as symbols and parables of morality. However, instead of linking her largely Italian roster of painters to northern theorists, natural philosophers, and poets, Griseri related the references to creation and abundance to the contemporary poetry of Giambattista Marino.\(^{23}\) By mid-century, according to Griseri, Genoese artists took up the northern obsession with daily life, occasionally enlivening it with a dramatic subject or with a sense of seeing a “slice of life.” It is into this last category that she placed the National Gallery’s Larder.\(^{24}\)

Other scholars have proposed different interpretations of the painting’s specific meaning. On the basis of the natural environments of the animals and objects—birds of air and water, pottery and silver, vegetables, and fire—depicted in The Larder, Newcome recently suggested that it is an allegory of the four elements: earth, air, water, and fire.\(^{25}\) On the other hand, if Vassallo followed Castiglione’s example, perhaps the subjects of the paintings are, as Standing suggested, subordinate to the artist’s interest in the materiality of the objects portrayed.\(^{26}\) In this way, the painting may instead be a luxury object whose primary function is decorative.

If Vassallo, who was an erudite painter, deliberately polemicized the genres of narrative and still-life painting, The Larder may resonate on more levels than the superficial one of appearances. Recent scholarship on northern European still-life painting has shifted the debate from iconographic and emblematic interpretations to seventeenth-century constructs of vision and illusion. Whereas the former discussions address the meaning and the audience of the work, the latter offer a framework for comprehending the conceptual principles upon which the reality and the illusion of the image were based. Alpers, for example, differentiated between the acts of narrating and describing: the first term refers to Italian and Italianate painting, and the second more appropriately defines the intentions of the majority of Dutch painters.\(^{27}\) Wheelock recently proposed a middleground between the two extreme positions, in which he attempted to reconcile Italian art theory (especially optics and perspective) and the
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privileged place given to history painting with Dutch concerns for the visible world. Since by virtue of his nationality and training Vassallo straddled these two cultures, he would appear to be a good candidate for Wheelock’s compromise.

Vassallo’s mythologies, pastorals, and magical scenes are rich in poetic allusion and redolent in meaning. The question, therefore, seems to be whether The Larder, too, is iconographically and theoretically complex, or a “simple” genre scene.

Notes
1. Cardinal Fesch was exiled from Paris in 1815. In the 1845 sale catalogue, paintings brought to Rome at that time are marked with an asterisk. The present painting is not so marked, indicating that it was among those acquired by the cardinal after 1815. It appears in the posthumous catalogue of Cardinal Fesch 1841, 111, no. 2733 (as Castiglione).
2. Information from the annotated copy of the sale catalogue held by the Getty Provenance Index. Martha Hepworth has identified Aducci as a dealer (letter of 15 March 1993, NGA curatorial files).
3. Exhibited at Wrexham in 1876 as from his collection.
4. The annotated sale catalogue held by the Getty Provenance Index lists the purchaser as “M. Colnaghi for (Sir C. Robinson).” As Martha Hepworth pointed out, Robinson was Cook’s principal adviser and bought most of Cook’s paintings for him (letter cited in note 2).
5. Pictures at Doughty House 1903, 26, no. 29 (ascribed to Velázquez); Brockwell 1915, 3: 143, no. 504 (as Spanish seventeenth-century); Collection of Sir Herbert Cook 1932, 75, no. 504 (as Castiglione).
7. These first three exhibitions are recorded in Graves 1913–1915, 4: 1561–1564. It has not been possible to locate catalogues.
8. Longhi first proposed the attribution in a written opinion of December 1948 for the Kress Foundation (NGA curatorial files), and then in Longhi 1950, 39. The painting was given to Castiglione in the 1845 Fesch sale catalogue and again by Bodkin 1926, 264–265, and the 1932 Cook collection catalogue. The attribution to Velázquez was first advanced in the 1876 Wrexham and 1879 Royal Academy exhibitions and generally accepted or slightly revised to Spanish school until Bodkin’s reattribution to Castiglione in 1926 (see exhibitions and references). Only Mayer 1915, 126, moved the painting to the Neapolitan school by proposing an attribution to Mariano Nani.
9. Grosso 1923, 502–522, repro. 510 and 511. The paintings had been attributed to Castiglione. They were recently discussed by Eisler 1990, 98; Cyrus, repro. 94–95.
11. Longhi, written opinion as in note 8.
12. Zeri 1959, nos. 511, 512; figs. 511, 512.
14. Torriti 1987, 2: 305–306. Newcome 1985, 215, fig. 5, has attributed a highly finished drawing of a kitchen to Vassallo on the basis of its marked relationship to The Larder. It shares many of the same still-life elements and is set in a kitchen, though one closer in type to Bernardo Strozzi’s La cuoca (Genoa, Accademia Ligustica).
15. Torriti 1987, 2: 305–306, who also praised Vassallo’s “chromatic richness” in the depiction of objects and animals, especially the peacocks.
16. Newcome 1989, 2: 915. The early confusion between the two painters, in her view, rested on Vassallo’s early foray into etching, Diogenes, and their common ties to the colorism of Bernardo Strozzi (q.v). Although she made other important distinctions between the two artists, the present writer does not share Newcome’s opinion on the importance of Strozzi’s color for both Castiglione and Vassallo. Strozzi’s blended colors and fluid brushwork seem quite distinct from either of the younger artists’ techniques: Vassallo’s work is more methodical and precise, while Castiglione’s is more rhythmic in the application of short strokes of color.
18. See biography. For the most recent discussion of expatriate Flemish artists in Genoa see Gavazza and Rotondi Terminelli 1992.
19. Griseri 1989, 102, fig. 90, proposed the alternate title.
20. On Scorza, see Anna Orlando in Gavazza and Rotondi Terminelli 1992, 255–258.
22. Shapley 1979, 1: 517, rightly noted an affinity between Vassallo’s woman, seen at a great distance in the interior, to those in Dutch paintings by such artists as Vermeer.
23. Griseri 1989, 102. Although Marino was long since dead when Vassallo began painting still lifes, the poet’s importance had not diminished, and it is not unreasonable to think that the artists of the mid-seicento were competing with their forebears who were immortalized in the Galleria or the Adone.
25. Newcome 1992, 142. She has also read Bernardo Strozzi’s La cuoca (Palazzo Rosso, Genoa, c. late 1620s) as an allegory of the four elements, despite the emphatically mundane action of the cook in removing the feathers of the fowl in the foreground.
27. For a brief, but partisan, review of the issues involved, see Alpers 1983, xv–xvi, and 229–234, in which she set out her differences with De Jongh 1971, 143–194.
29. One theory that deserves more study is that Vassallo’s painting reflects, consciously or unconsciously, in its ordering of animal, vegetable, fruit, fowl, the current guild debates concerning the authority to sell a variety of produce and meats. Even as still-life painters were bringing together a panoply of comestibles in a single image, the green grocers, butchers, poulterers, etc., were fighting over the exclusive rights to sell their specialty. The markets in Genoa were anything but free. For information regarding the tightening of legislation, see Riccobene 1993, 3–45. These were not simple squabbles between shop owners, but issues that, especially in the 1620s–1640s, meant economic survival (p. 30).
Pietro Della Vecchia

1602 or 1603 – 1676

Pietro Della Vecchia’s father, Gasparo, was a painter registered with the Venetian guild, yet the younger Della Vecchia probably received his initial training from Alessandro Varotari (1588–1648), known as Padovanino. Varotari was the leading painter of the first half of the seventeenth century in Venice, and his style attempted to recapture the classicism of Titian’s (c. 1488–1576) early manner. Varotari had a large and successful school, and he was compared by the eighteenth-century historian Luigi Lanzi to the Carracci for the diversity and excellence obtained by his students. Varotari’s pedagogy may have served as an inspiration to Della Vecchia, who later ran his own academy and was one of the founding members of the Collegio de Pittori, a precursor to the Venetian academy created in 1752.

Della Vecchia himself was registered with the Venetian guild between 1629 and 1640, though his first documented work likely dates from 1626 to 1628. He was married to Clorinda Régnier (1642–1690), the daughter of the Caravaggesque painter Nicholas Régnier (Nicolò Renieri, 1591–1667). Clorinda was herself an accomplished artist who imitated both her husband’s and her father’s manners. Della Vecchia, Régnier, and the Venetian art critic Marco Boschini (1605–1681) were the leading connoisseurs of painting in Venice and served as agents for, among others, the great Florentine collector, Leopoldo de’ Medici, whose collection of Venetian masterpieces is now housed in the Pitti Palace.

In the 1630s Della Vecchia became the preeminent religious painter of Venice. In 1640 he was commissioned to design new mosaics for the Basilica of Saint Mark and given the title of ducal painter. Della Vecchia was acclaimed for his skill in emulating the monumental manner of Venetian history painting, which served him well in his capacity as a restorer. In 1643–1645 he was called upon to restore Giorgione’s (1477–1511) Castelfranco altarpiece.

Della Vecchia’s affection for and knowledge of Venetian sixteenth-century painting is evident not only in his original paintings and his restorations, but also in his capricious imitations of old masters, especially Giorgione and Titian. These were not simply copies or forgeries in the modern sense, but rather feats of virtuosity designed to appeal to connoisseurs. These imitations are recognizable for what may now seem exaggerations of the manners of their models, but this was perhaps less evident at the time they were painted. Della Vecchia’s Giorgionesque landscapes, and his imaginary portraits of philosophers and bravos, pages and courtesans, are also “modern” in that they depend to some extent on the seventeenth-century taste for bizarre subject matter and character heads deriving from Caravaggio (1571–1610) and Rembrandt (1606–1669).
The sophisticated taste to which Delia Vecchia catered in his imitations must also have provided the audience for Delia Vecchia’s many depictions of arcane subject matter, such as philosophers and mathematicians. Delia Vecchia’s interest in the cabala and alchemy partook of the general scientific curiosity of his period, and his involvement with scientific, literary, and artistic academies in Venice is well documented. His only son, Gasparo (1653–1735), was a mathematician as well as a musician and painter.

Delia Vecchia’s style, which did not greatly evolve, is characterized by a bluntness that achieves monumentality through compositional simplicity. His palette consists in a shadowy monochrome, occasionally set off by figures in primary colors. His Caravaggism stems from the tradition transmitted in Venice by Carlo Saraceni (1579–1620), and is manifest in his interest in the effects of artificial light. Delia Vecchia’s brushwork seems to vary more according to the type of painting rather than to develop chronologically.

Gregorio Lazzarini (1655–1730), the teacher of Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (q.v.), was one of Delia Vecchia’s many students. Through Lazzarini, Tiepolo may have been influenced by Delia Vecchia’s taste for fanciful and arcane subject matter, and for feats of artistic virtuosity. While modern viewers may agree with the critic Anton Maria Zanetti’s assessment that Delia Vecchia’s paintings appeal more through surprise than through beauty, in the seventeenth century the ability to incite curiosity and marvel was considered the highest expression of wit.

**Bibliography**
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**Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian**

Probably 1690
Oil on canvas, 112.2 × 93.7 (44 1/8 × 36 1/4)
Timken Collection

**Inscriptions**

Inscribed at lower right on wood block held by sitter: “T. Vecellius P. / AET.LXXXIV./ ANNO MDLXI.”

**Technical Notes:** The support is a plain-weave, medium-weight fabric. X-radiographs reveal another composition under the surface layer. At the center a female figure turns to the left with her breasts bared and her right arm drawn across her waist. A fist holding a dagger is visible at the right edge of the support. The shadow in the upper-left quadrant of the x-radiographs suggests the presence of another figure, and a layer of pink is visible with a stereomicroscope. Examination also reveals an overall warm dark red layer, but it cannot be determined if this is the ground or an intermediate layer between the compositions. X-radiographs also reveal that the sitter’s left pupil was moved slightly to the right. The paint was applied thinly except in lighter passages.

There is cusping along all four of the fabric edges. The paint is abraded and has scattered losses throughout, especially in the sitter’s head, beard, and hands, and the statue in the background. The discolored varnish is thinner over the lighter areas, exaggerating the contrast between the light and dark areas. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition.

**Provenance:** Possibly Cavaliere Francesco Fontana, Venice, by 1676 [as Titian].1 Paolo Paolini, Rome, 1894;2 (his sale, American Art Association, New York, 10–11 December 1924, no. 116, as Titian); purchased by R. M. Catts [as Titian].3 (Van Diemen Galleries, New York), by 1928 [as Titian];4 William Robert Timken [1866–1949] and Lillian Guyer Timken [1881–1959], Croton-on-Hudson, New York, by 1931,5 and following Mr. Timken’s death, New York City.6


Despite former attributions to Titian, all recent scholars disavow Titian as author of this supposed self-portrait.8 Instead, it has long been recognized that this evocation of the sixteenth-century master is attributable to Pietro Della Vecchia.9

Although the painting deliberately mimics Titian’s manner, it clearly betrays Della Vecchia’s hand. The broad, thinly applied brushwork and the dramatic chiaroscuro are both characteristic of Della Vecchia’s style, which did not greatly evolve.
Vecchia’s style in the 1650s. The physiognomy, too, is characteristic of Della Vecchia’s figures, as is amply confirmed by comparison with other paintings representing old men, philosophers, and warriors, such as the Philosopher (ex-Chrysler Collection, New York, present location unknown). X-radiographs of the Washington painting reveal an earlier composition (fig. 1) that represents a partially nude woman pursued by an attacker, probably Tarquin and Lucretia. This first composition also recalls Della Vecchia’s themes.

Whether this portrait reflects a lost sixteenth-century self-portrait by Titian or a portrait of the master by another artist remains to be determined. Della Vecchia’s painting does not replicate either of the two Titian self-portraits now accepted as entirely autograph (Prado, Madrid, and Gemäldegalerie, Berlin-Dahlem). A painting in the Uffizi, Florence, most probably represents an authorized reduction of the Berlin self-portrait produced in Titian’s workshop. Many other paintings purporting to be self-portraits are now considered to be free copies or variations, for the most part from the seventeenth century. These include the ones in Hampton court, the Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, the Uffizi, the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, and other locations. All are more or less free variations on the Berlin self-portrait, and all represent the artist without the block or statuette of the Washington painting.

A possible source for Della Vecchia’s image may have been provided by a self-portrait in tondo format mentioned in the 1569 inventory of Titian’s patron, Gabriele Vendramin. The 1609 inventory of the Vendramin collection further specifies that the portrait showed Titian, wearing the gold chain given him by Charles V, in the act of drawing. This painting, according to the report of one of Leopoldo de’ Medici’s agents, Paolo del Sera, passed into the collection of the painter and dealer Nicholas Regnier. The catalogue of the lottery of Regnier’s collection...
held in 1666 indicates that his picture also showed Titian with a statuette of the Medici Venus in the background. Thus, the Vendramin-Regnier painting contained all the iconographic elements of the National Gallery of Art’s Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian. Della Vecchia would have known this painting well, since it was in his father-in-law’s collection.

The iconography and tondo format of the Vendramin-Regnier painting may also be reflected in a possibly autograph painting once in the Kaufmann collection, Berlin, and now in a private collection, Rome. If the Kaufmann picture accurately reflects the Vendramin-Regnier self-portrait, then it must be admitted that Della Vecchia transformed his model: the format is now rectangular, and the artist’s features have been corrected with reference either to the autograph self-portrait now in Berlin or to one of its copies.

Another lost painting after Titian known only from photographs, a half-length once in the Ashburnham collection (fig. 2), also repeats this presentation of the sitter, though the artist’s features and the pose of the statuette are different from both the National Gallery of Art’s Della Vecchia and from the ex-Kaufmann portrait. But like the present painting, it too derives from the Vendramin-Regnier Self-Portrait.

It is significant that both the ex-Ashburnham and the National Gallery of Art’s self-portraits resemble the description of a similar painting that was offered for sale in 1676 to Cardinal Leopoldo de’ Medici by the Cavaliere Francesco Fontana:

A painting by the hand of Titian, showing his own portrait in half-length, in which with one hand he holds a small canvas and in the other a toccalapis. He is engaged in the act of drawing, and behind him is a statue of the Venus de Medici in bronze. [The picture is] approximately 7 quarti [sic] high and 6 wide.

The iconography and dimensions of Fontana’s painting correspond to both the Washington and the ex-Ashburnham Self-Portraits. Although it is impossible to argue conclusively that Fontana’s picture can be identified with certainty as either of the two known works, the evidence from the correspondence cited above is germane to any understanding of the way paintings such as the Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian were produced and appreciated.

Cardinal Leopoldo de’ Medici was one of the most important collectors of the seventeenth century, and he particularly appreciated Venetian painting. He was the first collector to apply what may be considered modern historical methods and connoisseurship to the formation of his gallery, and to this end he also collected drawings and self-portraits. These self-portraits were important to Leopoldo, for apart from their iconographic interest, he considered that they furnished the most secure evidence of an artist’s manner. The self-portraits were thus the touchstones of his collection, and judgments on the authenticity of other paintings were made from their brushwork.

For the formation of his collection, Leopoldo employed many agents who informed him of prospective purchases. His agents in Venice were del Sera and Della Vecchia’s friend and business associate, the art critic Marco Boschini. It was through Boschini that Fontana offered Leopoldo his large collection of paintings, including a Raphael (1483–1520), a Guido Reni (1575–1642), and a Guercino (q.v.), as well as self-portraits by Giorgione and Titian.
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To ascertain the quality, condition, and value of these paintings, Boschini proposed to assess them with the assistance of Della Vecchia, who was also known as one of the best connoisseurs in Venice.\(^9\) However, Della Vecchia and Boschini, despite their many protestations of good will, were unable to conduct the sale smoothly because the wily Fontana was endlessly creating difficulties and impeded their access to the paintings,\(^30\) in the case of the Giorgione and the Titian self-portraits.\(^31\) The reason for Fontana's reluctance to allow Boschini and Della Vecchia to assess these works came to light when they were finally permitted to examine the Giorgione. According to Boschini:

...having seen it Vecchia at once asked me how it seemed to me, and I replied that he knew better than I what that portrait was. He then commanded me to tell him my opinion, and I told him, smiling, that it was unnecessary for him to ask me such a thing, since he knew that he had made it himself. Then he also began to laugh, and confessed that it was from his hand. He recounted that he had made it at the behest of the late Signor Nicolò Renieri thirty two years ago, and that in truth to satisfy that painter he labored hard to put all his knowledge into it, painting it from his own head without using anything for a model, much less copying it directly from Giorgione. Rather, he intended to emulate that singular artist, as in such a way Vecchia has done numerous things that give thought and have also tricked many....\(^32\)

No more is heard of the Titian self-portrait in Fontana's collection, but it may safely be assumed that, like the Giorgione, it too was probably by Della Vecchia. Boschini especially remarked on Fontana's intentional stealth in not permitting them to see the Giorgione, and thus implied that the Cavaliere was well aware that these works were not originals.

The episode reveals much about contemporary attitudes to such paintings. First, it demonstrates that Della Vecchia at some point produced not only sixteenth-century imitations, as was well known, but also imaginary self-portraits of the artists he wished to emulate. Della Vecchia was careful to point out that the genre of the self-portrait furnished a most difficult challenge, and that he did not merely copy a preexisting model but himself was responsible for the invention. Della Vecchia's own claims are confirmed by Boschini, who calls such imitations "not copies but creations of his intellect."\(^33\) Finally, these paintings were not made to deceive (though Della Vecchia proudly admits that they did have that effect) or for gain. Rather, Della Vecchia intended to "give rise to thought," that is, to appeal to those able to appreciate the extent of the artist's skill involved. It is also implied that Leopoldo, himself a connoisseur, should enjoy Della Vecchia's and Boschini's triumph, both the original trick and its unmasking.\(^34\)

Indeed, it is evident that by the late seventeenth century the ability to recognize Della Vecchia's manner in imitating Giorgione was the mark of a true connoisseur.\(^35\)

Della Vecchia's success in achieving his aims are evident in the issue of this sale. Although the purchase of the Giorgione and the Titian came to naught, Leopoldo was so impressed with Della Vecchia's ability that, through Boschini, he commissioned an "original" Giorgione by this modern artist as worthy to hang with his other Venetian old masters.\(^36\) Della Vecchia's Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian must thus be appreciated as it must have been by contemporary viewers: as a supreme expression of the artist's skill and wit rather than as a simple forgery produced for financial gain.

**Notes**

1. Procacci and Procacci 1965, 98. See full discussion in text.
2. The catalogue of Paolini's sale states that Paolini purchased the painting from the family of Count Rackzinsky in Melbourne, Australia. The painting has not yet been identified in the collection of Count Atanazy Rackzinsky [1788–1874], Poznan and Berlin, which was for a time on loan to the Prussian National Gallery, Berlin. On Rackzinsky see Sammlung Graf Raczyński 1992.

The Paolini sale catalogue also places the painting in the "Renier Collection, Venice," an error compounded by IntSt 1929, 56; Venturi 1931, pl. 389, and 1933, 3: pl. 528; and exh. cat. New York 1939 (which changed Melbourne the city to Lord Melbourne). They all identified the painting as the self-portrait by Titian known to have been in the collection of the painter Nicholas Regnier, and assume it to have passed with the collection to Catherine the Great of Russia and then to a Count Rackzinsky. The Regnier self-portrait was, however, a tondo on panel. For its present location see text.
3. "Titian" 1924, 1. Thought to be by Titian, the painting fetched the highest price at the sale ($9,200).
7. Exhibition recorded in Freund 1929, 190–192.
8. Richter 1931, 167, was the only early author not to support the attribution. Wethey 1969–1975, 2: 197–198, dismissed the work as a seventeenth-century forgery, but did not offer an alternative attribution.
9. Shapley 1979, 1: 519, citing oral opinions by Pierre Rosenberg, Rodolfo Pallucchini, Michel Laclotte, and Federico Zeri. There has been no opposition to this attribution since Shapley’s publication.
11. Shapley 1979, 1: 519, considered that it represented a Saint Margaret, but more recent x-radiographs clearly reveal a male attacker at the female figure’s left. The underlying composition should be compared with the Zeus and Semele, location unknown, and the Warrior Attacking a Youth, Galleria Doria Pamphili, Rome: Aikema 1990, 136, no. 135, pi. 72, and 148, no. 202, pl. 89, respectively.
17. Other self-portraits by Titian, no longer identifiable, are reflected in early descriptions or reproductive engravings. Vasari mentioned a self-portrait in Titian’s house, but the description is too vague to permit identification with any surviving painting: Vasari, Le vite 2: no. 104. As in the Vecchia, Britto’s print depicts the artist in the act of drawing, but the artist’s features and attitude are somewhat different. Della Vecchia probably knew the engraving by Agostino Carracci that reproduces part of the Berlin self-portrait: De Grazia Bohlin 1979, no. 145.
18. Rava 1920, 178.
22. Marini 1980, 255, figs. 36–39, claimed that a recent conservation treatment supports the attribution of the work to Titian himself. The authenticity of the Kaufmann painting has also been supported recently on documentary grounds by Garas 1980, 298–299, who considered but rejected the possibility that it may have been a copy by Regnier of the Vendramin painting (she had not seen the painting). However, most authors have rejected this work on the basis of photographs (Wethey 1969–1975, 2: 179). Anderson 1979, 644, withheld opinion, since the location of the painting had not been revealed at the time of her writing.
24. Wethey 1969–1975, 2: 180, associated this document only with the ex-Ashburnham painting, though its description accords equally well with the present work.
26. A quarta is roughly equal to 16 or 17 cm. The approximate measurements given in the inventory are thus approximately 102 × 96 or 119 × 102 cm, close to those of both the Washington (112.2 × 93.7 cm) and Ashburnham paintings (109 × 87.7 cm).
27. This and the following paragraph synthesize aspects of the large literature on Leopoldo’s collections, for which see most recently Goldberg 1983, 23–78, and Barocchi 1987.
34. See for this context Aikema 1990, 54–55.
35. This is the sense of a story told by the German artist and critic Joachim von Sandrart, discussed in Kurz 1948, 36.
36. Procacci and Proacci 1965, 109–110. The painting sent so pleased the cardinal that he awarded the artist a gold chain, above and beyond his payment.
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Venetian Eighteenth Century

1945.15.1 (874)

Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace, Venice

1742 or after
Oil on canvas, 160.7 × 221.6 (63 1/4 × 87 1/4)
Gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave, loosely woven fabric prepared with a red-brown ground visible at the edges and through abrasion of the paint layer. A white underlayer was used beneath the architecture and sky. Infrared reflectography reveals fine, precise underdrawing for the perspective and architectural details, probably executed with the aid of a straightedge. Incised lines were also used in the architecture. The sky was painted first and then the successive layers of architecture. The figures were added over the already completed background. The paint was applied quickly wet-into-wet and is moderately thick throughout. Glazes were added for detail.

The tacking margins have been removed, but strong cusping is present around all four sides. There is abrasion throughout as well as losses. Several losses are concentrated in a 40 × 40 cm area at the right. Traction crackle is present especially in the dark glazes. The varnish is discolored with markedly discolored patches in the sky. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition.

Provenance: Possibly Cardinal Gianfrancesco Stopani [d. 1774], Rome; by inheritance to Marchese Schiuchinelli, Cremona; Giuseppe Castagna and Felice Ponzio, 1836.1 Lady Mary Baillie of Polkemmet, née Stewart [d. 1910];2 Admiral Johnston Stewart of Polkemmet, perhaps nephew of preceding; (Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 21 June 1912, no. 140);3 bought by C. H. Thrift4 for (Arthur Tooth and Sons, 1912);5 sold 14 July 1925 to Viscount Gabriel Chabert.6 (Arnold Seligman, London), early 1930s; sold to Barbara Hutton.7

Exhibited: Billings, Montana, Yellowstone Art Center, 1991, Old Master Italian Paintings, Prints and Drawings, no catalogue.

1945.15.2 (875)

Procession of Gondolas in the Bacino di San Marco, Venice

1742 or after
Oil on canvas, 160.7 × 221.6 (63 1/4 × 87 1/4)
Gift of Mrs. Barbara Hutton

Technical Notes: The support is a plain-weave, loosely woven fabric identical to that of the companion painting. This canvas was also prepared with a red-brown ground visible at the edges and through abrasion of the paint layer. A white underlayer was used to prepare the architecture and sky. Unlike the companion piece, no underdrawing can be detected using infrared reflectography, nor are incised lines apparent in the architecture. The sky was painted first, then the successive layers of architecture, and finally the sea and gondolas. As in the companion painting, the figures were added over the already completed background. The paint was applied quickly wet-into-wet and is moderately thick throughout. Glazes were added for detail, and the “crawling” effect visible in the other painting is less evident here.

The tacking margins have been removed, but strong cusping is present around all four sides. There is abrasion throughout as well as losses. The varnish is discolored with markedly discolored patches in the sky. The painting, which was lined at an unknown date, has not been treated since acquisition. It was examined in 1991.

Provenance: Same as 1945.15.1

Exhibited: Billings, Montana, Yellowstone Art Center, 1991, Old Master Italian Paintings, Prints and Drawings, no catalogue.

These two works came to the National Gallery of Art in 1945 with an attribution to Canaletto (q.v.), which was soon rejected. Michele Marieschi (1710–1743) had been suggested as the author of at least part of the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace, but the attribution was changed to “Follower of Canaletto.”8 This reflects the then-current understanding that view painters in mid-eighteenth century Venice were followers of Canaletto to one degree or another. Scholars have, however, repeatedly stressed that the paintings have no relation to Canaletto or his school and have continued to attribute them to Marieschi or his circle.9 Antonio Joli (c. 1700–1777) has also been proposed.10 With increasing knowledge of eighteenth-century view painting and the realization that the paintings are closely based on models by two differ-
ent artists, it is now clear that they are pastiches by an as yet unidentified artist or artists working in Venice during the mid-eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{11}

The Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace depends for its architecture on a depiction of the same site by Michele Marieschi,\textsuperscript{12} which exists in two slightly different painted versions (National Trust at Hatchlands, East Clarendon; formerly Sir Walter Bromley Davenport, Macclesfield)\textsuperscript{13} and a print taken from a slightly different viewpoint.\textsuperscript{14} Like Marieschi’s paintings, the National Gallery picture is taken from a point to the left of the central axis of the courtyard, showing more of the right-hand facade. It varies, however, from both painted versions in many minor details, such as ladders, scaffolding, and awnings, so that it is not certain whether it was directly based on one or the other. In addition, the handling of the perspective is somewhat less adept than in Marieschi’s depictions.

The Procession of Gondolas in the Bacino di San Marco is based in much the same way on depictions of the city seen from the Bacino di San Marco by Gaspar Van Wittel (Gaspare Vanvitelli, 1653–1736).\textsuperscript{15} The best known of these, signed and dated 1697, is in the Prado, Madrid, although others are known.\textsuperscript{16} The artist of the National Gallery painting followed Van Wittel in adopting a high viewpoint directly across from the Piazzetta and showing the buildings lined up straight across the picture plane in the style of a panorama. Also, the water in both recedes steeply and meets the quays at a rather sharp angle, suggesting two perspective systems.\textsuperscript{17} Like Van Wittel’s model and most other views of this site, the Procession of Gondolas shows a covered galley moored in front of the Ducal Palace with its oars out of the water. Depictions of the same view by Canaletto and Marieschi tend, however, to show fewer buildings, which recede diagonally into the distance toward one side or the other.\textsuperscript{18}

Although he adopted Van Wittel’s work as his model, the artist of the Washington painting slightly changed the viewpoint, probably as required by the event depicted. The viewer is now positioned more to the left, across from the left column on the Piazzetta instead of across from the porch of San Marco, with the result that the line of buildings ends with the prison on the right and the Fonteghetto della Farina on the left; the campanile of San Moise appears behind the Public Granaries and the Procuratie Nuove. Most significantly, the Punta della Dogana now appears at the extreme left of the composition. Without this landmark, it would not be immediately apparent that the procession of gondolas is heading for the entrance to the Grand Canal rather than for the Piazzetta or the Riva degli Schiavi. As in the Courtyard, there are some resulting perspectival distortions, such as the facade of the library of San Marco being seen in the same recession as in Van Wittel’s view. The Zecca is shown incorrectly with only six bays instead of nine. The Ducal Palace now appears taller and thinner, as it does in views of the site by Marieschi.

That the works are pastiches is further indicated by the fact that each follows the style of its model. In the Courtyard, the architecture has a definite Marieschi-like quality. The “crawling” effect in the glazes cited in the technical notes resembles the layered dabs of different colors that create the distinctive mottled surfaces of Marieschi’s buildings. The application here is, however, too dry and mechanical to attribute to Marieschi himself. In the Procession of Gondolas, this same “crawling” effect in the architecture is less evident, producing a smoother and slicker surface that recalls the style of Van Wittel. Technical examination has shown that the two works are nearly identical in construction and technique, with the exception that the Procession of Gondolas lacks incised lines and underdrawing in the architecture. Such technical evidence strongly suggests that the backgrounds of both works were painted by the same artist or perhaps by different artists working in the same studio. This studio probably had some connection, although rather tenuous, to Marieschi.

In both paintings the figures were painted over the completed background and further support the idea of pastiches created in one studio by different hands. The smaller figures in both paintings, found mainly in the procession in the Courtyard and in the gondolas of the companion piece, are very mechanical and stiff with well-defined contours and small, pinched features. These are similar to those in countless eighteenth-century depictions of ceremonial functions, and for the moment defy attribution. The larger figures, grouped mainly toward the left in both paintings, are more lively in their movements and created with a rather freer, less mechanical application of paint. These larger figures recall those in Marieschi’s early works of the 1730s, although not closely enough to attribute them to him.\textsuperscript{19} Two sets of figures in the Courtyard are derived from other
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painters, and other borrowings could probably be identified as well. The figure in the foreground carrying a burden on his head and in conversation with a child is a motif seen in the same spot, but facing in the opposite direction, in Marieschi’s two painted versions of the same courtyard. The young men perched jauntily on the cornice in front of the first floor balcony repeat a motif common in depictions of diplomatic processions by Luca Carlevarijs (1663–1730). They are nearly identical in pose to figures perched on the cornice of the Ducal Palace in Carlevarijs’ Entry of the French Ambassador Cardinal César d’Estrees (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). 20

It appears that the artist or artists also altered Van Wittel’s model for the Procession of Gondolas to reflect recent changes to the site, and these details can help date the paintings. The bronze gate, created by Antonio Gai in 1737, is clearly visible (but not discernible in photographs) in the railing of the Loggetta of the campanile, where it was installed only in 1742. 21 The flanking wings of the Torre dell’Orologio are shown as they existed prior to c. 1755/1760. 22 Further evidence for the date is provided by the arms of Benedict XIV Lambertini (1740–1758) clearly displayed on the side of the papal gondola in the center of the procession. 23 Benedict XIV’s arms would not have been shown on the gondola before his election, and it is certain that Gai’s gate would not have been included in a painting before its installation in 1742. Thus the pictures must have been painted in that year or sometime after. Benedict’s arms and the older form of the clock tower could, however, have been included as anachronistic elements in works painted after 1758.

Even with this somewhat narrow range of dates, it is virtually impossible to identify the exact event depicted because no other coats of arms can be identified. In the Courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale, a procession is shown descending the Scala dei Giganti and heading across the courtyard where it will exit onto the Riva degli Schiavoni, presumably so that the visiting dignitary can enter a gondola. 24 The visiting dignitary is clearly the bishop, in blue at the head of the procession: he walks at the right hand of the accompanying procuratore, dressed in red; his hem is held up by attendants, and the parasols are borne behind him. In the companion piece, the bishop and the accompanying procuratore are clearly seen in the gondola at the center of the procession moving across the Bacino di San Marco toward the mouth of the Grand Canal. The smaller black gondolas carrying groups of figures are propelled by gondoliers in the red livery of the Venetian republic. The parade gondolas are empty. One bears the imperial double eagle, another the papal tiara and keys on its cabin with the arms of Benedict XIV on its side. The various craft riding at anchor salute the visitor by firing their cannons.

These paintings have been tentatively identified as those described in Stefano Ticozzi’s Lettera intorno a due quadri di vaste dimensioni di Antonio Canal of 1836. 25 Ticozzi saw the paintings in the possession of Giuseppe Castagna and Felice Ponzio and identified them as those depicting the visit of Cardinal (then Bishop) Gianfrancesco Stopani to Venice in c. 1750 as Pope Benedict XIV’s emissary in the ongoing dispute between Venice and the empress Maria Theresa over the suppression of the patriarchate of Aquileia. 26 Ticozzi described the paintings as rappresentanti parte del canale della Zueca presso alla piazzetta di San Marco coi laterali edifici, e l’interno magnifico cortile del Palazzo ducale, veduti in occasione che il nunzio pontificio Stopani attraversa insieme al Doge, in mezzo ad affollato popolo, detto cortile, per uscire sull’attiguo canale ed entrare in gondola, ad oggetto di osservare la regata, come vedesi poi nel quadro compagno. 27

This description does not accord exactly with the present paintings, but the discrepancies could be the result of errors on the part of the non-Venetian Ticozzi, such as identifying the procuratore as a doge, the procession of gondolas as a regatta, and the view of the Molo from the Bacino di San Marco as the “canale della Zueca.” The arms of Benedict XIV and the imperial double eagle are both seen on the parade gondolas, although their presence could be expected at other similar ceremonies. Ticozzi’s attribution of the paintings to Canaletto might be ascribed to an earlier era’s less exacting attitude in such matters. The strongest argument against identifying the present works as those seen by Ticozzi remains, however, the discrepancy in dimensions. 28 Furthermore, views of the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale are not altogether rare, 29 nor are depictions of regattas or embarkations from the Piazzetta. In general, the pairing of large pictures of diplomatic ceremonies is not unusual, 30 yet no other paintings with the subjects described by Ticozzi are known at present.
Notes

1. According to Stefano Ticozzi, Lettera intorno a due quadri di vaste dimensioni di Antonio Canal, detto il Canaletto (Milan, 1836), quoted in Constable and Links 1976, 371. It has not been possible to locate this publication. Ticozzi called the dimensions “vast,” but gave them as only 32 x 45 pollici. A pollici could be an approximate measurement, a unit roughly equal to 2.5 cm, or more commonly another term for a pie, the twelfth part of a pie. In Milan the unit was equal to c. 3.65 cm. Thus Ticozzi’s measurements would convert to either c. 80 x 112 cm or most likely c. 116 x 163 cm, both smaller than the present painting and its companion, and not exactly vast.

It is possible that the paintings Ticozzi saw were not by Canaletto, for as a Milanese writing in 1836, he may well have had less than full knowledge of Canaletto’s style. On the twelfth part of a pie, the term for a pie, in Milan the unit was equal to c. 3.65 cm, both smaller than the present painting and its companion, and not exactly vast.

2. Francis J. B. Watson (letter of 26 May 1954, NGA curatorial files) reported the following notation on the back of an old photograph in his possession: “1912 June 21, B/O C. H. Thrift Signs [in right margin] Lady Baillie of Polkemmet; 1919 August 22 Bt ½ from McKay’s exors LTT; 1925 July 14 Sold to Viscount Gabriel Chabert for LFUXX” (with 5829/6997, here 1945.15.2).


4. 1912 June 21, B/O C. H. Thrift Signs [in right margin] Lady Baillie of Polkemmet; 1919 August 22 Bt ½ from McKay’s exors LTT; 1925 July 14 Sold to Viscount Gabriel Chabert for LFUXX” (with 5829/6997, here 1945.15.2).

5. The stock records of Tooth and Sons indicate that the painting was purchased from Thrift on 21 June 1912, as reported by Martha Hepworth (letter cited in note 3). He may have been acting as Tooth’s agent at that day’s sale. The stock records also confirm that the notations reported in note 2 reflect the sale of half-shares in the pictures.

6. According to the notations reported by Watson in note 2 and the Tooth stock records as reported by Martha Hepworth in note 3.

7. W. G. Constable (letter of 1 March 1946, NGA curatorial files) reported that he has seen the paintings at Arnold Seligman’s, who sold them to Barbara Hutton.

8. The change of attribution is discussed in letters and memoranda of 1947 and 1948 from the director John Walkerd (NGA curatorial files). W. G. Constable, letter of 1 March 1946 (NGA curatorial files), noted that the Courtyard was based on a print by Marieschi and that it might be in part by that artist, an opinion reiterated in 1962, 216, and Constable and Links 1976, 224–225.

9. Attributed to circle of Marieschi by Pignatti 1972, 156–157, who had earlier suggested Antonio Storn (oral communication 29 November 1962, recorded in NGA curatorial files, and 1964, 64). The following opinions are recorded in the NGA curatorial files. W. G. Constable: in part by Marieschi (letter of 1946 cited in note 1); Francis J. B. Watson: possibly Marieschi (letter of 6 March 1967); Ross Watson: possibly an imitator of Marieschi (undated draft catalogue entry written after 1967); Rodolfo Pallucchini: Michele Marieschi (in a list of opinions given on a visit to Washington, 15 October 1970).

10. Tentatively by Antonio Morassi (letter of 7 January 1958). Dario Succi has recently attributed the architecture to Joli and the figures to Giuseppe Bagatti (letter of 1958), and in “Que la fête continue: ospiti illustri e feste straordinarie nelle vedute da Carlevaris a Guardi,” Luca Car- levaris e la veduta veneziana del Settecento, Padua, Palazzo del la Ragione, 84. Both knew the paintings only in photographs.

11. The idea of a pastiche was suggested by Bernard Aikema during a visit to the Gallery (20 March 1993).

12. First noted by Constable in 1946 (letter cited in note 1), 1962, 2: 216, and subsequent editions, and later repeated by other scholars.

13. 120.6 x 176.5 cm; 116.8 x 180.2 cm respectively. The first is reproduced in Toledano 1988, 68, no. V.4.1, who noted that the view, with the strong shadow on the left, goes back to an etching by Luca Carlevaris from Le fabbriche e ve- dute di Venezia (Venice, 1703). This etching, however, is taken from a viewpoint on the central axis of the courtyard and much closer to the far end: Rizzi 1967, fig. 96.

The second painting by Marieschi sold at Christie’s, London, 2 July 1976, no. 45, and is reproduced in Succi, Marieschi tra Canaletto, 1989, 89, fig. 87. Succi argued that this painting is the one recorded in Schultenburg’s inventories, and is thus datable to 1736. Toledano had not seen the painting and questioned both its attribution and the Schultenburg connection.

Both have recently been attributed to Francesco Albotto, Marieschi’s student and closest follower, by Manzelli 1991, 74–75, nos. A.4.1 and A.4.2, repro.


15. Pointed out by Bernard Aikema, oral communication 20 March 1993. No one else had drawn this connection, although the painting was reproduced next to one of Van Wittel’s depictions in Brinton 1925.


17. Boudewijn Bakker in Aikema and Bakker 1990, 111–112, suggested that Van Wittel’s view derives from the corresponding panel of a panoramic view of Venice by Aniello Portia and Alessandro della Via published in 1686. It has not been possible to locate a reproduction of this panorama. Aikema (oral communication cited in note 15) commented on how the perspective system recalled earlier artists like Van Wittel. Pignatti 1972, 156, saw in the Proces- sion of Gondolas “una elaborazione vedutistica che tien conto piuttosto di schemi vanvittelliani che non canalettiani” and observed that the author of both works should be sought in “un ambito tradizionalista, ancora ispirato a Van Wittel e a Carlevaris” rather than one inspired by Canaletto.
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20. Ewoud Mijnlieff, in Aikema and Bakker 1990, 118–119, no. 13, color pl. 140. For the other ambassadorial receptions by Carlevaris see Rizzi 1967, 87, pl. 28: *Entry of the British Ambassador, the Earl of Manchester*, City Art Gallery, Birmingham; 88, pl. 143: *Entry of the Imperial Ambassador, Count Colloredo*, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden; and also 93, pl. 131: *Riva degli Schiavoni*, National Museum, Pozzania. Meinlieff pointed out that Carlevaris was famous in Venice for his depiction of such receptions; it is thus likely that artists painting similar scenes in the mid-eighteenth century might have looked back at Carlevaris.

21. This detail was noted by Dario Succi (letter cited in note 3). The history of the gate is recounted in Constable and Links 1976, 1: 201. Succi also pointed out that the pavement of the Piazzetta is shown in the new design completed in 1735.


23. "Gold, four pale gules," and surmounted by a papal tiara: Galbreath 1972, 102, fig. 117. This was first identified by Ross Watson (draft catalogue entry cited in note 2). Pignatti 1972, 156–157, identified this as the papal gondola that also appears in later drawings and paintings by Francesco Guardi.

24. Many paintings show embarkations and disembarkations on this quay, situated directly in front of the Palazzo Ducale. See, for example, those by Carlevaris cited in note 13. Succi 1994 (see note 10 above) identified the paintings as representing the formal entry of the papal nuncio in Francesco Stopani, Archbishop of Corinto, on 17 April 1741.


27. "...representing that part of the Zecca canal next to the square of Saint Mark’s with the flanking buildings, and the magnificent internal courtyard of the Ducal Palace, on the occasion when the papal nuncio Stopani crossed this courtyard with the doge, in the midst of a great crowd, to enter his gondola on the adjacent canal to observe the regatta, as subsequently seen in the companion work." Cited in Constable and Links 1976, 2: 371.


30. See 1968.13.2.
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Mardi Gras in the Piazzetta (New York, Sotheby Parke-Bernet), 121, 134
Palazzo Ducale from the Sea (Aylesbury, Waddesdon Manor), 136, 137n. 14
Palazzo Ducale from the Sea (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 136, 137n. 14
Piazza San Marco During the Feast of the Ascension (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum), 132
Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga (Canterbury, Royal Museum), 130n. 17
Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga (Milan, Rossello Collection), 129n. 6, 130n. 17
Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga (Philadelphia Museum of Art), 129n. 5
Rialto Bridge (Munich, Alte Pinakothek), 134
Seaport with a Ruined Arch (Milan, private collection), 137n. 17
Te Deum in Santi Giovanni e Paolo (Cleveland Museum of Art), 129n. 6
Te Deum in Santi Giovanni e Paolo (Paris, private collection), 129n. 5
Temporary Tribune in the Campo San Zanipolo, Venice [1939.1.129], ill. on 127, 124n. 10, 125–130
View on the Cannaregio Canal, Venice [1939.1.113], ill. on 123, 122 (fig. 1), 122–125
works by follower of
Rialto Bridge, Venice [1949.1.6], ill. on 142, 141–143
The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice [1958.7.1], ill. on 144, 143–145
Guardi, Gian Antonio, 145–146
problems of attribution in works of, 152–153, 158n. 51
works by
The Death of Saint Joseph (Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie), 146
Saint John Nepomuk (location unknown), 145–146
The Vision of Saint John of Matha (Pasiano di Pordenone, parish church), 146
Guardi, Gian Antonio, and Francesco Guardi influenced by Piazzetta, 148–152
influenced by Marco Ricci, 220
works by
Carlo and Ubaldo Resisting the Enchantments of Armida’s Nymphs [1964.21.1], ill. on 150, 147–156
Erminia and the Shepherds [1964.21.2], ill. on 151, 147–156
Erminia Discovers Argante Dead and Tancred Wounded (Venice, Galleria dell’Accademia), 149
Godfrey de Boulogne Gathers the Christian Princes (Pasadena, Norton Simon Museum), 149
Rinaldo and the Nymphs (location unknown), 149, 156n. 40
Single Combat Between Tancred and Argante in the Presence of Clorinda (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst), 149
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Soliman and Ismenus Entering Jerusalem (location unknown), 149, 152, 155n. 22-23

Sophronia Offers Her Life to the Saracen King in Order to Save the Christians (Kingston upon Hull, Ferens Art Gallery), 148, 156n. 40

Tancred Baptizes the Dying Clarinda (Montreal, Musée des Beaux-Arts), 149

Tasso cycle, 148-156

Guarino, Francesco, Jacob and Isaac, 204n. 27

Guercino, 157-158

influenced by the Carracci, 55, 157

influence on Cantarini, 41

influence on Piazzetta, 205

technique and style of, 159

works by

**Amnon and Tamar** [1986.17.1.], ill. on 164, 162-163, 167

**Cardinal Francesco Cennini** [1961.9.20], ill. on 161, 158-163

**Cleopatra** (Genoa, Galleria d'arte del Commune), 169n. 24

**Ecstasy of Saint Francis** (Paris, Musée du Louvre), 70n. 12

**Holy Family and Saint John the Baptist and an Angel** (Cleveland Museum of Art), 162n. 13, 162n. 19

**Investiture of Saint William** (Bologna, Pinacoteca Nazionale), 157

**Joseph and Potiphar's Wife** [1986.17.2], ill. on 165, 163, 166-167

**Lot and His Daughters** (El Escorial, Monastery of San Lorenzo), 162n. 15

**The Marriage of the Virgin** (Fano, Cassa di Risparmio), 169n. 24

**Phrygian Sibyl with a Putto** (England, private collection), 169n. 24

**Portrait of a Dog** (Pasadena, Norton Simon Museum), 162n. 12-13

portrait of Fra' Bonaventura Bisi (location unknown), 162n. 12

portrait of Giulio Gagliardi (Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi), 162n. 12

**Portrait of a Lawyer, probably Francesco Righetti** (Fort Worth, Kimbell Art Museum), 162n. 12

portrait of an old man or philosopher (Modena, Galleria Estense), 162n. 12

**Pepe Gregory XV** (Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum), 159-160, 162n. 12

**Return of the Prodigal Son** (Turin, Galleria Sabauda), 162n. 15

**Saint Margaret** (Rome, Vatican Museum), 169n. 24

**Saint Matthew** (Dresden, Gemäldegalerie), 41

**Saint Peter Resuscitates Tabitha** (Florence, Palazzo Pitti), 162n. 15

self-portrait (New York, Richard L. Feigen & Co.), 162n. 12

self-portrait (Paris, Musée du Louvre), 162n. 12

**Semiramis** (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts), 162n. 13

study for Amnon and Tamar [1989.14.1] (Washington, National Gallery of Art), 167 (fig. 1)

**Susanna and the Elders** (Madrid, Museo del Prado), 162n. 15

**Venus at Her Toilet** (Madrid, Museum of Fine Arts), 160, 161n. 20

Venus, Mars, Capid, and Time (Cheshire, Dunham Massey), 162n. 19

H

Hartford

**Wadsworth Atheneum**

Caravaggio, attributed to, Still Life, 204n. 19

Gentileschi, Orazio, Judith and Her Maidservant, 97, 111n. 31

Magnasco, Alessandro, Hunting Scene, 177, 182

Tinelli, Tiberio, portrait of Marc’Antonio Vario, 318

Hausser, Jean, Lazarus and the Rich Man (after Fetti), 90 (fig. 1), 92

historical subjects

Alexander the Great. See Creti, Donato

allegory of the monarchy of King Charles III of Spain. See Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista

Queen Zenobia addressing her soldiers. See Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista

Tarquin and Lucretia. See Crespi, Giuseppe Maria

Tiepolo’s treatment of, 265-266, 269-270

Hobbema, Meindert, and Marco Ricci, 222

Houston

Sarah Campbell Blaffer Foundation

Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Juno and Luna, 301, 304-305, 305 (fig. 3), 307nn. 7-8

Howard, Henry, 4th earl of Carlisle, as collector of Canaletto, 29, 29n. 1

J

Imola

San Domenico

**Carracci, Lodovico, Martyrdom of Saint Ursula**, 58

K

Kansas City

**Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art**

Ricci, Sebastiano, Marriage at Cana, 235nn. 13-14

Kingston upon Hull

**Ferens Art Gallery**

Guardi, Gian Antonio, and Francesco Guardi, Sophronia Offers Her Life to the Saracen King in Order to Save the Christians, 148, 156n. 40

Königstein, topography and history of, 14, 16

L

landscape painting

as subject, 48, 48n. 13

ITALIAN PAINTINGS
Lanfranco, Giovanni, 101–102
and Gentileschi, 103–112
as apprentice to Agostino Carracci, 101
as student of Correggio, 101
works by
The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew (Rome, Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica), 218n. 7
Saint Cecilia (Greenville, South Carolina, The Bob Jones University Collection), 108 (fig. 5)

Lisbon
Pinto Basto collection (formerly)
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Entombment, 262

London, Italian painters in. See Canaletto; Ricci, Marco; Ricci, Sebastiano

Bearsted collection
Guardi, Francesco, Benediction in Campo San Zanipolo, 129n. 6
British Rail Pension Fund (on loan to National Gallery)
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Miracle of the Holy House of Loreto, 398
Courtauld Institute Galleries
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Saint Joseph, 262
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Saint Pascual Baylon, 262

Dulwich Picture Gallery
Ricci, Sebastiano, Resurrection, 235n. 20
Collection John Harris
Ricci, Sebastiano, Baptism, 235n. 15
National Gallery
Caravaggio, Boy Bitten by a Lizard, 199
Caravaggio, Supper at Emmaus, 199, 203n. 13
Giordano, Luca, Perseus and Phineas, 120n. 17
Raphael, Julius II, 160
Clovis Whitfield
Ribera, Jusepe de, The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, 218n. 7

Longhi, Alessandro, 3
Longhi Pietro, 170–171
works by
Blindman’s Buff (Windsor Castle, Royal Collection), 175
Doctor’s Visit (Venice, Ca’ Rezzonico), 175
The Faint [1939.1.63], ill. on 172, 171, 174–176
The Game of the Cooking Pot [1939.1.64], ill. on 173, 171, 174–176
Married-Couple’s Breakfast (Windsor Castle, Royal Collection), 175
Oil Seller (Venice, Ca’ Rezzonico), 293n. 20
The Visit (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 174
Wet-Nurse (Venice, Ca’ Rezzonico), 175
Lorrain, Claude, influenced by Annibale Carracci, 45
Los Angeles
Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Castiglione, Giovanni Benedetto, Sacrifice of Noah, 324
Lotto, Lorenzo, Venus and Cupid (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 53n. 28

M
macchiette, 179
Macclesfield
Refectory of Capuchin Monks (Seitenstetten, Stiftsgalerie), 187
Saint Anthony Preaching to the Fish (private collection), 182
Saint Augustine Encountering the Christ Child on the Beach (Genoa, Palazzo Bianco), 182
study for Saint John the Baptist and Christ (private collection), 179
study in reverse for Saint John the Baptist and Christ (Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage), 179
Synagogue (Seitenstetten, Stiftsgalerie), 187
Tempest (private collection), 182
Trattenimento in un giardino d’Albaro (Genoa, Palazzo Bianco), 179
Vagrants in a Landscape (Sarasota, John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art), 183n. 10
Malibu
The J. Paul Getty Museum
Carracci, Lodovico, Saint Sebastian Thrown into the Sewer, 58
Guercino, Pope Gregory XV, 159–160, 162n. 12
Manfredi, Bartolomeo, attributed to, Allegory of the Seasons (The Dayton Art Institute), 200
Mantegna, Andrea, Sacra Conversazione (Boston, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum), 288n. 1
Marieschi, Michele, 13, 25, 29, 138, 334–339
works by
Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace (East Clarendon, National Trust at Hatchlands), 335
Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace (formerly Macclesfield, Sir Walter Bromley Davenport), 335
Mariette, Pierre-Jean, 261, 264n. 16
Marseille
Musée des Beaux-Arts
Carracci, Agostino, Fête Champêtre, 49n. 21
McSwiny, Owen
as agent of Canaletto, 23
as patron of the Ricci, 237, 242n. 24
Medici, Cardinal Leopoldo de’, 327, 329–332
Medici, Cosimo II de’, 90
Medici, Ferdinando III de’ as patron of Crespi, 66
and Magnasco, 177
Medici, Marie de’, as patron of Gentileschi, 96
Melbourne
National Gallery of Australia
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Finding of Moses, 306
Mengs, Anton Raphael, 288, 288nn. 17–18
Michelangelo, influence on Annibale Carracci, 44, 50
Milan
Cariplo
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, A Hunter on Horseback, 309, 310 (fig. 1)
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, A Hunter with a Stag, 310 (fig. 2), 314, 315n. 23
painters in. See Magnasco, Alessandro
Pinacoteca Ambrosiana
Caravaggio, Basket of Fruit, 199, 203n. 13
Pinacoteca di Brera
Bellotto, Bernardo, views of the village of Gazzada, 7
Cantarini, Simone, Transfiguration, 40
Gentileschi, Orazio, Saints Cecilia, Valerianus, and Tiburtius Visited by the Angel, 111n. 33, 111n. 44
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Susanna at the Well, 61n. 16
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Madonna del Carmelo, 316n. 28
private collection
Ghislandi, Giuseppe, Count Galeazzo Vertova, 115
Guardi, Francesco, Capriccio with an Arsenal, 137n. 17
Guardi, Francesco, Seaport with a Ruined Arch, 137n. 17
Rossello collection
Guardi, Francesco, Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga, 129n. 6, 130n. 17
Sant’Ambrogio
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Martyrdom of Saint Victor, 314
Mirandola, Padre Antonio, 157
modello
Piazzetta and, 207–208, 211n. 10
Tiepolo and, 261–262, 273–275, 278–282, 286
Modena
Galleria Estense
Carracci, Lodovico, The Assumption of the Virgin, 58
Carracci, Lodovico, Galatea, 56
Guercino, portrait of an old man or philosopher, 162n. 12
Montréal
Musée des Beaux-Arts
Guardi, Gian Antonio, and Francesco Guardi, Tancred Baptises the Dying Clorinda, 149
Monza
private collection
Guardi, Francesco, Interior of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, 129n. 13
Munich
Alte Pinakothek
Carracci, Annibale, Landscape with Bathing Women, 46
Carracci, Annibale, Landscape with River Scene, 46
Gentileschi, Orazio, Martha and Mary Magdalene, 97
Guardi, Francesco, Canal Grande at San Geremia, 134
Guardi, Francesco, Concert in Honor of the Conti del Nov, 130n. 17
Guardi, Francesco, Fire at San Marcuola, 132
Guardi, Francesco, Rialto Bridge, 134
music, 111n. 43
in the works of Gentileschi, 98
liturgical, 185, 186
period’s interest in and representation of, 98, 100n. 7
mythological subjects
Apollo pursuing Daphne. See Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista
Bacchus and Ariadne. See Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista
cupids and nymphs. See Crespi, Giuseppe Maria
Diana and Endymion. See Giordano, Luca
Venus. See Carracci, Annibale
Naples, painters in. See Lanfranco, Giovanni; Ribera, Jusepe de
Museo di Capodimonte
Caravaggio, Flagellation, 217
Carracci, Annibale, Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine, 60n. 32
Titian, Portrait of Pope Paul III, 160
private collection
Giordano, Luca, Death of Jezebel, 120n. 17
Neri, Philip, 210
New Haven
Yale University Art Gallery
Ribera, Jusepe de, studio of, The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, 218n. 7, 218n. 10
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels, 298, 300n. 8
New York
Butler collection
Crespi, Giuseppe Maria, Finding of Moses, 68
Crane collection (formerly)
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Apollo and the Muses, 306
Richard L. Feigen & Co.
Guercino, self-portrait, 162n. 12
Collection of Asbjorn R. Lunde
Panini, Giovanni Paolo, Interior of the Pantheon, 192 (fig. 1)
Metropolitan Museum of Art
Carracci, Annibale, Landscape with Jacob Sleeping, 49n. 23
Guardi, Francesco, Palazzo Ducale from the Sea, 136, 137n. 14
Longhi, Pietro, The Visit, 174
Lotto, Lorenzo, Venus and Cupid, 53n. 28
Poussin, Nicolas, Companions of Rinaldo, 154n. 4
Ricci, Sebastiano, Baptism, 230–231, 235n. 15, 235n. 17
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Apotheosis of Francesco Barbaro, 266, 270n. 1
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Conquest of Carthage, 314
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, The Virgin Hearing the Prayers of Saint Dominic, 298
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Departure of the Gondola, 290, 293n. 20
Collection Stanley Moss
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Blessed Laduina, 290
Jacques Seligmann and Co. (formerly)
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Madonna of the Goldfinch, 286 (fig. 1)
Novara
San Gaudenzio
Tanzio da Varallo, Battle of Sennacherib, 256
Novelli, Pier Antonio, influence on Angeli, 3

Oberlin
Allen Memorial Art Museum
Tanzio da Varallo, Saint John the Baptist, 256

Olgia
Marchese Mario Incisa della Rocchetta collection
Cesari, Giuseppe, Deposition, 64
Orlandi, Pietro, Abecedario pittorico, 170
Oléans
Musée des Beaux-Arts
Ricci, Sebastiano, Venus and Adonis, 235n. 20
Osuna
Museo Parroquial
Ribera, Jusepe de, The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, 216, 218n. 7–8, 218n. 15
Ribera, Jusepe de, Penitent Saint Peter, 218n. 8
Ribera, Jusepe de, Saint Jerome and the Angel of Judgment, 218n. 8
Ottawa
National Gallery of Canada
Bellotto, Bernardo, attributed to, The Arsenal, 14n. 20
Bellotto, Bernardo, attributed to, The Piazzaetta Looking North, 14n. 20
Oxford
Ashmolean Museum
Canalletto, Dolo on the Brenta, 34n. 3
Guardi, Francesco, Benediction in Campo San Zanipolo, 126 (fig. 2), 129n. 5
Magnasco, Alessandro, preliminary drawing for Christ at the Sea of Galilee, 182
Strozzi, Bernardo, portrait of Claudio Monteverde, 252
Strozzi, Bernardo, portrait of Giulio Strozzi, 252
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, preparatory study for Madonna of the Goldfinch, 288
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Young Woman with a Parrot, 290, 293n. 18

Panini, Giovanni Paolo, 188–189
as influence on French painters, 188
manipulation of space in the works of, 190, 193n. 11
works by
Exterior of Saint Peter’s, Rome (Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie), 194, 196 (fig. 1), 197n. 5
Interior of a Gallery with Views of Ancient Rome (Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie), 197
Interior of a Gallery with Views of Modern Rome (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts), 197
interior of Saint Peter’s (Detroit Institute of Arts), 198n. 4
Interior of Saint Peter’s (Boston, Athenaeum), 197
Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome [1968, 13, 2], ill. on 195, 193–198
Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome (Paris, Musée du Louvre), 194, 197
Interior of the Pantheon, Rome [1939, 1, 24], ill. on 191, 189–193, 196, 197
Interior of the Pantheon (New York, Collection of Asbjorn R. Lunde), 192 (fig. 1), 193n. 9
parables, in the works of Fetti, 89–90, 92, 93n. 4–5, 93n. 8, 94n. 17–18
Paris
Musée du Louvre
Carracci, Annibale, *Fishing*, 46, 48n. 6, 48n. 10
Carracci, Annibale, *Hunting*, 46, 48n. 6, 48n. 10
Carracci, Annibale, *Landscape with a Fishing Scene*, 49n. 21
Carracci, Lodovico, *The Dream of Saint Catherine of Alexandria*, 58, 58 (fig. 1), 59
Guericau, *Ecstasy of Saint Francis*, 70n. 12
Guericau, *Self-portrait*, 162n. 12
Panini, Giovanni Paolo, *Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome*, 194, 197
Strozzi, Bernardo, *Madonna della Giustizia*, 248
private collection
Carracci, Lodovico, *Vision of Saint Hyacinth*, 58
Guardi, Francesco, *Te Deum in Santi Giovanni e Paolo*, 129n. 5
Sambon collection
Magnasco, Alessandro, *Organist and His Pupils*, 184
Parma, painters in. See Lanfranco, Giovanni
Galleria Nazionale
Ricci, Sebastiano, *Continent of Scipio*, 242n. 17
Pasadena
Norton Simon Museum
Guardi, Gian Antonio, and Francesco Guardi, *Godfrey de Boulogne Gathers the Christian Princes, 149
Guericau, *Portrait of a Dog*, 162n. 12–13
Pasiano di Pordenone
parish church
Guardi, Gian Antonio, *The Vision of Saint John of Matha*, 146
Pasinelli, Lorenzo, influence on Crespi, 68
Pavia
Necchi collection
Pensionante del Saraceni, 198–199
influenced by Carlo Saraceni, 198, 200
misattribution to Caravaggio of works by, 199
works attributed to, 203n. 8
works by
Denial of Saint Peter (Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland), 203n. 12
Denial of Saint Peter (Rome, Vatican Museum), 200
Fruit Vendor (Detroit Institute of Arts), 200, 200 (fig. 1), 203n. 14, 204n. 16
Saint Jerome (Rome, Vatican Museum), 200
Still Life with Fruit and Carafe [1939.1.159], ill. on 201, 199–205
Perugia
Galleria Nazionale di Umbria
Gentileschi, Orazio, after, *Saint Cecilia with an Angel*, 106, 107 (fig. 4)
Philadelphia
Philadelphia Museum of Art, The John G. Johnson Collection
Guardi, Francesco, *Grand Canal Showing Scalzi and San Simeone Profeta*, 132 (fig. 1), 133
Guardi, Francesco, *Pius VI Met by the Doge at San Giorgio in Alga*, 129n. 5
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, *Venus and Vulcan*, 294 (fig. 1), 296, 297n. 19–21, 308n. 42
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, 205–207
influenced by Crespi, 206, 210
influence on Angeli, 3–4, 6
influence on Guardi, 148, 154n. 9
tenebrist style of, 206
works by
Angelo Custode (Detroit Institute of Arts), 208, 211n. 5
Arrest of Saint James the Great (Venice, San Stae), 206
Carlo and Ubaldo in Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* (Library of Congress, Rare Book and Special Collections Division, The Lessing J. Rosenwald Collection), 148, 149 (fig. 2)
Erminia and the Shepherds in Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* (Library of Congress, Rare Book and Special Collections Division, The Lessing J. Rosenwald Collection), 148, 149 (fig. 1)
Guardian Angel with Saints Anthony of Padua and Luigi Gonzaga (Venice, San Vitale), 208
Madonna and Child Appearing to Saint Philip Neri [1961.9.82], ill. on 209, 207–212
The Madonna and San Filippo Neri (Venice, Santa Maria della Fava), 207 (fig. 1)
Saint Dominic in Glory (Venice, Santi Giovanni e Paolo), 206
Susanna at the Well (Milan, Pinacoteca di Brera), 6n. 16
Vision of San Filippo Neri (Salzburg, Residenzgalerie), 208 (fig. 2)
Pius VI, Pope, depiction of visit to Venice of, 125–126, 129n. 5
private collection
Magnasco, Alessandro, *La cioccolata*, 186
Magnasco, Alessandro, *Concerto di monache*, 186, 187n. 9
Magnasco, Alessandro, *Saint Anthony Preaching to the Fish*, 182
Magnasco, Alessandro, *study for Saint John the Baptist and Christ*, 179
Magnasco, Alessandro, *Tempest*, 182
unknown artist, *The Clary Family in the Cameron*, Palazzo Bárbaro, Venice, 269 (fig. 5)
unknown artist, *View of the Cameron, Palazzo Bárbaro*, Venice, 268 (fig. 4)
Vassallo, Anton Maria, *Martyrdom of Saint Marcello*, 322
Vassallo, Anton Maria, *Woman with a Rabbit, Cock, and Cat*, 323, 326n. 13
Polignac, Cardinal Melchior de, 188, 192, 194
Ponce
Museo de Bellas Artes
Badalocchio, Sisto, *The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew*, 218n. 17
Pordenone, 3
portraiture
ecclesiastical, 160
in the works of Ghislandi, 112–115
in the works of Tiepolo, 289–290, 292
in the works of Tinelli, 317–318
in the works of Della Vecchia, 327–332
Rotari and, 244–245
Van Dyck’s influence on, 318
Venetian, 289–290, 292, 317–318
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Poussin, Nicolas
  influence of, 71n. 23
  works by
    Companions of Rinaldo (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 154n. 4

Poznan
  National Museum
    Carlevarijs, Luca, Rivu degli Schiavoni, 340n. 20

Presconstanzo
  Collegiata
    Tanzio da Varallo, Madonna dell’incendio sedato, 254, 256

Princeton
  The Barbara Piasecka Johnson Collection
    Bellotto, Bernardo, The Tiber with the Castel Sant’Angelo, 12
    Bellotto, Bernardo, The Tiber with the Church of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, 12

quadratura, 231, 235n. 23

R

Raleigh
  North Carolina Museum of Art
    Ricci, Sebastiano, Family of Darius Before Alexander, 240, 242n. 28

Raphael
  influence on Guercino, 160
  works by
    Julius II (London, National Gallery), 160
    Pope Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de’ Medici and Luigi de’ Rossi (Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi), 160
  Regnier, Nicholas, and Della Vecchia, 327, 329, 332n. 2, 333n. 21-22

religious subjects
  New Testament
    Baptism of Christ. See Magnasco, Alessandro
    Christ at the Sea of Galilee. See Magnasco, Alessandro
    Last Supper. See Ricci, Sebastiano
    Madonna and Child appearing to Saint Philip Neri. See Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista
    Madonna della Misericordia, 211, 212n. 34
    Madonna of the Goldfinch. See Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista
  martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, 217n. 3, 218n. 7
  Saint Sebastian. See Varallo, Tanzio da
  Saint Veronica. See Fetti, Domenico

Old Testament
  Amnon and Tamar, 168n. 14. See also Guercino
  Elijah. See Angeli, Giuseppe
  Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife. See Guercino

Rembrandt, influenced by Annibale Carracci, 45

Renaissance, California
  Goethe Academy
    Titian, Adoration of Venus, 160, 161n. 20

Reni, Guido
  as prototype for representation of Saint Philip Neri’s Marian vision, 210, 212n. 26
  influenced by the Carracci, 54
  influence on Cantarini, 40-42
  influence on Creti, 77
  influence on Guercino, 158
  influence on Ribera, 213, 218n. 19
  works by
    Aurora (Rome, Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi), 157
    Giving of the Keys to Peter (Paris, Musée du Louvre), 40
    Madonna and Child with Saints Thomas and Jerome (Rome, Vatican Museum), 40
    Saint Matthew (Rome, Vatican Museum), 41, 42n. 8

Ribera, Jusepe de, 213-214
  influenced by Reni, 213, 218n. 19
  influence on Giordano, 116, 118
  Spanish patronage of, 213
  technique of, 216-217
  works attributed to
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum), 218n. 7, 218n. 10
  works by
    Five Senses, 213
    The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew [1990.137.1], ill. on 215, 214-218
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Barcelona, Museo de Bellas Artes), 218n. 7, 218n. 9-10, 218n. 14-15, 218n. 22
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Collection Mrs. Barbara Johnson), 218n. 7
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Florence, Palazzo Pitti), 218n. 7, 218n. 9-10, 218n. 15, 218n. 22
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (London, Clovis Whitfield), 218n. 7
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Osuna, Museo Parroquial), 216, 218n. 7-8, 218n. 15
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Rome, Galleria Pallavicini-Rospigliosi), 218n. 7
    Penitent Saint Peter (Osuna, Museo Parroquial), 218n. 8
    Saint Jerome and the Angel of Judgment (Osuna, Museo Parroquial), 218n. 8
    Saint Martin and the Beggar (lost), 213
    Saint Matthew (Fort Worth, Kimbell Art Museum), 216
    Saint Peter (Madrid, Museo del Prado), 216
  works by studio of
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (Grenoble, Musée des Beaux-Arts), 218n. 7
    The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery), 218n. 7, 218n. 10
Ricci, Marco, 219–220

collaboration with Magnasco, 177, 219
collaboration with Pellegrini, 219
influence on Francesco Guardi, 136

works after, View of the Mall in Saint James’s Park [1970.17–132], ill. on 221, 220–223

Ricci, Sebastiano, 223–224

influenced by theater design, 231

collaboration with Bibiena, 231

influenced by Tintoretto, 228, 232

influenced by Veronese, 224, 228

works by

Assumption of the Virgin (Springfield, Museum of Fine Arts), 235n. 20
Assumption of the Virgin (Vienna, Karlskirche), 229n. 17
Baptism (Drey-Finarte), 230–231, 234n. 7, 235n. 15, 235n. 17
Baptism (London, Collection John Harris), 235n. 15
Baptism (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 230–231, 235n. 15, 235n. 17
Baptism of Christ (Milan, formerly Finarte), 231, 232 (fig. 1)
Beheading of the Baptist, 228, 229n. 13
Continence of Scipio (Parma, Galleria Nazionale), 242n. 17
Continence of Scipio (Windsor Castle, Royal Collection), 242n. 17

The Exaltation of the True Cross [1939.1.72], ill. on 227, 225–230

Family of Darius before Alexander (Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art), 240, 242n. 28

Hercules sketches (Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi), 235n. 20

The Last Supper [1943.4.23], ill. on 223, 230–236

Marriage at Cana (Kansas City, Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art), 235n. 13–14

A Miracle of Saint Francis of Paola [1939.1.71], ill. on 227, 224–225

Pope Gregory the Great Interceding for Souls in Purgatory, 229n. 20

Pope Saint Pius V, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Saint Peter Martyr (Venice, Church of the Gesuati), 229n. 12

Resurrection (London, Dulwich Picture Gallery), 235n. 20

Saint Francis of Paola (Venice, Church of San Rocco), 225, 226 (fig. 1)

Saint Helen and the True Cross (Venice, Church of San Rocco), 225, 226 (fig. 2)

Saint Louis of France Exhibiting the Crown of Thorns (Turin, Superga), 229n. 12

Saint Maur healing a Child, 228, 229n. 14

Saint Paul Preaching (Toledo Museum of Art), 235n. 13

Self-Portrait (four copies) (Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi), 235n. 13

Venus and Adonis (Orléans, Musée des Beaux-Arts), 235n. 20

Ricci, Sebastiano, and Marco Ricci

works by

Allegorical Tomb of the 1st Duke of Devonshire (Birmingham, Barber Institute), 237–238, 240, 241n. 6

Memorial to Admiral Sir Cloudesley Shovell [1961.9.58], ill. on 239, 237–242

Ricordo

Piazzetta and, 208, 211n. 5–6, 235n. 16

Tiepolo and, 262

Rome

Galleria Borghese

Caravaggio, Boy with a Basket of Fruit, 199

Galleria Doria-Pamphilii

Vecchietta, Pietro Della, Warrior Attacking a Youth, 333n. 11

Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica

Gentileschi, Orazio, Saint Francis Supported by an Angel (two copies), 258n. 17

Guercino, The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew, 218n. 17

painters in. See Carracci, Annibale; Gentileschi, Orazio; Guercino; Lanfranco, Giovanni; Panini, Giovanni Paolo

Palazzo Barberini

Gentileschi, Orazio, Venus Playing the Harp, 109

Palazzo Magnani

Carracci, Annibale, Story of the Founding of Rome, 44

Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi

Gentileschi, Orazio, and Agostino Tassi, The Musical Concert Sponsored by Apollo and the Muses, 97

Guercino, Saint Margaret, 169n. 24

Reni, Guido, Aurora, 157

Ribera, Jusepe de, The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, 218n. 7

Vassallo, Anton Maria, Still Life with Pastries and Meat, 343

Palazzo Venezia

Cantarini, Simone, Saint Matthew and the Angel, 41

private collection

Ghislandi, Giuseppe, Portrait of a Gentleman, 115

S. Orsola

Baglione, Giovanni, Saint Sebastian Attended by Angels, 258n. 18

San Marcello

Rossi, Giovanni Francesco de’, tomb for Cardinal Francesco Cennini, 159, 160 (fig. 1)

Santa Maria del Popolo

Carracci, Annibale, Assumption, 44

Santa Maria in Vallicella

Cesari, Giuseppe, Coronation of the Virgin, 64, 65n. 12

Vatican Museum

Pensionante del Saraceni, Denial of Saint Peter, 200

Pensionante del Saraceni, Saint Jerome, 200

Reni, Guido, Madonna and Child with Saints Thomas and Jerome, 40

Reni, Guido, Saint Matthew, 41, 42n. 8

Rondinini, Natale, as patron of Gentileschi, 108–109, 109n. 1, 109n. 3, 111n. 36, 111n. 39

Roos, Jan, David and Abigail (Offering of the Gifts of the Earth) (Genoa, private collection), 324

Rossi, Giovanni Francesco de’, tomb for Cardinal Francesco Cennini (Rome, San Marcello), 159, 160 (fig. 1)
Rotari, Pietro, 243
influence in Moscow, 243
works by
A Girl with a Flower in Her Hair [1939.1.108], ill. on 247, 244, 248
A Sleeping Girl [1939.1.107], ill. on 246, 244, 248

Rovigo
Accademia dei Concordi
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Portrait of Antonio Riccobono, 292

Rubens, Peter Paul
influence of Decius Mus Addressing His Legions on Tiepolo, 311, 315n. 15, 316n. 27
influence on Fetti, 84
works by
Decius Mus Addressing His Legions [1957.14.2] (Washington, National Gallery of Art), 311, 311 (fig. 5), 315n. 15

Rovigo
Accademia dei Concordi
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Portrait of Antonio Riccobono, 292

Rubens, Peter Paul
influence of Decius Mus Addressing His Legions on Tiepolo, 311, 315n. 15, 316n. 27
influence on Fetti, 84
works by
Decius Mus Addressing His Legions [1957.14.2] (Washington, National Gallery of Art), 311, 311 (fig. 5), 315n. 15

Sachsen-Teschen, Herzog Albert von
collection of, 74
works by
Ulysses Abducting Andromache’s Son Astyanax (after Crespi) (Vienna, Kupferstichkabinett der Akademie der Bildenden Künste), 74, 74 (fig. 3), 75n. 2

Saint Petersburg
The Hermitage
Caravaggio, Lute Player, 97
Guardi, Alessandro, Landscape with Large Trees, 134
Magnasco, Alessandro, study for Baptism of Christ, 179 (fig. 1)
Magnasco, Alessandro, study in reverse for Saint John the Baptist and Christ, 179
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Maecenas Presents the Arts to Augustus, 305
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Magnificence of Princes, 261–262, 264n. 16, 264n. 20
Vassallo, Anton Maria, The Nurture of Cyrus, 323
Vassallo, Anton Maria, Orpheus Enchanting the Animals, 323

Salzburg
Residenzgalerie
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Vision of San Filippo Neri, 208 (fig. 2)

San Francisco
Museum of Fine Arts
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Triumph of Flora, 305

Saraceni, Carlo. See Pensionante del Saraceni

Sarasota
John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art
Guardi, Francesco, Charit, 152
Guardi, Francesco, Faith, 152
Magnasco, Alessandro, Bacchanal, 183n. 10
Magnasco, Alessandro, Vagrants in a Landscape, 183n. 10

Schulenburg, Johann Matthias von der, 146, 206

Scorza, Sinibaldo, Orpheus Enchanting the Animals (Genoa, Zerbone collection), 324
Scriptores Historiae Augustae, 309, 315n. 10, 315n. 12

Scuola di San Rocco, Venice, 3, 6, 7n. 23
Scuola Grande dei Carmini, Venice, 6

Seattle
Seattle Art Museum
Magnasco, Alessandro, Christ Saving Saint Peter from the Waves, 183n. 10

Seitenstetten
Stiftsgalerie
Magnasco, Alessandro, Capuchins in their Library, 187
Magnasco, Alessandro, Catechism, 187, 187–188n. 17
Magnasco, Alessandro, Refectory of Capuchin Monks, 187
Magnasco, Alessandro, Synagogue, 187

Seven Years’ War, 8, 17
Shovell, Admiral Sir Clowdisley, 238, 241n. 14

Simonneau, Charles, Veil of Veronica (after Fetti), 85 (fig. 1)

Smith, Joseph, as agent and patron of Canaletto, 23, 29, 31, 38

Soprapporto
as landscapes, 46, 48n. 13
Tiepolo and, 265–266, 268–270, 274, 296

Springfield, Massachusetts
Museum of Fine Arts
Bellotto, Bernardo, The Campo di SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, 10, 12 (fig. 2), 14n. 17
Ricci, Sebastiano, Assumption of the Virgin, 235n. 20

still life
Caravaggio and, 202
interpretation of, 324
Pensionante del Saraceni and, 199–202
Vassallo and, 323

Stockholm
Nationalmuseum
Ribera, Jusepe de, attributed to, The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian, 218n. 7, 218n. 10
University Museum
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Danàe, 296n. 14

Strozz, Bernardo, 248–249
influenced by Van Dyck, 249–250, 252, 253n. 19
works by
Bishop Alvise Grimani [1961.9.41], ill. on 251, 249–253
Bishop Alvise Grimani (Genoa, Antiquario Attilio Oddone), 250
La Cucza (Genoa, Palazzo Rosso), 248, 326n. 14, 326n. 25
Invitation to the Wedding Feast (Genoa, Chiesa degli Incubuiali), 252
Madonna della Giustizia (Paris, Musée du Louvre), 248
Portait of a Bishop (Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo-Pallavicini), 252
portrait of Cardinal Federico Corner (Venice, Museo Correr), 252
portrait of Doge Francesco Erizzo (Venice, Galleria dell’Accademia), 252
portrait of Doge Francesco Erizzo (Venice, Kunsthistorisches Museum), 252
portrait of Claudio Monteverde (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum), 252
portrait of a procurator from the Grimani Family (Venice, Galleria dell’Accademia), 252

INDEX 383
portrait of Giulio Strozzi (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum), 252

Stuttgart
Staatsgalerie
Panini, Giovanni Paolo, Interior of a Gallery with Views of Ancient Rome, 197
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Rest on the Flight into Egypt, 262

Panini, Giovanni Paolo, 252
Stuttgart Staatsgalerie
Panini, Giovanni Paolo, Interior of a Gallery ‘with Views of Ancient Rome’, 197
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Rest on the Flight into Egypt, 262

Tanzio da Varallo, 254
influenced by Baglione, 254–255
influenced by Borgianni, 254–255
influenced by Caravaggio, 254–255
influenced by Gentileschi, 254–255

works by
Battle of Sennacherib (Novara, San Gaudenzio), 256
Circumcision, 254
David with the Head of Goliath (two copies) (Varallo, Pinacoteca), 256
Madonna dei Sette Dolori (Presconstanzo, Collegiata), 254, 256
Saint Charles Borromeo Giving Holy Communion to Plague Victims, 254
Saint John the Baptist (Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum), 256
Saint John the Baptist (Tulsa, Philbrook Art Center), 256

Saint Sebastian [1939.1.191], ill. on 257, 254–258
Tasso, Torquato, Jerusalem Delivered, 148, 153n. 12
Tassi, Agostino, and Gentileschi, 96–97
têtes de caractère, in the works of Rotari, 244–245
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, 259–260

and Venetian Academy of Painting and Sculpture, 28
Capricci, 259
commissions for
Ca’ Dolfin, Venice, 312, 314, 316n. 26, 316n. 31, 316n. 33
Church of the Gesuati, Venice, 259
Palazzo Archinto, Milan, 294
Palazzo Barbaro, 265–266
Palazzo Clerici, Milan, 259, 279, 281, 284nn. 71–72
Palazzo Labia, Venice, 260, 268, 306
Residenz, Würzburg, 260, 279, 281
San Pascual Baylon, Aranjuez, 260, 262, 285, 288, 288n. 13
Scuola Grande dei Carmini, 6
Villa Contarini, Mira, 268
Villa Valmarana, Vicenza, 260, 296

influenced by Piazzetta, 206
influenced by Rubens, 311

influence of political events on Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III, 275

influence on Angeli, 3
influence on Gian Antonio Guardi, 148, 153n. 11
problematic interpretation of subject in Scene from Ancient History, 269

use of Ripa’s Iconologia, 261, 262nn. 10–11, 274, 283nn.

22–24, 283n. 26, 283n. 28, 283n. 30, 283n. 40, 309, 315n. 13
Scherzi di fantasia, 259

style and technique of, 262, 286, 292

works by
Anunciación (formerly Madrid, Duke of Luna-Villahermosa collection), 285
Apollo and Marsyas (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst), 266, 296n. 14
Apollo and the Muses (formerly New York, Crane collection), 306
Apollo Pursuing Daphne [1952.5.78], ill. on 295, 292n. 16, 293–297, 298n. 42

Apotheosis of Francesco Barabba (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 266, 270n. 1
Bacchus and Ariadne [1960.6.36], ill. on 303, 301–308, 303 (fig. 1)

Blessed Laduina (New York, Collection Stanley Moss), 290

Conquest of Carthage (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 314
Danæ (Stockholm, University Museum), 296n. 14

Discovery of the True Cross (Venice, Galleria dell’Accademia), 298

Entombment (formerly Lisbon, Pinto Basto collection), 262
Finding of Moses (Melbourne, National Gallery of Australia), 306

A Hunter on Horseback (Milan, Cariplo), 309, 310 (fig. 1), 314
A Hunter with a Stag (Milan, Cariplo), 310 (fig. 2), 314, 315n. 23

Immaculate Conception (Madrid, Museo del Prado), 285

Juno and Luna (Houston, Sarah Campbell Blaffer Foundation), 301, 304–305, 305 (fig. 3), 307nn. 7–8

Jupiter Before the Roman Consul (Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery), 316n. 29
Justice and Peace (Venice, San Lazzaro degli Armeni), 317n. 49

Latino Offering Lavinia to Aeneas in Matrimony (?) (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst), 266, 266 (fig. 3), 268, 270

Madonna del Carmelo (Milan, Pinacoteca di Brera), 316n. 28

Madonna of the Goldfinch [1943.4.40], ill. on 287, 285–289, 286 (fig. 2)

Madonna of the Goldfinch (formerly New York, Jacques Seligmann and Co.), 286 (fig. 1)

Maccenas Presents the Arts to Augustus (Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage), 305

Magnificence of Princes (Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage), 261–262, 264n. 16, 264n. 20

Martyrdom of Saint Victor (Milan, Sant’Ambrogio), 314

Matronalia Offering Gifts to Juno Regina (Atlanta, High Museum of Art), 265 (fig. 2), 266, 268

Matronalia Offering Gifts to Juno Regina (Pavia, Necchi Collection), 265–266, 270n. 13

Miracle of the Holy House of Loreto (London, British Rail Pension Fund, on loan to National Gallery), 298

Olympus and the Four Continents (Würzburg, Archiepiscopal Palace), 260
preparatory study for *Madonna of the Goldfinch* (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum), 288

*Portrait of a Procurator* (Venice, Galleria Quirini-Stampalia), 290, 292, 292n. 16

*Portrait of Antonio Riccobono* (Rovigo, Accademia dei Conordi), 292

*Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers* [1961.9.42], ill. on 313, 309–317

*Queen Zenobia Before Aurelian* (Madrid, Museo del Prado), 309, 311 (fig. 4), 312, 316n. 44

*Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie), 262

*Rinaldo Enchanted by Armida* (Art Institute of Chicago), 308n. 45

*Sacrifice of Isaac* (Venice, Chiesa dell’Ospedaletto), 316n. 30

*Saint James of Campostella* (Budapest, Szépmüvészeti Museum), 148

*Saint Joseph* (London, Courtauld Institute Galleries), 262

*Saint Joseph with the Christ Child* (Detroit Institute of Arts), 285

*Saint Pascual Baylon* (London, Courtauld Institute Galleries), 262

*Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels* [1956.9.16], ill. on 299, 297–301

*Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels* (New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery), 298, 300, 301

*Scene from Ancient History* [1939.1.365], ill. on 267, 264–272

*Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel* [1939.1.100], ill. on 263, 260–264, 296n. 16

*Tarquin and Lucretia* (Augsburg, Städtische Kunstsammlungen), 265 (fig. 1), 268

*Tarquin and Lucretia* (Zanesville, Ohio, Art Institute), 266

*Triumph of Amphitrite* (Dresden, Gemäldegalerie), 301–302, 304, 304 (fig. 2), 305–307, 307nn. 7–8, 308n. 34

*The Triumph of Aurelian* (Tirun, Galleria Sabauda), 309, 310 (fig. 3), 312, 314, 316n. 44

*Triumph of Flora* (San Francisco, Museum of Fine Arts), 305

*Venus and Vulcan* (Philadelphia Museum of Art, The John G. Johnson Collection), 294 (fig. 1), 296, 297nn. 19–21, 308n. 42

*The Virgin Hearing the Prayers of Saint Dominic* (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 298

*A Warrior Before a Judge* (Chicago, Joresco collection), 316n. 29

*Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III* [1943.4.39], ill. on 277, 272–285

*Woman with a Fan* (lost), 290, 293n. 18

*Woman with a Mandolin* (Detroit Institute of Arts), 290, 293n. 18

*Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat* [1952.5.77], ill. on 291, 289–293, 290 (fig. 1)

*Young Woman with a Parrot* (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum), 290, 293n. 18


works by

*Departure of the Gondola* (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art), 290, 293n. 20

Tiepolo, Lorenzo Baldiessera

works by

*Holy Family* (location unknown), 286, 288n. 15

*Monument to the Glory of Heroes* (after Giovanni Battista Tiepolo) [1984.83.1] (Washington, National Gallery of Art), 260–262, 261 (fig. 1), 264n. 18, 306

Tinelli, Tiberio, 317

influenced by Van Dyck, 317–318, 321n. 9

works by

*Lodovico Widmann* [1946.6.1], ill. on 319, 318–321

*Portrait of Giulio Strozzi* (Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi), 317

portrait of Marc’Antonio Vario (Hartford, Wadsworth Athenaeum), 318

Tintoretto

at the Scuola di San Rocco, Venice, 6, 7n. 23

influence on Angeli, 3, 6, 7n. 23

influence on Sebastiano Ricci, 232

Titian

attributed to

*Self-portrait with a Figure of Venus* (formerly Ashburnham collection), 330 (fig. 2)

influence on Crespi’s *Tarquin and Lucretia*, 72, 75n. 9

influence on Marco Ricci, 219

works by

*Adoration of Venus* (Renaissance, California, Goethe Academy), 160, 162n. 20

*Benedetto Varchi* (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum), 315n. 9

*Portrait of Pope Paul III* (Naples, Museo di Capodimonte), 160

*Self-Portrait* (Berlin, Staatische Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie), 320, 332

*Self-Portrait* (Madrid, Museo del Prado), 329, 332

Toledo

*Toledo Museum of Art*

Ricci, Sebastiano, *Saint Paul Preaching*, 235n. 13

Tulsa

*Philbrook Art Center*

Tanzio da Varallo, *Saint John the Baptist*, 256

Turin

*Galleria Sabauda*

Guercino, *Return of the Prodigal Son*, 162n. 15

Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, *The Triumph of Aurelian*, 309, 310 (fig. 3), 312, 314, 316n. 44

Santa Maria al Monte dei Cappuccini

Gentileschi, Orazio, *Madonna in Glory with the Trinity*, 258n. 17

Superga

Ricci, Sebastiano, *Saint Louis of France Exhibiting the Crown of Thorns*, 229n. 12

U

Unigenitus dei Filius, 196

unknown artists
works by

The Clary Family in the Cameron, Palazzo Barbaro, Venice (private collection), 269 (fig. 5)

View of the Cameron, Palazzo Barbaro, Venice (private collection), 268 (fig. 4)

Portrait of Lodovico Widmann (after Tinelli) (Venice, Museo Civico Correr), 318 (fig. 1)

unknown Venetian artists

works by

Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace, Venice [1945.15.1], ill on 336, 334–335, 338–340

Procession of Gondolas in the Bacino di San Marco, Venice [1945.15.2], ill on 337, 334–335, 338–340

Urbino

Galleria Nazionale delle Marche

Gentileschi, Orazio, Madonna Presenting the Christ Child to Santa Francesca Romana, 106, 106 (fig. 3)

V

Vanvitelli. See Van Wittel, Gaspar

Van Dyck, Anthony, Portrait of the Abbé Scaglia (Viscount Camrose collection), 318

Van Wittel, Gaspar, 188, 335, 338

works by

view of Venice from the Bacino di San Marco (Madrid, Museo del Prado), 335

Varallo

Pinacoteca

Tanzio da Varallo, David with the Head of Goliath (two copies), 256

Vasi, Giuseppe, 138–139, 139n. 9

Vassallo, Anton Maria, 322

comparison with Castiglione, 323–324

influenced by Flemish art, 323–324

works by

Apollo as Shepherd (Genoa, private collection), 322

Copper Basins and Fish (Genoa, private collection), 322–323

Fable of Latona (Genoa, Palazzo Reale), 322

The Larder [1961.9.91], ill. on 325, 323–327

Martyrdom of Saint Marcello Mastrelli (private collection), 322

The Nurture of Cyrus (Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage), 333

Orpheus Enchanting the Animals (Saint Petersburg, The Hermitage), 323

Putti, Animals, and Copper Basins (Genoa, private collection), 322–323

Saint Francis with Three Female Saints (Genoa, Palazzo Bianco), 322

Still Life with Animals (Rome, Galleria Pallavicini-Rospigliosi), 323

Still Life with Pastries and Meats (Rome, Galleria Pallavicini-Rospigliosi), 323

Woman with a Rabbit, Cock, and Cat (private collection), 323, 326n. 13

Woman with a Turkey (Genoa, private collection), 323

Vecchia, Pietro Della, 327–328

works by

Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian [1960.6.39], ill. on 331, 328–333, 329 (fig. 1)

Philosopher (location unknown), 329

Warrior Attacking a Youth (Rome, Galleria Doria-Pamphilii), 333n. 11

Zeus and Semele (location unknown), 333n. 11

vedute ideate, 8, 38, 39n. 9, 188. See also capriccio

vedute, 16, 334

Francesco Guardi and, 120–121

Panini and, 188–198

Marco Ricci and, 219

Veggio

Oratorio of Sant’Andrea Avellino

Crespi, Giuseppe Maria, Virgin with Saints Philip Neri and Andrea Avellino, 210

Venice

artists in. See Angeli, Giuseppe; Bellotto, Bernardo; Canaletto; Fetti, Domenico; Ghislandi, Giuseppe; Guardi, Francesco; Longhi, Pietro; Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista; Strozzi, Bernardo; Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista; Tinelli, Tiberio; Vecchia, Pietro Della

Brass collection

Magnasco, Alessandro, Parlatorio delle monache, 186, 187n. 9

Ca’ Rezzonico

Longhi, Pietro, Doctor’s Visit, 175

Longhi, Pietro, Oil Seller, 293n. 20

Longhi, Pietro, Wet-Nurse, 175

Chiesa dell’Ospedaletto

Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Sacrifice of Isaac, 316n. 30

Church of the Gesuati

Ricci, Sebastiano, Pope Saint Pius V, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Saint Peter Martyr, 229n. 12

Church of San Rocco

Ricci, Sebastiano, Saint Francis of Paola, 225, 226 (fig. 1)

Ricci, Sebastiano, Saint Helen and the True Cross, 235, 226 (fig. 2)

Church of the Maddalena

Angeli, Giuseppe, Madonna Presenting the Habit to Saint Simon Stock, 4, 6n. 15

Galleria dell’Accademia

Canaletto, capriccio of the interior of a palace courtyard, 24

Guardi, Francesco, Fire at San Marcuola, 132

Guardi, Gian Antonio, and Francesco Guardi, Erminia Discovers Argante Dead and Tancred Wounded, 149

Strozzi, Bernardo, portrait of a procurator from the Grimani family, 252

Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Discovery of the True Cross, 298

Galleria Quirini-Stampalia

Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Portrait of a Procurator, 290, 292, 292n. 16

influence of Sebastiano Ricci on artists in, 224, 228

Museo Civico Correr

Strozzi, Bernardo, portrait of Cardinal Federico Corner, 252

unknown artist, Portrait of Lodovico Widmann (after Tinelli), 318 (fig. 1)

private collection

Magnasco, Alessandro, Novitiate Brothers in the Monastery’s Library, 186
San Lazzaro degli Armeni
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Justice and Peace, 317n. 49

San Stae
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Arrest of Saint James the Great, 206

San Vitale
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Guardian Angel with Saints Anthony of Padua and Luigi Gonzaga, 208

Santa Maria della Fava
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, The Madonna and San Filippo Neri, 207 (fig. 1)

San Vitale
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Guardian Angel with Saints Anthony of Padua and Luigi Gonzaga, 208

Venetian Academy of Painting and Sculpture, 3, 28

Verona
Museo del Castelvecchio
Giordano, Luca, Diana and Endymion, 117–118

Veronese, Paolo, Family of Darius (London, National Gallery), 242n. 28

Vienna
Graphische Sammlung Albertina
Canaletto, Porta Portello, 32 (fig. 2), 34, 34n. 10
Canuti, Domenico Maria, Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father, 80 (fig. 1)
Carracci, Agostino, Venus and a Satyr, 53n. 32

Kunsthistorisches Museum
Crespi, Giuseppe Maria, Achilles and the Centaur Chiron, 74, 76n. 14
Crespi, Giuseppe Maria, Aeneas, Charon, and the Sibyl, 74, 76n. 14
Guardi, Francesco, Piazza San Marco During the Feast of the Ascension, 132
Strozzi, Bernardo, portrait of Doge Francesco Erizzo, 282

Tittian, Benedetto Varchi, 321n. 9

Kupferstichkabinett der Akademie der Bildenden Künste
Sachsen-Teschen, Herzog Albert von, Ulysses Abducting Andromache’s Son Astyanax (after Crespi), 74, 74 (fig. 3), 75n. 2

view painters. See vedute

Visentini, Antonio, Prospectus Magni Canalis Venetiarum, 23
Vittore, Fra. See Ghislandi, Giuseppe
Voragine, Golden Legend, 214, 216, 217n. 4–5

W

War of the Austrian Succession, 23, 25

Washington

Library of Congress, Rare Book and Special Collections Division, The Lessing J. Rosenwald Collection
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Carlo and Ubaldo in Torquato Tasso’s Gerusalemme Liberata, 148, 149 (fig. 2)
Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, Erminia and the Shepherds in Torquato Tasso’s Gerusalemme Liberata, 148, 149 (fig. 1)

National Gallery of Art
Canaletto, View of the Porta Portello at Padua, 10
Guercino, preparatory drawing for Amnon and Tamar, 167 (fig. 1)
Rubens, Peter Paul, Decius Mus Addressing His Legions, 311, 311 (fig. 5), 315n. 15, 316n. 27
Tiepolo, Lorenzo Baldissera, (after Giovanni Battista Tiepolo), Monument to the Glory of Heroes, 260–262, 261 (fig. 1), 264n. 18, 306

widmann family, as patrons, 320

Windsor Castle
Royal Collection
Canaletto, The Campo di SS. Giovanni e Paolo, 10, 131n. 16
Canaletto, drawing of beam with pulley wheel, 25, 28, 30n. 7
Canaletto, view of the Basilica and Doge’s Palace, 28, 30n. 12
Canaletto, View of Porta Portello, 32 (fig. 1), 34, 34n. 9
Carlevaris, Luca, Seaport with a Tower, 136, 137n. 17
Carracci, Agostino, Venus, Vulcan, and Cupid, 53n. 32
Longhi, Pietro, Blindman’s Buff, 175
Longhi, Pietro, Married-Couple’s Breakfast, 175
Ricci, Sebastiano, Continence of Scipio, 242n. 17

Würzburg
Archiepiscopal Palace
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Olympus and the Four Continents, 260

Tiepolo in, 260, 279, 281

Z

Zanchi, Antonio, 266, 312, 315n. 20
Zaneletti, Aurelio, as patron of Guercino, 163, 168nn. 5–6, 168nn. 7–8, 168nn. 10–11

Zanesville, Ohio
Art Institute
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista, Tarquin and Lucretia, 266

Zanetti, Anton Maria
as biographer of Canaletto, 23
guide to Venice of 1771, 4
Zenobio family, as patrons of Tiepolo, 312, 314–315, 316n. 48
Zuccaro, Federico, influence on Cesari, 61
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Concordance of Old-New Titles

Titles changed since publication by the National Gallery of Art of European Paintings: An Illustrated Catalogue (Washington, 1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Old Title</th>
<th>New Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto</td>
<td>1942.9.7</td>
<td>View in Venice</td>
<td>The Campo di SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto and Workshop</td>
<td>1961.9.63</td>
<td>The Castle of Nymphenburg</td>
<td>Nymphenburg Palace, Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>1945.15.3</td>
<td>The Square of Saint Mark’s</td>
<td>The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>1945.15.4</td>
<td>Venice, the Quay of the Piazzetta</td>
<td>Entrance to the Grand Canal from the Molo, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>1961.9.53</td>
<td>The Portello and the Brenta Canal at Padua</td>
<td>The Porta Portello, Padua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>1964.2.1</td>
<td>Landscape Capriccio with Column</td>
<td>English Landscape Capriccio with a Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>1964.2.2</td>
<td>Landscape Capriccio with Palace</td>
<td>English Landscape Capriccio with a Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annibale Carracci</td>
<td>1952.5.58</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>River Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuseppe Maria Crespi</td>
<td>1939.1.62</td>
<td>Cupids with Sleeping Nymphs</td>
<td>Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuseppe Maria Crespi</td>
<td>1952.5.30</td>
<td>Lucretia Threatened by Tarquin</td>
<td>Tarquin and Lucretia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donato Creti</td>
<td>1961.9.6</td>
<td>The Quarrel</td>
<td>Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop of Domenico Fetti</td>
<td>1939.1.88</td>
<td>The Parable of Dives and Lazarus</td>
<td>The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1939.1.113</td>
<td>View on the Cannaregio, Venice</td>
<td>View on the Cannaregio Canal, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1939.1.129</td>
<td>Campo San Zanipolo</td>
<td>Temporary Tribune in the Campo San Zanipolo, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1942.9.27</td>
<td>View of the Rialto</td>
<td>Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1943.4.50</td>
<td>A Seaport and Classic Ruins in Italy</td>
<td>Capriccio of a Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1956.9.2</td>
<td>Castel Sant’Angelo</td>
<td>Fanciful View of the Castel Sant’Angelo, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower of Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1949.1.6</td>
<td>The Rialto Bridge</td>
<td>Rialto Bridge, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower of Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1958.7.1</td>
<td>Piazza San Marco</td>
<td>The Square of Saint Mark’s, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro Longhi</td>
<td>1939.1.63</td>
<td>The Simulated Faint</td>
<td>The Faint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro Longhi</td>
<td>1939.1.64</td>
<td>Blindman’s Buff</td>
<td>The Game of the Cooking Pot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITALIAN PAINTINGS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Old Title</th>
<th>New Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Paolo Panini</td>
<td>1939.1.24</td>
<td>The Interior of the Pantheon</td>
<td>Interior of the Pantheon, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensionante del Saraceni</td>
<td>1939.1.159</td>
<td>Still Life</td>
<td>Still Life with Fruit and Carafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Piazzetta</td>
<td>1961.9.82</td>
<td>Madonna and Child Appearing to San Filippo Neri</td>
<td>Madonna and Child Appearing to Saint Philip Neri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Marco Ricci</td>
<td>1970.17.132</td>
<td>A View of the Mall from Saint James's Park</td>
<td>View of the Mall in Saint James's Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastiano Ricci</td>
<td>1939.1.72</td>
<td>The Finding of the True Cross</td>
<td>The Exaltation of the True Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo</td>
<td>1939.1.100</td>
<td>The Apotheosis of a Poet</td>
<td>Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo</td>
<td>1939.1.365</td>
<td>Timocleia and The Thracian Commander</td>
<td>Scene from Ancient History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo</td>
<td>1943.4.39</td>
<td>The World Pays Homage to Spain</td>
<td>Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo</td>
<td>1952.5.77</td>
<td>A Young Lady in Domino and Tricorne</td>
<td>Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo</td>
<td>1956.9.16</td>
<td>The Apotheosis of a Saint</td>
<td>Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberio Tinelli</td>
<td>1946.6.1</td>
<td>Count Lodovico Vidmano</td>
<td>Lodovico Widmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro Della Vecchia</td>
<td>1960.6.39</td>
<td>Self-Portrait</td>
<td>Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian 18th Century</td>
<td>1945.15.1</td>
<td>The Courtyard, Doge's Palace, with the Procession of the Papal Legate</td>
<td>Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian 18th Century</td>
<td>1945.15.2</td>
<td>A Fete Day, Venice</td>
<td>Procession of Gondolas in the Bacino di San Marco, Venice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concordance of Old-New Attributions

Attributions changed since publication by the National Gallery of Art of *European Paintings: An Illustrated Catalogue* (Washington, 1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Attribution</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>New Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Piazzetta</td>
<td>1952.5.70</td>
<td>Giuseppe Angeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>1942.9.7</td>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenico Fetti</td>
<td>1939.1.88</td>
<td>Workshop of Domenico Fetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orazio Gentileschi</td>
<td>1961.9.73</td>
<td>Orazio Gentileschi and Giovanni Lanfranco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Guardi</td>
<td>1949.1.6</td>
<td>Follower of Francesco Guardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower of Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio</td>
<td>1939.1.159</td>
<td>Pensionante del Saraceni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed to Marco Ricci</td>
<td>1970.17.132</td>
<td>After Marco Ricci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed to Titian</td>
<td>1960.6.39</td>
<td>Pietro Della Vecchia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower of Canaletto</td>
<td>1945.15.1</td>
<td>Venetian 18th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower of Canaletto</td>
<td>1945.15.2</td>
<td>Venetian 18th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Artist and Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.24</td>
<td>Giovanni Paolo Panini, Interior of the Pantheon, Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.62</td>
<td>Giuseppe Maria Crespi, Cupids Disarming Sleeping Nymphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.63</td>
<td>Pietro Longhi, The Faint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.64</td>
<td>Pietro Longhi, The Game of the Cooking Pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.71</td>
<td>Sebastiano Ricci, A Miracle of Saint Francis of Paola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.72</td>
<td>Sebastiano Ricci, The Exaltation of the True Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.88</td>
<td>Workshop of Domenico Fetti, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.100</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Study for a Ceiling with the Personification of Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.102</td>
<td>Giuseppe Ghislandi, Portrait of a Young Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.107</td>
<td>Pietro Rotari, A Sleeping Girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.108</td>
<td>Pietro Rotari, A Girl with a Flower in Her Hair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.113</td>
<td>Francesco Guardi, View on the Cannaregio Canal, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.129</td>
<td>Francesco Guardi, Temporary Tribune in the Campo San Zanipolo, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.159</td>
<td>Pensionante del Saraceni, Still Life with Fruit and Carafe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.191</td>
<td>Tanzio da Varallo, Saint Sebastian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939.1.365</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Scene from Ancient History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942.9.7</td>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto, The Campo di SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942.9.27</td>
<td>Francesco Guardi, Grand Canal with the Rialto Bridge, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943.4.27</td>
<td>Alessandro Magnasco, The Baptism of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943.4.31</td>
<td>Alessandro Magnasco, Christ at the Sea of Galilee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943.4.32</td>
<td>Sebastiano Ricci, The Last Supper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943.4.39</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy under Charles III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943.4.40</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Madonna of the Goldfinch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943.4.50</td>
<td>Francesco Guardi, Capriccio of a Harbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945.15.1</td>
<td>Venetian 18th Century, Procession in the Courtyard of the Ducal Palace, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945.15.2</td>
<td>Venetian 18th Century, Procession of Gondolas in the Bacino di San Marco, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945.15.3</td>
<td>Canaletto, The Square of Saint Mark's, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945.15.4</td>
<td>Canaletto, Entrance to the Grand Canal from the Molo, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946.6.1</td>
<td>Tiberio Tinelli, Lodovico Widmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949.1.6</td>
<td>Follower of Francesco Guardi, Rialto Bridge, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.7</td>
<td>Domenico Fetti, The Veil of Veronica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.30</td>
<td>Giuseppe Maria Crespi, Tarquin and Lucretia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.58</td>
<td>Annibale Carracci, River Landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.59</td>
<td>Annibale Carracci, The Dream of Saint Catherine of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.70</td>
<td>Giuseppe Angeli, Elijah Taken Up in a Chariot of Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.77</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Young Lady in a Tricorn Hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952.5.78</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Apollo Pursuing Daphne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956.9.2</td>
<td>Francesco Guardi, Fanciful View of the Castel Sant'Angelo, Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956.9.16</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Saint Roch Carried to Heaven by Angels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958.7.1</td>
<td>Follower of Francesco Guardi, The Square of Saint Mark's, Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960.6.36</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, Bacchus and Ariadne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960.6.39</td>
<td>Pietro Della Vecchia, Imaginary Self-Portrait of Titian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961.9.6</td>
<td>Donato Creti, Alexander the Great Threatened by His Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961.9.9</td>
<td>Annibale Carracci, Venus Adorned by the Graces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>Guercino, <em>Cardinal Francesco Cennini</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>Bernardo Strozzi, <em>Bishop Alvise Grimani</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, <em>Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>Canaletto, <em>The Porta Portello, Padua</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>Sebastiano Ricci and Marco Ricci, <em>Memorial to Admiral Sir Clowdisley Shovell</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto and Workshop, <em>Nymphenburg Palace, Munich</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto and Workshop, <em>View of Munich</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>Orazio Gentileschi and Giovanni Lanfranco, <em>Saint Cecilia and an Angel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>Antonio Maria Vassallo, <em>The Larder</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Orazio Gentileschi, <em>The Lute Player</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Canaletto, <em>English Landscape Capriccio with a Column</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Canaletto, <em>English Landscape Capriccio with a Palace</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Gian Antonio Guardi and Francesco Guardi, <em>Carlo and Ubaldo Resisting the Enchantments of Armida’s Nymphs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Gian Antonio Guardi and Francesco Guardi, <em>Erminia and the Shepherds</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Giovanni Paolo Panini, <em>Interior of Saint Peter’s, Rome</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>17.132</td>
<td>After Marco Ricci, <em>View of the Mall in Saint James’s Park</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Alessandro Magnasco, <em>The Choristers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>Simone Cantarini, <em>Saint Matthew and the Angel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Giuseppe Cesari, <em>Martyrdom of Saint Margaret</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Guercino, <em>Amnon and Tamar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Guercino, <em>Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>Jusepe de Ribera, <em>The Martyrdom of Saint Bartholomew</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>Luca Giordano, <em>Diana and Endymion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Bernardo Bellotto, <em>The Fortress of Königstein</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>