CHAPTER 13

TRENDS IN HIGH BAROQUE SCULPTURE

ROME

The First Generation

HIGH BAROQUE sculpture came into its own with the full expansion of Bernini's studio. This, however, did not happen until the mid 1640s, when Bernini had to face the gigantic task of decorating the pilasters and chapels of St Peter's.[1] The building up of the studio began, of course, at a much earlier date. It was the Baldacchino (Plate 56) that first required extensive help by other hands. In addition to the old Stefano Maderno, some promising sculptors of Bernini's own generation found employment here: his brother Luigi, Stefano Speranza, Duquesnoy, Giuliano Finelli, Andrea Bolgi, and the younger Giacomo Antonio Fancelli. Not much need be said about Luigi Bernini; he always remained a devoted amanuensis of his great brother, supported him in a number of enterprises (mainly in St Peter's), and never showed a personal style.[2] Nor shall I discuss Stefano Speranza. Bernini used him over a number of years and his only doubtful claim to fame is the weak and retrogressive relief on the sarcophagus of the Matilda monument. Finelli and Bolgi on the other hand were, after the great masters, the most distinguished sculptors of this generation.

Giuliano Finelli (1601–57) arrived in Rome in 1622 and was immediately taken on by Bernini as his first studio hand.[3] He did not come direct from his home town Carrara, but from Naples, where he had studied sculpture under Naccherino. Finelli's association with Bernini lasted only a few years; in 1626 another Carrarese, Andrea Bolgi (1605–56), who had worked in Florence with Pietro Tacca, settled in Rome together with his compatriot Francesco Baratta, and soon attracted Bernini's attention. When, in 1629, the commissions for the four giant statues in the pillars of St Peter's were placed, Bernini recommended him in preference to Finelli. This virtually spelt the end of Finelli's career in Rome; and although he was not without work[4] (mainly due to the good offices of Pietro da Cortona) he soon went back to Naples, where he built up a large practice[5] in spite of Cosimo Fanzago's attempts to get rid of the dangerous rival. While in Naples Finelli maintained contact with Rome; and it was from Naples that he sent to Rome the tomb of Cardinal Domenico Ginnasi, to which we shall return later. In his youth, Finelli had thoroughly absorbed Bernini's grand manner. In Naples he progressively lost his sense for the finesse and subtlety of texture; his style became hard and coarse. This cannot be regarded simply as a degeneration into provincialism of a talented artist removed from the spiritual centre, Rome; it is after all what happened *mutatis mutandis* to the work of a great many artists during the 1630s and 40s, but in most cases the 'petrifaction' lay in the direction of a strengthened classicism. After his return to Rome at the end of his life, Finelli went even further in the same direction. Like Mochi in his last phase, he entirely lost interest in pleasing, warm, or sensuous surface qualities.[6]

While Finelli worked fast in Naples, executing considerable commissions, the sluggish Bolgi, the driest among Bernini's protégés, spent the better part of ten years on his statue of St Helena (1629–39; Plate 113A).[7] Its classicizing coolness, its boring precision and slow linear rhythm would seem to run counter to Bernini's dynamic conception of mass, of which an echo may be felt in the great sweep of the mantle. One might therefore rashly conclude that Bernini and Bolgi had parted company. On the contrary, however, Bolgi's style shows remarkable affinities to Bernini's work at this period. The *St Helena* is in fact so close to Bernini's *Countess Matilda* (1633–7) that the latter has often been ascribed to Bolgi. We have seen (pp. 98–9) that during the 1630s Bernini himself made concessions to the classical ideals held by the Poussin–Sacchi circle. It is therefore understandable that at this period he regarded Bolgi as one of his most reliable assistants.[8] He still employed him in St Peter's throughout the 1640s; but by then a new generation had arisen which responded enthusiastically to Bernini's new ideas. Before 1653 Bolgi went to Naples, and some of his work there shows a rather forced attempt to emulate Bernini's vigorous Baroque of the mid century.[9]

Among the remaining sculptors of this generation has been mentioned the unstable Francesco Baratta (*c.* 1590–1666), author of the relief above the altar in the Cappella Raimondi, S. Pietro in Montorio, and of one of the giant figures (Rio della Plata) on the Four Rivers Fountain in the Piazza Navona. Finally, Nicolò Menghini (*c.* 1610–65) should be recorded; he worked for Bernini in St Peter's during the 1640s and restored classical statues in the Palazzo Barberini. His name survives as the artist of the unsatisfactory figure of S. Martina (1635) under the high altar of SS. Martina e Luca, one of the many recumbent statues of martyrs dependent on Stefano Maderno's *St Cecilia*.[10]

This survey has shown that, apart from Bernini, Algardi, and Duquesnoy, in the second quarter of the seventeenth century the number of gifted sculptors in Rome was small. Of course, it must not be forgotten that the aged Mochi lived and worked throughout this period, and that Stefano Maderno died only in 1636. It is apparent that for the greatest task of the second quarter, the giant statues in the pillars under the dome of St Peter's, Bernini, Duquesnoy, and Mochi were the obvious choice; for the fourth figure the choice lay between Finelli and Bolgi, no better masters being at hand since Algardi's reputation had not yet been sufficiently established. This situation changed considerably about the middle of the century. The next generation was rich in talent, although there was none who approached in quality and importance the pathfinders of the High Baroque.

The Second Generation

Among the many young sculptors working in 1650, there are three or four who stand out either by the intrinsic merits of their work or as heads of large studios. Their names are Ercole Ferrata (1610–86), the oldest of this group, Antonio Raggi (1624–86), and Domenico Guidi (1625–1701). The fourth sculptor who should here be mentioned is

Ferrata's pupil Melchiorre Caffà. Born in Malta as late as 1635, Caffà really belongs to a Late Baroque generation. But he was extremely precocious and died at the early age of thirty-two (in 1667)[11] – too young to carry the style over into its new phase. Without any doubt, he was the most gifted of the younger sculptors, and nobody came as close as he did to the exalted style of Bernini's later period. The principal works which he executed in the short span of less than ten years are quickly mentioned; they are the *Ecstasy of St Catherine* in the choir of S. Caterina da Siena a Monte Magnanapoli (Plate 114), *St Thomas of Villanova distributing Alms* (S. Agostino; Plate 113B), the relief of *St Eustace in the Lion's Den* (S. Agnese in Piazza Navona), and the recumbent figure of *St Rosa* in S. Domingo at Lima, Peru.[12] These works, all of considerable size, were executed concurrently over a number of years; but it seems that only the *St Catherine in Ecstasy* was entirely finished by Caffà himself before his death.[13] The saint, in mystic exaltation, is carried heavenwards on clouds supported by angels. Higher up the sky opens (i.e., in the lantern), and a crowd of angels and putti play in the heavenly light, out of which the Trinity floats down in a radiant glory to receive the saint. The thaumaturgic character of the mystery has been emphasized by contrasting the white marble of the saint and her angelic companions with the multicoloured marble background.

It seems certain that the whole choir was to form a grand unit comprising reliefs along the side walls, which death prevented him from executing.[14] Caffà utilized fully the ideas of Bernini's Cornaro Chapel and, indeed, no other work is so close in spirit to the *St Teresa*. There is, however, a significant difference between master and disciple: an almost morbid sensibility emanates from the relief of St Catherine, and this can never be said of any of Bernini's works. This difference seems to be one of generation rather than of personal temperament, for the younger artist was able to use freely those formulas of expression which the older one had to create.

The *Ecstasy of St Catherine* belongs to the new Berninesque category of a pictorial group attached to the wall. In his *St Thomas of Villanova* Caffà produced a free-standing group which is closely integrated with the entire scheme of the chapel. The work forms the centre of a large sculptured 'altarpiece', the wings of which consist of reliefs by Andrea Bergondi (*c.* 1760) showing scenes from the life of the saint. Unlike Algardi's *Beheading of St Paul* (Plate 99), where two isolated figures are deployed in the same plane, Caffà's composition not only ties together very closely the saint and the woman receiving alms, but by placing the latter outside the central niche and turning her towards the saint, he has made her function as a link between real life and the fictitious world of art. Instead of adoring a cult image, the poor who pray here are stimulated to identify themselves with the recipient of the alms and to participate in the charitable work of the Church 'in action'. But the female figure is not an anonymous woman of the people – by an act of poetical identification of the donor with the recipient, she appears herself in the traditional role of Charity. For the composition of his group Caffà followed a pictorial model, namely Romanelli's painting of the same scene in the Convent of S. Agostino. The figures, by contrast, take their cue from Bernini, as the very attractive terracotta model, Plate 113B, shows: the saint is indebted to the church fathers of the Cathedra, and the 'Charity' to the corresponding group on the tomb of Urban VIII.[15] But once again these figures display a hypersensitive spirituality, in comparison with which Bernini's works appear solid, firm, and virile.

Apart from technical skill, Caffà could have learned little from his infinitely less subtle teacher, Ercole Ferrata, who was born at Pelsotto, near Como, and worked at Naples[16] and Aquila before settling in Rome. What has survived of his early work is provincial and of little interest. He was already middle-aged when we find him in Rome, working under Bernini on the marble decoration of the pillars of St Peter's (1647). Contrary to a persistent tradition, he cannot have executed one of the allegories for Algardi's tomb of Leo XI, nor is it certain that he collaborated on the Attila relief. By 1653 his reputation was such that Bernini entrusted him with the most important figure on the tomb of Cardinal Pimentel in S. Maria sopra Minerva – that of the Cardinal himself. Ferrata was given preference here over the younger Antonio Raggi and the less distinguished Giovan Antonio Mari, each of whom executed one of the allegories in full relief.[17] A year or two later he had the main share in continuing, after Algardi's death, the latter's work for S. Nicolò da Tolentino, to which Guidi and Francesco Baratta also contributed. During the following fifteen years Bernini showed his appreciation of Ferrata's skill by employing him on a number of great undertakings;[18] in spite of such close contacts, however, Ferrata never fully absorbed Bernini's dynamic style but tended towards a classicism of Algardian derivation.

Characteristic works by Ferrata are in S. Agnese in Piazza Navona, where one can study the different manners of the four masters with whom we are at present concerned. Ferrata's free-standing statue of *St Agnes on the Pyre* (1660; Plate 119A) recalls in certain respects Duquesnoy's *St Susanna*, for here too the dress is relatively unruffled and supports the structure of the body, while the head derives as much from Duquesnoy as from classical Niobids. But no artist working in 1660 in Bernini's orbit could return to Duquesnoy's classical purity of 1630. Following the example of Bernini's statues of saints, Ferrata represented a transitory moment; we witness a dramatic climax: the power of her prayer makes the saint immune against the leaping flames. The gesture of the extended arms, the painterly treatment of the fire, the wind-swept gown – all these create a formal and emotional unrest, strongly contrasting with the purist tendencies of the 1630s. Along the left side of the figure will be noticed an autonomous piece of drapery, which Ferrata borrowed from Bernini's *Longinus*. The motif is only a weak echo of the original; it remains alien to the form and spirit of the statue and is a revealing pointer to the derivative quality of Ferrata's art.

The study of a relief, the large *Stoning of S. Emerenziana* in the same church (begun 1660; Plate 115), leads to similar conclusions. In accordance with current classical theory (p. 171) Ferrata composed his work with a minimum number of figures, each clearly differentiated by action, gesture, and expression. The clean and simple tripartite arrangement with the attackers on the right, the frightened people on the left, and the saint isolated in the centre seems to result from a dogmatic application of Algardi's principles. While the type of the saint again shows a close study of Duquesnoy's Susanna, and while certain figures are evidently inspired by the Attila relief, Ferrata reverts for the figures of the attackers to the most classical of Baroque painters, Domenichino, whose *Stoning of*

St Stephen (now at Chantilly) must have been known to him.[19] The reader may have noticed that the sculptural principles displayed in the upper half of the relief contrast with those of the lower half. The figures – particularly that of the huge shapeless angel – not only have different proportions, small heads and elongated bodies, but masses of picturesque drapery conceal the structure of the bodies, and the diffuse silhouettes entirely lack Ferrata's clarity and precision. It is evident that Ferrata was not responsible for this part of the relief; after his death it was handed over to Leonardo Retti,[20] who finished it between 1689 and 1709, and only in this year were the two parts of the relief joined. Retti, Ferrata's pupil, worked many years under Raggi; thus the stylistic difference in the two halves of the Emerenziana relief is characteristic of the two different tendencies represented by Ferrata and Raggi and even more of the chronological change from the High Baroque to the picturesque and discursive manner of the Late Baroque.

In certain respects, Antonio Raggi represents the opposite pole to Ferrata. If Ferrata is the Algardi, Raggi is the Bernini of the second generation. Fourteen years younger than Ferrata, he also was born in the region of Como, at Vico Morcote; in contrast to Ferrata, he went to Rome in early youth and joined Algardi's studio. Little is known of his activity under Algardi[21] and, like Ferrata, we meet him first in 1647 engaged under Bernini on the decoration of the pilasters of St Peter's. Subsequently he became Bernini's most intimate and most prolific pupil, and with the exception of Caffà there was nobody who so fully absorbed the master's grand manner. In addition to his extensive activity under Bernini over a period of thirty years,[22] Raggi carried on independent work of great importance, among which the following deserve special mention: the relief with the *Death of St Cecilia* in S. Agnese (1660–7; Plate 116A), the large *Baptism of Christ* on the high altar of S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini (*c.* 1665), the vast cycle of stucco decorations in the clerestory of the nave and transept of the Gesù (1669–83; Plate 116B), the relief and statues of the Cappella Ginetti in S. Andrea della Valle (1671–5), and finally, at the beginning of the 1680s, the Gastaldi monument and the decoration of the high altar in S. Maria de' Miracoli.

It is difficult to give an adequate idea of the high quality of Raggi's sculpture without illustrating many details.[23] His genius was particularly suited to work in stucco, and the marble relief in S. Agnese is perhaps not his most engaging performance. But it commands special interest for a number of reasons. Originally, Giuseppe Peroni (*c.* 1626–63), one of the closest collaborators of Algardi, was commissioned with the relief (1660). Peroni died when the full-scale model was finished. Raggi, who was asked to take over, appears not to have entirely discarded Peroni's preparatory work; the left half of the relief in particular, with the standing figure of Pope Urban (who was present when the martyr saint died surrounded by Christians) and his kneeling attendant, corresponds closely to Algardi's Attila relief. Here, too, we find the division in the centre, and the differentiation between the calm faith of the pope and the emotional crowd on the right. This is as far as Algardi's influence goes. Raggi's individual manner is apparent in the extremely elongated proportions of the figures, their slender build and elegant movements,[24] as well as in the fall of the draperies, which betray a nervous and restless temperament. This restlessness is also noticeable in the grouping of the figures. Unlike

Ferrata, Raggi rejected the lesson to be learned from Domenichino, whose classically poised fresco of the same subject in S. Luigi dei Francesi is not much farther than a stone's throw from S. Agnese. Compared with the lucid disposition of Ferrata's Emerenziana relief, the figures in Raggi's work appear crowded together in complicated, almost confused groups which reveal his disregard for the classical dogma of clarity expressed through a minimum number of figures. On the other hand, the beautiful angel with the martyr's palm, thoroughly Berninesque and obviously derived from the contemporary glory of angels on the Cathedra, shows the sweetness and tenderness of feeling characteristic of Raggi's art. These qualities, perhaps less obvious in other parts of the relief, can be observed in a great number of his works and often seem like anticipations of the lighter charms of the eighteenth century. The story of Raggi's St Cecilia relief illustrates the futility of attempting a rigid separation of the Berninesque from the Algardesque current; at the time such contrasts were not of sufficient consequence to prevent a commission's being transferred from the follower of one master to that of the other.

In his later work, especially in his stuccoes, Raggi yielded wholly to the mystical late style of Bernini, and this phase in his development is best studied in the Gesù. According to contemporary sources, Gaulli, the painter of the frescoes, was also responsible for the design of the stuccoes. Whether this is entirely or only partly true, Raggi's stuccoes are a perfect sculptural parallel to Gaulli's intense response to Bernini's fervent, spiritualized late manner. The tempestuous movement and rapture of Raggi's jubilant putti on clouds, set into panels above the cornice of the nave and transept, must be understood as reactions to the main subject of the ceiling – the fresco of the *Adoration of the Name of Jesus*. As types, these putti owe not a little to Duquesnoy, but no greater contrast to the soothing composure of the latter's creations could be imagined. Higher up, flanking the windows, are allegories[25] of monumental size, wildly gesticulating or in attitudes of deep devotion and contemplation, clad in draperies that seem to follow their own laws, wind-blown, rearing, twisting, and zigzagging across the figures. Although many of them disclose a real understanding of the late Bernini, it will be found that others must be regarded as an anticlimax, since virtuosity replaces spirituality. In other words, in this cycle of figures the decorative quality of the Late Baroque appears side by side with the purposeful tension of the High Baroque.

With the exception of the sculptural decoration of St Peter's, which was carried out by many hands over a period of 150 years, there is no other Baroque sculptural cycle in Rome that bears comparison with Raggi's, executed in the short span of little more than a decade. In order to accomplish this *tour de force*, Raggi had to use assistants on an extensive scale, and this may account for the differences in quality. The allegories on the right-hand side of the nave are on the whole weaker than the ones on the left; they seem to be by Leonardo Retti, whose large share in the decoration of the Gesù is well attested. Other collaborators were Michele Maglia (right transept) and the worthy Paolo Naldini, who was thoroughly trained in Bernini's studio and was mentioned by Bernini himself as the best sculptor in Rome after Antonio Raggi.[26]

Ferrata and Raggi stand for rival trends without being antagonists. The case of Domenico Guidi is different. It is characteristic of him that he never went through

Bernini's school; and he was probably the only important artist of his generation whose services were rarely sought by Bernini. In addition, he did not often participate in common undertakings with Ferrata and Raggi but concentrated on building up a large clientele of his own. Born in Carrara, he followed his uncle Giuliano Finelli to Naples; his career really began when, at the age of twenty-two, he fled to Rome at the time of Masaniello's revolt and joined the studio of Algardi. There he remained as a favourite pupil until the latter's death in 1654, after which he established an independent studio and evolved a rule-of-thumb method for quick success. He surrounded himself with a staff of mere craftsmen, and with their help he was able to work more quickly and more cheaply than the *professori* whom he despised. By such methods, Guidi managed to pour out a stream of works, not only for Rome and the rest of Italy,[27] but also for Germany, France, Spain, and Malta.

His early works, such as the monument to Natale Rondinini in S. Maria del Popolo (1657), are dry versions of Algardi's prototypes. During the 1650s and 60s he still shows interest in solid and careful execution, but his productions during the last quarter of the century display, with few exceptions, an unpleasant crudeness and rigidity. His figures become stocky and are criss-crossed by angularly broken masses of drapery. It was he who was mainly responsible for the change from the Roman High Baroque to the new Late Baroque idiom – a change well illustrated in his large relief over the altar of the Cappella Monte di Pietà (1667–76; Plate 118A). In this work, Algardi's painterly relief style has been submitted to an interesting transformation. Compared with other works by Guidi, the composition, rising in a great curve from the kneeling Magdalen at the right bottom corner to the figure of God the Father at the top, is not without merits; but there is no discrimination between the degrees of spiritual importance of the holy personages, nor are the single figures sufficiently articulated to enable the beholder to follow their movements with confidence and ease, or even to decide whether drapery belongs to one figure or to another. And no longer are the superhuman and the human sphere separated. The plane of the relief is covered by figures without much qualifying differentiation, resulting in a flickering farrago of plastic form. Algardi had worked back into depth starting from the principal figures, which stand out almost three-dimensionally and thus hold the interest of the spectator. Guidi, by contrast, gave most of the figures equal relief projections, leading to a neutralization of the dramatic focus. It is mainly this change from a painterly, illusionistic relief conception to a 'picturesque' one, reminiscent of Late Antique sarcophagi, that accounts for the unaccentuated distribution of sculptural form over the surface.

Looking back from the new position, Algardi's Attila relief seems to have a powerful, dynamic quality. And although there are always close ties between Guidi and Algardi as regards individual forms and types, the slackened tension of the former's work is characteristic of a new period in which the passion of the High Baroque has grown cold. The breaking-down of the High Baroque sense of unity and drama may be observed not only in other works by Guidi but also, of course, in contemporary productions in the other arts. Guidi himself played a leading part in effecting this transition, of which hardly an indication was to be found in the works of Ferrata and Raggi.

Tombs with the Effigy in Prayer

Before turning to the minor masters of this period, we may single out for special consideration the most common type of the High Baroque tomb showing the portrait of the deceased, who turns in devotional attitude towards the altar. The best-known tomb of this type is that of the physician Gabriele Fonseca, one of the most moving works of the late Bernini (*c.* 1668–75, S. Lorenzo in Lucina; Plate 117B). Fonseca's fervent devotion and spiritual surrender are called forth by the mystery of the Annunciation, painted above the altar; thus an intangible bond between Fonseca and the altar bridges the space in which the beholder moves. This idea first occurs in tombs of the fifteenth century, and from then on may be found in Spain, France, Germany, and the Low Countries.[28] With the exception of Spanish Naples, however, the type was rare in Italy, and it was not until well into the sixteenth century that the bust with praying hands turned towards the altar began to appear in Rome. The series starts with the impressive Elena Savelli by Giacomo del Duca in S. Giovanni in Laterano (1570) [29] and leads on, before the end of the century, to such works as Valsoldo's simple and sturdy Cardinal Giovan Girolamo Albani in S. Maria del Popolo (1591).[30] Bernini first took up the type in his early bust of Cardinal Bellarmine (1622, Gesù), whose slight turn of the face in the opposite direction from the praying hands suggests a link between the congregation and the altar.

The next step in the evolution of the High Baroque type is, unexpectedly perhaps, due to Algardi in the Millini tomb in S. Maria del Popolo (*c.* 1630): the figure of the deceased cardinal is distinctly turned towards the altar, one hand clasping the prayer-book, the other pressed to his chest in the traditional gesture of devotion. Moreover, the large rectangular tablet of the inscription serves as a parapet,[31] and, although no real illusion is here attempted or achieved, Bellori's description of the tomb shows that contemporaries were reminded of 'a kneeling figure which turns praying towards the altar'. Giuliano Finelli developed the idea further in the tomb of Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santorio (Plate 117A), placed in Onorio Longhi's large oval chapel in S. Giovanni in Laterano, dating from the early 1630s, probably just before the artist went to Naples. It is here that the figure really seems to kneel behind a prie-dieu, resting his praying hands on the cushion. The Algardesque realism of the surface treatment supports the illusion of real life. And with this goes a bolder movement of the figure towards the altar and an intensified expression of devotion. About ten years later, Finelli made the tomb of Cardinal Domenico Ginnasi for the little church of S. Lucia dei Ginnasi.[32] Although the handling is less refined, the work must be regarded as a further step towards the consolidation of the type. Finelli returned to the gestures of Algardi's Millini, but the figure is leaning out of the niche in deep agitation, the mouth half open as if murmuring a prayer. Thus while the stone image of the dead appears in the attitude of everlasting adoration, a transient moment in his relationship with the Divine has been caught. This was the end of the development, and in future the type could only be varied. Bernini's *Fonseca* complied with it, and numberless busts in Roman chapels testify to a trend of devout piety during the Catholic Restoration. Such works began to become rarer, however, with the slackening of religious fervour at the end of the seventeenth century.

Before this happened the theme was extended, and in Gesù e Maria an entire church instead of a chapel became the field of action for the deceased. Giorgio Bolognetti, Bishop of Rieti, commissioned the work. He financed the splendid decoration and had the whole church turned into a kind of mausoleum for members of his family. Carlo Rainaldi unified the entire space not only architecturally but also colouristically; its black, brown, and reddish marbles, interrupted by the flicker of the white figures, form perhaps the last sonorous High Baroque colour symphony.[33] Sculpture was assigned a place on the two pairs of broad pillars above the confessionals; the pillars near the entrance contain double tombs with lively gesticulating half-figures behind prie-dieus, while behind those nearer the altar kneel single full-size figures. All these portrayals of the Bolognetti turn their attention to the gorgeous altar with Giacinto Brandi's *Coronation of the Virgin*. The statues are placed before a small-scale, columned architecture suggesting the opening into imaginary spaces, and above them, like heavenly protectors, are large stucco figures of saints in simple niches. As in Bernini's Cappella Cornaro there are here no sarcophagi, and hardly anything is reminiscent of death: the illusion was to be as complete as possible. The six deceased are represented in finely differentiated stages of religious enthusiasm. Near the entrance the visitor meets those who look and listen, prepare themselves for prayer, or are absorbed in colloquy about the eucharistic miracle on the altar (Plate 118B); proceeding towards the altar, he finds himself face to face with Bishop Giorgio Bolognetti, the donor, kneeling in silent prayer, and with the Maltese knight Francesco Mario, who sinks upon his knee with gestures of profound devotion. But if one compares these figures by Michele Maglia, Francesco Aprile, and Francesco Cavallini with Bernini's *Fonseca*, one cannot overlook that they carry considerably less conviction, and that the most excited of them, Francesco Mario, the one closest in style to the late Bernini, appears almost melodramatic in his reverential exuberance.[34] The spatial conceptions of the High Baroque found in this church a triumphant realization, but the religious feeling which had carried them began to flag.

The connexion across space between figures and the altar, as developed during the Roman High Baroque, weaves together art and life and effaces the most powerful boundary of all, the one that separates life from death. Nowhere else can one pinpoint so clearly the paradoxical situation of the Baroque age: it is the dead who invite the living to join in their prayers, and while the dead seem alive and the living emotionally prepared to accept the elimination of the borderline between fiction and reality, they yet remain always conscious that commemorative portraits greet them from the walls.

Minor Masters of the later Seventeenth Century

Two of the artists responsible for the Bolognetti monuments, Aprile and Maglia, were Ferrata's pupils. There were no sculptors of importance in Guidi's studio; [35] nor was Raggi the head of a school.[36] The opposite is true of Ferrata: as well as Caffà, Retti, and the artists just mentioned, Filippo Carcani, Giuseppe Mazzuoli, Lorenzo Ottoni, the

Florentine Giovan Battista Foggini, the Milanese Giuseppe Rusnati, and even Camillo Rusconi were among his pupils.[37] But Ferrata was not a great enough artist to give his school a personal stamp; most of the work turned out by his studio consisted of variations of the Berninesque idiom. The majority of his pupils belong to a later generation, and a word about them will therefore be reserved for another chapter. Francesco Aprile died young, in 1685,[38] so that it fell to his teacher Ferrata to finish his masterpiece, the recumbent statue of St Anastasia under the high altar of the church of that name, a statue in which the type of Maderno's St Cecilia was translated into the forms of Bernini's late manner. Maglia, whose earliest known works date from about 1672, adhered more closely to the manner of his master. His principal work is the decoration of the beautiful chapel in S. Maria in Araceli dedicated to St Peter of Alcantara (1682–4),[39] where above the altar the ecstatic saint hovers in the air before a vision of the Cross, while on the side walls life-size angels carry medallions with reliefs of St Stephen and St Ranieri. The convincing spirituality of these figures and the free transitions between sculpture and space make this work a legitimate descendant of Bernini's Cornaro Chapel.

Maglia often collaborated with Francesco Cavallini, an able decorator who was the third chief contributor to the sculptural decoration of Gesù e Maria. The over-life-size stucco statues of saints in S. Carlo al Corso (1678–82) were his largest commission; these are uneven in quality and on the whole show close affinities with Raggi's turbulent style. Cavallini, however, came neither from Ferrata nor Raggi; he was a pupil of Cosimo Fancelli (1620?–88), the more important brother of Giacomo Antonio (1619–71) whom we saw employed, in spite of his youth, on the Baldacchino. After beginning his career under Bernini in St Peter's, Cosimo attached himself to Pietro da Cortona; and wherever we find the latter working as architect and decorator, Cosimo Fancelli is sure to be near at hand. Thus there is decorative sculpture by him in SS. Martina e Luca (1648–50), S. Maria della Pace (1656), S. Maria in Via Lata (*c.* 1660), S. Carlo al Corso (after 1665), in the Cappella Gavotti in S. Nicolò da Tolentino (1668), and on the vaulting of the Chiesa Nuova (1662–5). After Cortona's death he still took part in a variety of important tasks, and since he was one of the most distinguished sculptors in Rome Bernini transferred to him the execution of an angel for the Ponte S. Angelo. This angel (1668–9; Plate 119B) shows, in the somewhat voluptuous forms and the type of the head, how indebted Fancelli was to Cortona while at the same time he paid tribute to the current Berninesque manner. Uneven in his work, he often attempted to reconcile Cortona's and Bernini's manners with an emphatic simplicity of forms which he shared with Ferrata, his collaborator on more than one occasion. It is often difficult, therefore, to distinguish between their work.[40]

The angels on the Ponte S. Angelo enable the student to assess the position of Roman sculpture in the year 1670. Bernini naturally employed the sculptors with the highest reputation and those of whom he was particularly fond. As well as the angels for which he was himself responsible, we find – as we should expect – angels by Ferrata, Raggi, and Guidi; there are those by his closest circle, Lazzaro Morelli, Giulio Cartari, and Paolo Naldini; finally there is the angel by Cosimo Fancelli, and there are others by

Antonio Giorgetti and Girolamo Lucenti.[41] Gioseppe Giorgetti,[42] Antonio's brother, left one masterpiece of great beauty: the recumbent *St Sebastian* in S. Sebastiano fuori le Mura – yet another version of Maderno's St Cecilia type – a statue derived from Michelangelo's Dying Slave in the Louvre and imbued with an exquisite Hellenistic flavour. Girolamo Lucenti (1627–92) began as a pupil of Algardi, whose influence is still traceable in the relatively unemotional angel on the Ponte S. Angelo. His tomb of Cardinal Girolamo Gastaldi (1685–6) in the choir of S. Maria de' Miracoli shows him as a weak imitator of Raggi's manner; while the bronze statue of Philip IV of Spain, under the portico of S. Maria Maggiore, dating from the last years of Lucenti's life, is hardly a shadow of the one planned by Bernini in 1667.[43]

Looking back for a moment from the statues on the Ponte S. Angelo to those placed forty years earlier under the dome of St Peter's, we realize that, in contrast to the earlier highly personal and subjective performance, we are faced with the work of epigones among whom Bernini appears like a solitary giant. His intense High Baroque did not only have an equalizing influence on most of these masters of the younger generation but also reduced their capacity for individual expression, and perhaps even their desire to attain it.

Bernini's Studio and the Position of Sculptors in Rome

The last remark indicates that for good or evil Bernini's influence on the sculptors in Rome during the second half of the seventeenth century cannot be overestimated. After Algardi's death in 1654 there was, in fact, nobody seriously to challenge his authority. I cannot attempt here to reconstruct the organization and working of the studio. Suffice it to say that it became the attraction for artists from all over Europe, and such sculptors as the Englishman Nicholas Stone the younger, the Frenchman Puget,[44] and the German Permoser laid there the foundation for their future work. Nearer home, year by year a stream of masons and sculptors, particularly from the North of Italy, went to Rome, stimulated less by the idea of acquiring there a great style than by the hope of getting a share in the gigantic commissions the Church had to offer. More often than not they were utterly disappointed, and sculptors were lucky if they found a corner for themselves in Bernini's vast organization or in one of the studios more or less dependent on him. Willy-nilly they had to submit to the established hierarchy.

The fate of the competent Lazzaro Morelli (1608–90) may be quoted as one example of many. He came to Rome from Ascoli, but in spite of excellent letters of introduction everything seemed to go wrong, and his biographer, Pascoli, makes him exclaim bitterly: 'How much better would it have been for me to stay at home, where I did not and could not earn very much, but where, eventually, I would have taken first place amongst my colleagues.' In the end, Morelli shared the fate of so many others in becoming almost entirely dependent on Bernini for work. In fact Bernini must have regarded him as one of his most reliable studio hands, for he allotted to him tasks of great responsibility in the work on the Piazza of St Peter's,[45] the Cathedra, and the tomb of Alexander VII. Morelli maintained contact with his native town and became on his part the head of a school through which Bernini's manner spread in the Marches.[46] This is the typical constellation: it was by direct transmission rather than by the independent initiative of other masters that the style was disseminated throughout Italy and Europe. Since, as I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the great extension of the studio did not take place until the later 1640s, it will be apparent that Bernini's Baroque was taken up in the rest of Italy not until the second half and, as a rule, only during the last quarter of the century.

It was to a large extent due to Bernini's immense authority that the profession of a sculptor had become financially rewarding. To be sure, towards the middle of the seventeenth century there was an unparalleled boom for sculptors, and yet in spite of the years of prosperity the proletariat of artists remained large in Rome. In 1656 one hundred and eleven artists lived in the borough of Campo Marzio, and no less than fifty-three of them – i.e. almost 50 per cent – were registered as poor.[47] But quality was so highly valued that the top class of sculptors, and above all Bernini, were paid star salaries, even by modern standards. As early as 1633 an original statue by Bernini was estimated as being worth between four and five thousand scudi.[48] In 1651 Francis I of Este paid as much as 3,000 scudi for his portrait bust. This was, of course, exceptional, even for Bernini. In 1634 Algardi signed his contract for the tomb of Leo XI with a fee of 2,550 scudi, but at the time the tomb was finished, eighteen years later, when both the craving for sculpture and Algardi's reputation were at a climax, he was granted an additional 1,000 scudi. Such prices were not maintained from the late seventeenth century onwards. A good comparison is offered by the 7,000 scudi Bernini was paid in 1671 for his *Constantine* as against the 4,000 scudi Cornacchini received in 1725 for its counterpart, the equestrian statue of Charlemagne.[49]

SCULPTURE OUTSIDE ROME

It has already become apparent that not much need be said about the development of sculpture outside Rome. With Rome's supremacy incontestably established, Roman sculptors catered for the need of patrons all over Italy. Naples, vigorously active, had room even for Finelli and Bolgi. But as a rule figures and busts were sent from Rome. Bernini provided work for Spoleto, Siena, Modena, Venice, and Savona (school piece); Algardi for Genoa, Piacenza, Parma, Bologna, Perugia, and Valletta (Malta). Not Florentines or Sienese but Caffà, Ferrata, and Raggi gave Siena Cathedral monumental Seicento sculpture. Later, Giuseppe Mazzuoli, born near Siena, inundated Siena with Berninesque statuary. Ferrata also worked for Venice, Modena, and Naples; Raggi for Milan, Sassuolo, and Loreto; Naldini for Orvieto and Todi. There is no need to prolong this list.

It was not until late in the century that flourishing local schools sprang up in centres like Bologna, Genoa, and Venice. Apart from Milan with her conservative cathedral school of sculptors, a continuity was maintained only in Florence and Naples, due in each city mainly to the activity of one artist. Florentine sculpture did not enter a High Baroque phase even with Pietro Tacca's son, Ferdinando (1619–86), who remained Tuscan through and through. His bronze relief of the *Martyrdom of St Stephen* in S. Stefano, Florence (1656), points back via Francavilla and Giovanni Bologna to the illusionism of Ghiberti's Porta del Paradiso, while his fountain of the Bacchino at Prato (1665, now Museum), with the figure crowning the shaft and basin like a monument, is not developed far beyond Giovanni Bologna's prototypes in the Boboli Gardens. Compelling Baroque unification of parts remained foreign to Florentine artists. But the little bronze Bacchus on top of the fountain has High Baroque softness and roundness although one cannot overlook the faint family likeness to Verrocchio's putti. All too often the bronze relief of the Crucifixion in the Palazzo Pitti has been attributed to Pietro Tacca,[50] revealing an erroneous assessment of what was possible in Florence around 1640. As K. Lankheit has shown, the relief dates from 1675–7 and is by G. B. Foggini.[51] He at last exchanged the Florentine for the Roman relief style of the type of the reliefs at S. Agnese in Piazza Navona. The Roman High Baroque had made its entry into Florence.

Earlier than any other Italian city, Naples assimilated Roman High Baroque sculpture through the activity of Giuliano Finelli; and in the Lombard Cosimo Fanzago (p. 197) Naples had an autonomous Baroque sculptor. He began with works of late Mannerist classicism (1615–16, St Ignatius at Catanzaro; 1620, tomb of Michele Gentile, Cathedral, Barletta) and developed even before Finelli's arrival towards a High Baroque style (Plate 112B), certainly not without contacts with events in Rome. Yet in contrast to the true High Baroque masters in Rome, the versatile Fanzago was capable of using side by side two idioms which would seem mutually exclusive: the Tuscan Renaissance comes to life in the chaste *Immacolata* of the Cappella Reale (1640–6) while the Roman Baroque informs a figure like the Jeremiah (1646, Cappella S. Ignazio, Gesù Nuovo) with its masses of brittle folds, its luminous surface and strong *contrapposto* movement.[52] Although by training a sculptor and mainly active as an architect, Fanzago's most lasting achievement was probably in the field of semi-decorative art, such as his fountains and pulpits, his splendid bronze gates in S. Martino and the Cappella del Tesoro, and his many polychrome altars, where he wedded flourishing sculptural ornament to inlaid marble work. As early as the 1630s this manner was fully developed (1635, high altar, SS. Severino e Sosio, Naples), and there is reason to believe that it had considerable repercussions in the rest of Italy.[53] Even the decorative style of an architect like Juvarra seems to owe a good deal to Fanzago, and the question to what extent the roots of the Rococo ornament can be traced back to Fanzago, directly or indirectly, would need further careful investigation.

CHAPTER 14

HIGH BAROQUE PAINTING AND ITS AFTERMATH

ROME

Baroque Classicism – Archaizing Classicism – Crypto-Romanticism

THE preceding discussion of the Cortona–Sacchi controversy supplies the background to the development of painting in Rome during most of the second and third quarters of the seventeenth century. Painters had to side with one of the two opposing camps, and the general trend of their decision has already been indicated.

At the beginning of this period Rome harboured two immensely vigorous Baroque frescoes of singular importance, those by Lanfranco in the dome of S. Andrea della Valle and by Cortona in the Gran Salone of the Palazzo Barberini. One would have thought that these masterpieces would immediately have led to a revolution in taste, even among the artists of second rank, and there cannot be any doubt about the impression they made. But Lanfranco soon left Rome and settled for about twelve years in Naples (1634–46), where he continued his dense and dramatic Baroque manner in a number of large fresco cycles (p. 230). When he returned to Rome (1646), shortly before his death, the climate had considerably changed, mainly due to the ascendancy of Andrea Sacchi. Between 1640 and 1647 Cortona too was absent from Rome, and this meant that Sacchi remained in full command of the situation.

It is for this reason that among the rank and file of artists born between 1600 and 1620 the pattern of development varies but little. Andrea Camassei (1602–48/9), Francesco Cozza (1605–82), Sassoferrato (1609–85), and Giovanni Domenico Cerrini (1609–81) stem mainly from Domenichino; G. F. Romanelli (*c.* 1610–62), Giacinto Gimignani (1611–81), and Paolo Gismondi (*c.* 1612–*c.* 1685), to name only a few, from Pietro da Cortona.[1] But Sacchi lined up all these painters behind him. It is characteristic that in the 1640s Camassei and Gimignani worked for him in the Baptistery of the Lateran, where also the young Maratti painted from the master's cartoons. Camassei, who disappointed the high hopes of his Barberini patrons, had a typical career; after his beginnings under Domenichino, he painted under Cortona in Castel Fusano, only to be associated with Sacchi towards the end of his brief life. With few exceptions his work is archaistic, like that of the whole group. In fact, Sassoferrato's stereotyped pictures of the Virgin and Child appeared so anachronistic that he was long taken for a follower of Raphael. Cozza is the most interesting and Romanelli the best-known of these practitioners who had their great moment in the decade before the mid century. While Cozza deserves being resuscitated from semi-obscurity (see below),[2] little need be said about Romanelli's career. Trained under Domenichino, he became Cortona's assistant on the Barberini ceiling, was permanently patronized by the Barberini, and was given commissions of considerable size which he executed not without decorative skill. It was he who introduced a watered-down and classicized version of Cortona's manner into Paris, where his mythological, allegorical, and historical frescoes in the gallery of the Hôtel Mazarin (1646–7)[3] and in several rooms of the Louvre (1655–7) reveal a facile routine, which is equally apparent in his Roman work of these years (frescoes, Palazzo Lante, 1653).

At the beginning of the 1630s these artists were still too young to contribute independently to important commissions. Only the oldest of them, Camassei, was allowed a share in the most interesting enterprise of this period, the decoration with paintings of S. Maria della Concezione (1631–8), undertaken on the initiative of Cardinal Antonio Barberini, the pope's brother. Here the older generation was given pride of place: Reni, Domenichino, and Lanfranco (two pictures)[4] painted mature masterpieces; the Florentine Mannerist Baccio Ciarpi, Cortona's teacher, contributed a picture as well as Alessandro Turchi (1578–1648) from Verona, who had made Rome his home and, after an early Caravaggesque phase, had moved far towards Bolognese classicism. Of the younger masters, in addition to Camassei, only Sacchi (two) and Cortona were commissioned. All in all, the church offers an excellent cross-section of the various trends of monumental easel painting in the 1630s: the old Bolognese classicism next to Sacchi's Baroque classicism and Reni's elegant and sublime late manner next to Lanfranco's and Cortona's full-blooded versions of the Baroque. The keynote of the latter's *Ananias healing St Paul of Blindness* (*c.* 1631) consists, rather typically, in a saturation of Raphaelesque reminiscences with Venetian colourism.

The reversal of values during the next decade, the return to a dry and archaizing Bolognese manner, the emphasis on design, and the almost complete turning away from Venetian colour will be found in such works as Sassoferrato's *Madonna del Rosario* (1643, S. Sabina), Cerrini's *Holy Family with St Agnes and St Catherine* (1642, S. Carlo alle Quattro Fontane), Gimignani's frescoes in S. Carlo ai Catinari (1641), and Romanelli's *Presentation in the Temple* (1638–42, S. Maria degli Angeli, from St Peter's).[5] One of the most extraordinary paintings of these years, shown on Plate 121B, illustrates this trend in absolute purity. Nazarene or Pre-Raphaelite paintings come to mind: this archaism seems to have a radical and therefore revolutionary quality. Even a man of a different calibre, the young Mattia Preti (1613–99), in spite of his originality and vigour, paints the frescoes in the apse of S. Andrea della Valle in 1650–1 essentially in the manner of Domenichino.

It is true that all these painters reflect as well as ossify in their work a development towards which Poussin, Sacchi, Algardi, and even Cortona tended, a development that had wide repercussions and links up with international Late Baroque classicism. Seen in proper perspective as an offshoot of Roman High Baroque classicism, this group of painters is therefore neither as anachronistic nor as revolutionary as it might appear.

In the meantime, the lower genre, the so-called Bambocciate (p. 45), to which Pieter van Laer had given rise, found scores of partisans. These 'Bamboccianti' had become a powerful coterie even before the 1640s; apart from Michelangelo Cerquozzi (1602–60), Viviano Codazzi (1611, not 1604, –72), and a few others,[6] they were however mainly northerners, among them Jan Miel, Jan Asselyn, Andries Both, Karel Dujardin, and Johannes Lingelbach. As early as 1623 the Dutch organized themselves in the Schildersbent,[7] a guild which guarded their interests but was at the same time a centre of Bohemian life in Rome. Just like their lives, their pictures, minute and intimate records of Roman street life, always in the cabinet format, seem unprincipled when compared with official painting in Rome. In their work these Bamboccianti would appear to represent the precise opposite to the conscious primitivism and classicism of the minor monumental painters. But the matter is not quite so simple. Codazzi's classically constructed *vedute*, which such painters as Miel, Micco Spadaro (p. 232), and, above all, Cerquozzi peopled with figures[8] (Plate 20B), show that the rift concerned the choice of subject matter rather than composition and design. It was the degraded subjects of the Bamboccianti against which the attacks from the classical camp were directed (p. 172). The critics, however, were unable to realize that, unlike themselves, the Bamboccianti, with their exploration of a vast field of human and visual experience, were fighting the battles of the future.

Moreover, precisely in the years of the ascendancy of the Sacchi clique, another 'unprincipled' artist, Bernini, began his bold experiments in painting which helped to break out of the cul-de-sac of classicist dogmatism. Two other, more intimate trends counterbalanced to a certain extent the rigidity of the archaizing group: a renewed interest in the representation of landscape and, not unconnected with this, the rise of a crypto- or quasi-romantic movement. These new departures are primarily connected with the names of Pier Francesco Mola (1612–66), Pietro Testa (1611[9]–50), and Salvator Rosa (1615–73); characteristically, none of these was in the first place a fresco painter. Mola began under the Cavaliere d'Arpino but received his direction for life from a prolonged stay at Venice. Not back in Rome until 1647,[10] he used in the following two decades a rich palette of warm brownish tones and created works in which once again the landscape element often forms the hub of the composition. He gave his best in small pictures which display a quite personal idyllic and even elegiac quality.[11] His masterpiece as a fresco painter, the *Joseph making himself known to his Brethren* in the Quirinal Palace (1657; Plate 122A),[12] reveals the specific problem of this group of artists. Even here the landscape plays a predominant part, but the organization of the painting with a figure composition as much indebted to Raphael as to Cortona exposes a tendency towards reconciliation with the prevailing classicism of the period.

In Testa's case the same conflict between an innate romanticism and the classical theories which he professed, takes on tragic proportions, for his brief career – he died at the age of about forty – probably ended by suicide.[13] Born at Lucca, he was in Rome before 1630, began studying with Domenichino, later worked with Cortona, and became one of the main collaborators of Cassiano del Pozzo (p. 152) in the 1630s and was thus drawn into Poussin's orbit. He was also closely associated with Mola. Passeri describes him as an extreme melancholic, bent on philosophical speculations, who found that work in black-and-white was more suitable than painting to express his fantastic mythological and symbolic conceptions. His etchings (Plate 123A)[14] have an abstruse emblematic quality and a poetical charm only matched by his Genoese contemporary, Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione (Plate 123B). It was Passeri's opinion that Testa outdistanced every painter by the variety and nobility of his ideas and the sublimity of his inventions.

The most unorthodox and extravagant of this group was certainly Salvator Rosa. Born in Naples, he began under his brother-in-law, Francesco Fracanzano, but soon exchanged him for Aniello Falcone. From the latter stems his interest in the battle-piece.[15] He was in Rome first in 1635, was back at Naples in 1637, and returned to Rome two years later. His Satire against Bernini during the Carnival of 1639 made the leading Roman artist a formidable enemy, and so, once again, Rosa left – this time for Florence, where he nursed his genius for over eight years, writing poems and satires, composing music, acting, and painting. His house became the centre of a sophisticated circle (Accademia dei Percossi). In 1649 he finally settled in Rome and now stayed till his death in 1673. A man of brilliant talent, but a rebel in perpetuity,[16] remorseless in his criticism of society, obsessed by a pre-romantic egotistic conception of genius, he took offence at being acclaimed as a painter of landscapes, marines, and battle-pieces. But it is on his achievement in this field rather than on his great historical compositions that his posthumous fame rests.[17] True to the Italian theoretical approach (p. 19), he regarded these 'minor' genres as a frivolous pastime. On the other hand, they gave him the chance of letting his hot temper run amok. Setting out from the Flemish landscape tradition of Paul and Mattheus Brill, many of his landscapes have their skies dark and laden, storms twist and turn the trees, melancholy lies over the crags and cliffs, buildings crumble into ruins, and banditti linger waiting for their prey. Painted with a tempestuous brownish and grey palette, these wild scenes were soon regarded as the opposite to Claude's enchanted elysiums. The eighteenth century saw in Salvator's and Claude's landscapes the quintessential contrast between the sublime and the beautiful. In Sir Joshua Reynolds's words, Claude conducts us 'to the tranquillity of Arcadian scenes and fairy land', while Rosa's style possesses 'the power of inspiring sentiments of grandeur and sublimity'.

Yet it must be emphasized that the romantic quality of Rosa's landscapes is superimposed on a classical structure, a recipe of 'landscape making' which he shares with the classicists. The example on Plate 122B [18] shows the repoussoir trunk and tree left and right in the foreground, the classical division into three distances, the careful balancing of light and dark areas. In addition, the arc of the group of figures, which represent the Finding of Moses, fits harmoniously into the undulating terrain, is 'protected' by the larger arc of the tree, and given prominence by the silvery storm-clouds of the background. Based on accepted formulas, such landscapes were carefully devised in the studio; they are, moreover, 'landscapes of thought', because more often than not the figures belong to mythology or the Bible and tie the genre, sometimes by a tender link, to the great tradition of Italian painting. The quasi-romantic approach to landscape painting was shared to a lesser extent by Mola and Testa and, while the work of the minor classicists of this period was soon almost forgotten, Rosa's new landscape style opened horizons of vast consequences.[19]

It was during the very years of the rise of the 'romantic' landscape that Poussin and Claude developed their formulas of the heroic and ideal landscape and that landscapes *al fresco* were once again admitted to palace and church; and it is a memorable fact that in the late 1640s and early 1650s Poussin's brother-in-law, Gaspar Dughet (1615–75), whose early manner – not uninfluenced by Salvator – may be described as half-way between the classical and romantic conception of landscape, painted the cycle of monumental landscapes with scenes from the lives of Elijah, Elisha, and St Simon Stock in S. Martino ai Monti as well as landscape friezes in the Colonna, Costaguti, and Doria-Pamphili palaces – thus taking up a tradition for which Agostino Tassi had been famed in the second and third decades of the century.[20] At the same time, the Bolognese Gian Francesco Grimaldi (1606–80), an all-round talent, returned in his frescoes and cabinet pictures to the older tradition of Annibale Carracci's classical landscape style.[21]

On the whole, therefore, the lure of classical discipline far outweighed the attractions of the crypto-romantic movement during the fifth and sixth decades. The 'inferiority complex' from which the romantics suffered makes this doubly clear. How thoroughly they were steeped in the current classical theory is demonstrated by Testa's manuscript treatise on art[22] as well as by Rosa's rather dreary and emphatically rhetorical history paintings. Only on occasion did he allow the fantastic and visionary-romantic elements to gain the upper hand. A case in point is the extraordinary *Temptation of St Anthony* which conjures up the spirit of a Jerome Bosch (Plate 121A).[23]

Not many years later – in the 1660s – the law was laid down *ex cathedra*. The prevalent taste of the 1640s and 50s had prepared the climate for Bellori's *Idea*, the supreme statement of the classic-idealist doctrine, read to the Academy of St Luke in 1664.[24] This tract, in turn, laid the theoretical foundation for the ascendancy of Maratti's Late Baroque Classicism. Soon Maratti was acclaimed the first painter in Italy. And yet Salvator and the other romantics, far from being out of touch with the spirit of their own time, struck chords which reverberated through the whole of Italy.

The Great Fresco Cycles

It is a memorable fact that none of the High Baroque churches built by Bernini, Cortona, Borromini, and Rainaldi had room for great Baroque ceiling decoration,[25] the only exception being the dome of S. Agnese, and here no indication is extant of what Borromini would have wished to do. All these churches were designed as architectural entities which would have been interfered with by an illusionistic break-through in the region of the dome. A moment's reflection will make it clear how absurd it would be to imagine the domes of S. Ivo, SS. Martina e Luca, S. Andrea al Quirinale, or the vault of S. Maria in Campitelli decorated with grandiloquent Baroque frescoes. Only Bernini admitted illusionist ceiling painting under certain conditions (e.g. Cornaro Chapel). High Baroque ecclesiastical architecture of the first order, in other words, had no use for contemporary fresco paintings, and this also applies by and large to the cities outside Rome.[26] It is doubtful whether other than artistic reasons may account for this situation, for a man like Cortona, who made it impossible for all time to have the dome of SS. Martina e Luca painted, began in the very same years of its construction the extensive fresco decoration of the Chiesa Nuova.

The paradoxical position then is this: High Baroque frescoes were only admitted on the vaults of older churches, where originally none or certainly not this kind of decoration was planned, while contemporary architecture offered no room for monumental painting. This revealing fact must be supplemented by an equally interesting one, namely that after Lanfranco's frescoes in the dome of S. Andrea della Valle, painted between 1625 and 1627, twenty years went by until another dome was similarly decorated: that by Cortona in the Chiesa Nuova (1647–51). At the same moment Lanfranco, back from Naples,[27] painted the frescoes in the apse of S. Carlo ai Catinari (1646–7), his not entirely successful parting gift to the world; and after February 1650 followed Mattia Preti's frescoes in the apse of S. Andrea della Valle. Excepting the continuation of Cortona's work in the Chiesa Nuova during the mid fifties and mid sixties, nothing of real importance happened until 1668, when Gaulli painted the pendentives of S. Agnese (finished 1671). From then on the pace quickened. In 1670 Ciro Ferri, Cortona's faithful pupil, began the dome of S. Agnese in the tradition deriving from Lanfranco's S. Andrea della Valle (finished in 1693, after Ferri's death).[28] Antonio Gherardi's (1644–1702) remarkable frescoes on eighteen fields of the ceiling of S. Maria in Trivio – the most Venetian work in Rome at this period – also date from 1670. In 1672 Gaulli began in the Gesù the most ambitious decoration of the Roman Baroque, which kept him occupied for over a decade (Plate 125).[29] Two years later Giacinto Brandi worked on the large vault of S. Carlo al Corso and Canuti on that of SS. Domenico e Sisto (1674–5; Plate 126). Between 1682 and 1686 follow Brandi's ceiling frescoes in S. Silvestro in Capite, and immediately after, those in Gesù e Maria (1686–7). Filippo Gherardi's *Triumph of the Name of Mary* in S. Pantaleo dates between 1687 and 1690. Padre Pozzo's immense frescoes in S. Ignazio (Plate 129) were painted between 1691 and 1694; after 1700 fall Garzi's frescoes in S. Caterina da Siena and Calandrucci's ceiling in S. Maria dell'Orto (1703) and, finally, from 1707 date Gaulli's late frescoes in SS. Apostoli.[30]

It appears, therefore, that most of the large frescoes in Roman churches belong to the last thirty years of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. Gaulli's work in the Gesù and Pozzo's in S. Ignazio, which are rightly regarded as the epitome of monumental Baroque painting, were done at a time when High Baroque architecture and sculpture had long passed their zenith. This situation is not entirely paralleled as regards the decoration of palaces. But in the thirty years between about 1640 and 1670 only three major enterprises are worth mentioning, namely the decoration of the Palazzo Pamphili in Piazza Navona where Camassei (1648), Giacinto Gimignani (1649),[31] Giacinto Brandi, Francesco Allegrini[32] (*c.* 1650), Cortona (1651–4), and Cozza (1667–73) created the most impressive aggregate of friezes and ceilings after the Palazzo Barberini; the great Gallery of the Quirinal Palace, the most extensive work of collaboration, dated 1656–7, where, under Cortona's general direction, G. F. Grimaldi (who seems to have had an important share in the enterprise), the Schor brothers,[33] Guglielmo and Giacomo Cortese (Courtois), Lazzaro Baldi, Ciro Ferri, Mola (Plate 122A), Maratti, Gaspar Dughet, and some minor *Cortoneschi* appear side by side;[34] and the cycle of frescoes in the Pamphili palace at Valmontone near Rome,[35] painted between 1657 and 1661 by Mola, Giambattista Tassi ('il Cortonese'), Guglielmo Cortese, Gaspar Dughet, Cozza, and Mattia Preti.

Once again some of the most sumptuous decorations follow after 1670. Apart from Cozza's library ceiling in the Palazzo Pamphili (Plate 124), mention must be made of the frescoes in the Palazzo Altieri by Cozza, Canuti,[36] and Maratti (Plate 128) and of Giovanni Coli's and Filippo Gherardi's immense Gallery in the Palazzo Colonna (1675–8; Plate 127).[37] And once again, this chronological situation also prevails throughout Italy.

This survey makes it abundantly clear that monumental fresco decorations in Roman churches belong mainly to the Late Baroque. The stylistic change from the High to the Late Baroque can be traced in Preti's fresco of the Stanza dell'Aria in the Valmontone palace, dated 1661.[38] It was here for the first time that the High Baroque method of using time-honoured concepts of firm organization and clear, incisive structure as well as of stressing the individuality and massiveness of each single figure were abandoned and replaced by a flickering dotting of the entire ceiling with seemingly casually arranged figures so that the eye seeks a focusing or resting point in vain. Compared with Preti's Valmontone fresco, even such contrasting performances as Cortona's and Sacchi's Barberini ceilings (Plates 89 and 93) have basic features in common. Preti's work, on the other hand, shows stylistic idiosyncrasies which soon became current not only in painting but also in the sculpture of the Late Baroque.

Cozza was quick in accepting his friend Preti's new manner; and with the latter's Valmontone frescoes almost entirely gone, Cozza's library ceiling in the Palazzo Pamphili (Plate 124)[39] takes on particular importance. Painted with an extremely light and luminous palette, the individual figures remain much indebted to Domenichino. Thus one is faced here with the attractive and almost unbelievable spectacle of a typically Late Baroque open sky peopled with masses of allegorical figures in a naive classicizing style.

In a varying degree elements of Preti's revolution will be found in the decoration of churches from about 1670 on. A generic description has to emphasize two decisive points. In the grand decorative frescoes of the High Baroque, each figure has an immense plastic vitality, seems close to the beholder, and plays a vital part in the whole composition (Plate 89). By contrast, the figures of the later series of frescoes (Plates 125, 126, and 129) have, as it were, only a collective existence; they are dependent on larger units and, what is more, get much smaller with the feigned distance from the spectator until they are lost in the immeasurable height of the empyrean. While Cortona's figures seem to act before the open sky, the figures now people the sky, they inhabit it as far as the eye can see. And secondly, dazzling light envelops them. The nearer they are to the source of divine illumination, the more ethereal they become. Aerial perspective supports the diminution of figures in creating the sensation of infinitude. The Correggio–Lanfranco tradition had, of course, a considerable share in bringing about the new illusionism.

Despite such common features, some of the monumental fresco decorations are poles apart. We saw in a previous chapter (p. 114) how Gaulli in the Gesù became the mouthpiece of Bernini's ideas. Before this Genoese artist (1639–1709)[40] arrived in Rome he had laid the foundation for his style in his native city under the impression of Van Dyck and Strozzi and, above all, of Correggio during a stay at Parma. A brilliant talent, also one of the first portrait painters of his time, he was capable of conveying drama in fresco as well as on canvas with a warm and endearing palette. The head of the Angel on Plate 120, a detail from his frescoes in the Gesù, gives a good idea of the loving care of execution, the bravura of handling, the free and easy touch, and the flickering light effects produced by the application of fresh impasto. Moreover, by painting the half-open mouth and the eyes as if seen through a haze – revealing his study of Correggio's *sfumato* – he managed to endow such a head with the languid spirituality of Bernini's latest manner (see Plate 49). In his later work his palette got paler and the intensity of his style dwindled, no doubt under the influence of the prevailing taste of the *fin de siècle*.

The Bolognese Domenico Maria Canuti (1626–84), in his time a celebrated fresco painter, had been reared in the tradition of Reni's late manner, and came to Rome in 1672. What he saw there was not lost on him, for his dramatic *Apotheosis of St Dominic*[41] (Plate 126) in the open centre of the ceiling of SS. Domenico e Sisto discloses his familiarity with the grouping of figures and the aerial and light conquests of Gaulli's Gesù decoration, then *in statu nascendi*.[42] But Canuti also introduced a novelty. He framed the entire ceiling by a rich *quadratura* design (executed by Enrico Haffner) whereby Rome was given a type of scenographic fresco for which neither Bernini nor Cortona had any use, but which one may well expect to find in Genoa.

The greatest of all *quadratura* painters, Padre Andrea Pozzo[43] (1642–1709), also took his cue from the Bolognese masters. By contrast to the decorative profusion of Haffner's design, Pozzo's *quadratura* is always strictly architectural and in so far old-fashioned; it is only the virtuosity and hypertrophic size of his schemes – typical signs of a late phase – that give him his special stature. Within the *quadratura* framework in S. Ignazio, as elsewhere, he arranged his figures in loosely connected light and dark areas – proof that he too had learned his lesson from Gaulli.

Giovanni Coli (1636–81) and Filippo Gherardi (1643–1704), two artists from Lucca who always worked together, combined their Venetian training with the study of Cortona's style in the gallery of the Palazzo Colonna.[44] The Cortonesque framework, executed by G. P. Schor between 1665 and 1668, displays an enormous accretion of detail, while the strongly Venetian central panel (Plate 127) dazzles the eye by the almost unbelievable entanglement of figures, keels, and masts, all bathed in flickering light. How far this style is removed from Cortona's High Baroque needs no further comment. It is also evident that Gaulli's and Coli–Gherardi's styles have little in common, arising as they do from different sources: the one mainly from Bernini's spiritualized late manner, the other from the hedonistic Cortonesque–Venetian painterly tradition. On the other hand, compared with Maratti's Palazzo Altieri fresco (Plate 128), Gaulli and Coli–Gherardi seem to be on the same side of the fence.

Let the reader be reminded that these three contemporary works far outdistanced in importance any other fresco executed during the 1670s, and, furthermore, that Gaulli's cycle was infinitely more Roman and infinitely stronger than Coli–Gherardi's ceiling. The constellation that emerged at this historic moment was simply a struggle for primacy between Gaulli and Maratti. Forty years after the Cortona–Sacchi controversy the fronts were once again clearly defined. But neither the 'baroque' nor the 'classical' wing was the same. Gaulli's style had a distinctly metaphysical basis; often mystical and stirring in its appeal, it may have derived its strength from the forces lying behind Bernini's late manner: the current revival of pseudo-dionysiac mysticism[45] as well as the growing popularity of Molinos's quietism. A knowledge of the intervening history of painting makes it evident that the odds weighed heavily against Gaulli. Just as the close followers of Bernini in sculpture had not a ghost of a chance in the face of Late Baroque rationalism which was backed by the strong French party, so also in painting: Gaulli's mystical Late Baroque soon burnt itself out in the cool breeze blowing from Maratti's classicist camp.[46]

Carlo Maratti (1625–1713)

A study of Maratti's Altieri ceiling plainly shows that he wanted to restore the autonomous character of the painted area: once again the fresco is clearly and simply framed.[47] He also wished to reinstate the autonomy of the individual figure; he returned to the classical principle of composing with few figures and to an even, light palette which invites attention to focus on the plastically conceived figure, its attitude and gestures; he almost relinquished the *sotto in su* but, characteristically, did not revive the austere *quadro riportato* of the Early Baroque classicism. Moreover, the figures themselves are more Baroque and less Raphaelesque than he may have believed them to be, and the composition lacks poignancy and incisive accents. It undulates over the picture plane, and the first impression is one of a perplexing mass of sodden form. The closeness of this style to Domenico Guidi's in sculpture is striking.

It is also revealing that the Early Baroque classicism of Reni's *Aurora* (Plate 22) and the High Baroque classicism of Sacchi's *Divina Sapienza* (Plate 93) are closer to each other than either is to Maratti's Late Baroque Classicism. By comparison, Maratti had gone some way towards a reconciliation of the two opposing trends, the Baroque and the classical. In every sense he steered an agreeable middle course. His paintings contain no riddles, nothing to puzzle the beholder, nothing to stir violent emotions. His glib handling of the current allegorical language, the impersonal generalizations with which his work abounds, admission of just the right dose of festive splendour – all this predestined his grand manner to become the accepted court style in Louis XIV's Europe. Maratti was not an artist given to speculation and theory.[48] Somewhat paradoxically, it was his pragmatic approach by virtue of which he came up to the hybrid theoretical expectations of his friend Bellori who, like Agucchi before him, wanted the artist's *idea* to result from the empirical selection of beautiful parts rather than from an *a priori* concept of beauty.[49]

All this sounds perhaps scathing, yet it must be admitted that Maratti was an artist of extraordinary ability. Born at Cammerino (Marches) in 1625, he appeared as a boy of twelve in Andrea Sacchi's studio. As early as 1650 his reputation was firmly established with the Sacchesque *Adoration of the Shepherds* in S. Giuseppe dei Falegnami. From then on Maratti's career was a continuous triumph, and, indeed, one monumental masterpiece after another left his studio. Nor was he entirely partial to the manner of Sacchi and the other classicists. The paintings of the 1650s reveal the impact of Lanfranco's Baroque; he admitted influences from Cortona and Bernini and even had some sympathy with the mystic trend of the second half of the century. What impressed his contemporaries most was that he re-established a feeling for the dignity of the human figure seen in great, simple, plastic forms and rendered with a sincerity and moral conviction without parallel at that moment (Plate 130A). As early as the mid seventies neither Gaulli nor the Cortona succession was left with a serious chance, and by the end of the century Rome had to all intents and purposes surrendered to Maratti's manner. At his death in 1713 his pupils were in full command of the situation.[50]

PAINTING OUTSIDE ROME

During the period under review the contribution of Tuscany, Lombardy, and Piedmont was rather modest. Apart from Reni's late manner, even Bologna had little to offer that would compare with the great first quarter of the century. Venice slowly began to recover, while the schools of Genoa and Naples emerged as the most productive and interesting, next to Rome.

A bird's-eye view of the entire panorama reveals that neither the classical nor the crypto-romantic trend was peculiar to Rome. In fact, the Roman constellation is closely paralleled in other centres. With Reni in an unchallenged position at Bologna, his late manner became the inescapable law during the 1630s. His influence extended far beyond the confines of his native city, bringing about, wherever it was felt, a soft, feeble, sentimental, and rather structureless classicism. One can maintain that there was almost an inverse ratio between Reni's success on the one hand and Cortona's and Lanfranco's on the other. Soon Reni's Baroque classicism filtered through to the North and South of Italy. In Milan Francesco del Cairo (1607–65),[51] who began in Morazzone's manner (Plate 131, A and B), formed his style in the later 1640s on Reni and Venice, and his work became languid, thin, and classical. His contemporary, Carlo Francesco Nuvolone, called 'il Panfilo' (1608–61?), had a similar development; dependent on Reni, which earned him the epithet 'Guido lombardo', he exchanged his early *tenebroso* manner for a light tonality. In Florence, too, Reni's influence is evident; in Furini's work, superimposed on the native tradition, it led to a highly sophisticated, over-refined style. On the other hand, probably impressed by Poussin's classicism, from the 1640s on an artist like Carpioni in Venice found a way out of the local academic eclecticism through elegant classicizing stylizations. The classical *détente* of the 1640s and 50s is particularly striking in Naples. During their late phase such artists as Battistello, Ribera, and Stanzioni turned towards Bolognese classicism, while Mattia Preti embraced the fashion in his early period, only to break away from it some time later. Sicily, finally, had an artist of distinction in Pietro Novelli, called 'il Monrealese' (1603–47), who abandoned his early Caravaggesque *tenebroso* in the early 1630s, not uninfluenced by Van Dyck's visit to Palermo (1624) and under the impact of a journey to Naples and Rome (1631–2).[52]

By and large, the classical reaction, which lies broadly speaking between 1630 and 1660, spells a falling off of quality. This does not, of course, apply to the two great leaders, Sacchi in Rome and Reni at Bologna, nor to the position in Venice and Florence, where Baroque classicism was to some extent a regenerative agent; yet it is certainly true of the first generation of Carracci pupils at Bologna (p. 56f.); it is true of Guercino's manner in the last thirty years of his life, when he was open to Reni's influence and produced works with a strong classical bias, many of which have no more than a limited interest; and it is, above all, true of Naples, where the *élan* of the early Ribera fizzles out during the fourth and fifth decades into a rather feeble academic manner.

On the other side of the fence were some artists of a slightly younger generation (most of them born between 1615 and 1625), who reacted vigorously against the prevalent Baroque classicism. The principal names to be mentioned are Maffei from Vicenza, the Florentine Mazzoni, and the Genoese Langetti, all working in Venice and the *terra ferma*; Valerio Castello in Genoa; Mattia Preti and the early Luca Giordano in Naples. In one way or another these and other artists revitalized Caravaggio's heritage; but theirs was a new, painterly High Baroque Caravaggism (Plates 130B, 136, and 141A), the Caravaggism that was handed on to Magnasco and Crespi and through them to Piazzetta and the young Tiepolo.

There is, however, an important area where these Baroque individualists and the Baroque classicists meet. For the lightening of the palette, the most characteristic mark of those masters who turned Baroque classicists, was not simply a tactical reversal of their earlier *tenebroso* manner; it had a distinctly positive aim, namely the unification of the picture plane by means of an even distribution of colour and light. These painterly tendencies, mentioned in a previous chapter (p. 169) and nowhere more evident than in Reni's late manner (Plate 23B), distinguish High Baroque classicism from the classicism of the first quarter of the century. Although worlds apart, it is these painterly tendencies that form the common denominator between the Baroque classicists and the *neo-Caravaggisti*. In all other respects they differed most seriously.

To the comparatively light palette of the Baroque classicists the *neo-Caravaggisti* opposed a strong chiaroscuro; to the relatively smooth handling of paint, a *pittura di tocco* (stroke) and *di macchia* (spot) – work with the loaded brush and sketchy juxtapositions of small areas of colour; to the harmonious scale of tones, unexpected colour contrasts; to the classical types of beauty, subjective deviations; to the tedium of balanced compositions, unaccountable vagaries; to the facile rhetorical repertory, violent movement, drama, and even a new mysticism. Even though this generic list of contrasts may be too epigrammatic, it helps to clarify the entangled position of the second and third quarters of the century.

No doubt Salvator Rosa's crypto-romanticism had partisans up and down the peninsula. But allegiance to one trend or the other also changed; some artists were torn between them. Giovan Benedetto Castiglione seems the most remarkable example.

Bologna, Florence, Venice, and Lombardy

After this introduction, the Reni succession at Bologna need not detain us: Francesco Gessi (1588–1649), Giovan Giacomo Sementi (1580–1636), Giovanni Andrea Sirani (1610–70) and his daughter Elisabetta (1638–65), or Luca Ferrari from Reggio (1605–54) who transplanted his master's manner to Padua and Modena. These mediocre talents transformed the positive qualities of Reni's late 'classicism' (Plate 23B)[53]: the unorthodox simplicity of his inventions into compositions of boring pedantry; his refined silvery tonality into a frigid scale of light tones; his vibrant tenderness into sentimentality; and his late 'sketchy' manner with its directness of appeal was neither understood nor followed. Among the Reni succession in Bologna only two artists stand out, namely Simone Cantarini (1612–48)[54] and Guido Cagnacci (1601–63);[55] the former for having left a number of carefully constructed, serene, and strong works, in which Carraccesque elements are combined with those from Cavedoni and the early Reni to form a distinctly personal style, well illustrated by the moving portrait of his aged teacher (Plate 135A); the latter, who sought his fortune in Vienna (*c.* 1657) and became court painter to Emperor Leopold I, for breaking away from the orthodox Baroque classicists and creating some works of great poignancy in strange violet and bluish tones. On the whole, the Bolognese remained faithful to their classical tradition, guarded, during the second half of the century, by the three *caposcuole*, Reni's pupil, Domenico Maria Canuti (p. 220); Cantarini's pupil, Lorenzo Pasinelli (1629–1700);[56] and Albani's pupil, Carlo Cignani, to whom I have to return in a later chapter.

At the same time, Bologna continued to be the acknowledged centre of *quadratura* painting. This tradition was handed on through Girolamo Curti, called il Dentone (1570–1632), to Angelo Michele Colonna (1600–87) and Agostino Mitelli (1609–60). These two artists joined forces and for a time almost monopolized *quadratura* painting, working together at Parma, Florence (Plate 142A), Genoa, Rome, and even Madrid, where Mitelli died. Their rich scenographic views, foreshadowing the Late Baroque by virtue of the complexity of motifs, form a decorative court style in its own right rather than a mere framework for figure painters. They educated a large school, and since Mitelli claimed to have invented *quadratura* with more than one vanishing point,[57] it is he who must be credited with having laid the foundation for the rich eighteenth-century development of this speciality.

Very different from the Bolognese was the Florentine position.[58] Matteo Rosselli, who has been mentioned (p. 60), made sure that the typically Florentine qualities of elegant design and bright local colour remained for a time unchallenged. He educated the foremost artists of the next generation, among whom may be mentioned Giovanni Mannozzi, called Giovanni da San Giovanni (1592–1636), Francesco Furini (*c.* 1600–46), Lorenzo Lippi (1606–65), Baldassare Franceschini, called Volterrano (1611–89), and Jacopo Vignali (1592–1664)[59] and his pupil Carlo Dolci (1616–86). These artists responded in various ways to the rarefied atmosphere of the Florentine court.

Furini, above all, influenced by Reni, produced paintings of a morbid sensuality (Plate 135B). The ultramarine flesh-tones together with his *sfumato* give his pictures a sweetish, sickly flavour, but nobody can deny that he had a special gift for rendering the melodious calligraphy of the female body, thus disclosing his attachment to the Mannerist tradition. Giovanni da San Giovanni had a more healthy temperament. An artist capable of handling very large fresco commissions, even the experience of Rome (fresco in the apse of SS. Quattro Coronati, 1623) did not rid him of Florentine idiosyncrasies. Although his light touch, translucent colours, and the ease and brilliance of his production make him one of the most attractive Florentine painters of the Seicento, the retardataire character of his art[60] is shown by the fresco cycle in the Sala degli Argenti of the Palazzo Pitti (1635), glorifying Lorenzo de' Medici's concern for art and philosophy, a work, incidentally, that was finished after Giovanni's death by Furini, Ottavio Vannini, and Francesco Montelatici, called Cecco Bravo (1607–61).[61] The comparison with Cortona's work in Rome and Florence reveals Giovanni's provincialism.[62]

Giovanni da San Giovanni had been dead for some years when Cortona settled in Florence, and Furini died before he left. But a number of other artists were thrown off their course by the study of Cortona's grand manner. Volterrano's case is characteristic. He had begun as Giovanni da San Giovanni's assistant in the Palazzo Pitti (1635–6) and painted his frescoes in the Villa Petraia (1637–46)[63] in the same manner, but changed to a Cortonesque style in the Sala delle Allegorie of the Palazzo Pitti (*c.* 1652), a style which with modifications he maintained in his later work (e.g. the frescoes in the dome of the SS. Annunziata, 1676–80/3). A similar course was taken by Giovanni Martinelli (active between 1635 and 1668), while Furini's pupil Simone Pignoni (1611–98)[64] made few concessions to the new vogue. It was mainly Ciro Ferri (1634–89), Cortona's closest follower, who ensured the continuity of the Cortona succession in Florence. Ferri made Florence his home from 1659 to 1665 in order, above all, to complete the Palazzo Pitti frescoes which his master had left unfinished when he returned to Rome in 1647.[65]

Carlo Dolci's art, the Florentine counterpart to that of Sassoferrato in Rome, deserves a special note because the languid devoutness expressed by his half-figures of Virgins and Magdalens must be regarded as the fullest realization of one side of Late Baroque mentality. These cabinet pictures, painted with the greatest care in a slick miniature technique, enjoyed a great reputation in his time, and contemporaries admired what appears to the modern spectator a false and even repulsive note of piety. A real prodigy, Dolci at the age of sixteen painted the excellent portrait of Ainolfo de' Bardi (Plate 133). But it was not only his own vow to devote his life to religious imagery, in acceptance of Cardinal Paleotti's theoretical demand,[66] that prevented him from making headway as a portrait painter. He had no chance against the immensely successful Fleming Justus Sustermans (1597–1681), court painter in Florence from 1620 on and a master of the official international style of portraiture which developed in the wake of Van Dyck.

Finally, Stefano della Bella (1610–64)[67] must be mentioned, whose place is really outside the tissue of Florentine Seicento art. The teacher of his choice was Callot; magically attracted by the latter's etchings, della Bella preserved in his work something of their spirited elegance. His best and most productive period was the ten years in Paris, 1639–49, in the course of which his style changed under the impact of Rembrandt and the Dutch landscapists. He must rank as one of the greatest Italian etchers, but he was a typical master of the *petite manière*, his more than a thousand etchings, often peopled with tiny figures, being concerned with all aspects of popular life. The influence of his work on the further course of Italian genre painting was probably greater than is at present realized.

The development in Venice[68] shows certain parallels to that in Florence, in spite of the exquisite work of the great triad Fetti, Lys, and Strozzi, who brought entirely new painterly values to bear on the Venetian scene between 1621 and 1644, the year of Strozzi's death. What Matteo Rosselli had been for Florence, Padovanino was for

Venice. Most painters of the second and third quarter of the century stemmed from him; they carried over his academic eclecticism into a refined and often languid Seicentesque idiom. Girolamo Forabosco from Padua (1604/5–79), distinguished as a portrait painter, Pietro Muttoni, called della Vecchia[69] (1605–78), Giulio Carpioni[70] (1613–79), who worked mainly at Vicenza, and the feeble Pietro Liberi (1614–87) represent different facets of this somewhat superficial manner. The Palma Vecchio character of Forabosco's portraits, Vecchia's neo-Giorgionesque paintings, and Carpioni's Poussinesque Bacchanals would seem to be nuances of the same classicizing vogue (Plate 137A).[71]

Like Cortona's appearance in Florence, Luca Giordano's stay in Venice in 1653 had a revolutionizing effect on local artists. Riberesque in his early phase, Giordano brought to Venice a Neapolitan version of Caravaggio's 'naturalism' and *tenebroso*. This dramatic manner found immediate response in the work of the Genoese Giambattista Langetti[72] (1625–76), who probably began under Assereto, then worked in Rome under Cortona,[73] and appeared in Venice towards the mid century. His work is distinguished by violent chiaroscuro applied with a loaded brush (Plate 130B). Langetti's manner was followed, above all, by the German Johan Karl Loth (1632–98), who had settled in Venice after 1655,[74] and by his competitor Antonio Zanchi from Este (1631–1722). Further, Pietro Negri, Zanchi's pupil, the Genoese Francesco Rosa, and Antonio Carneo (1637–92) from Friuli[75] should be mentioned in this context.

But long before Luca Giordano's first visit to Venice two 'foreigners', both artists of exceptional calibre, revolted against the facile academic practices: Francesco Maffei[76] from Vicenza (*c.* 1600–60) and the Florentine Sebastiano Mazzoni[77] (1611–78). Soon after 1620 Maffei liberated himself from the fetters of current Mannerism. The study of Jacopo Bassano, of Tintoretto and Veronese, and, above all, of such Mannerists as Parmigianino and Bellange led to his characteristic manner, which was fully developed in the *Glorification of Gaspare Zane* (1644, Vicenza, Museum). Painting with a nervous and rapid brush, he delighted in exhibiting sophisticated dissonances. Much of his work has an uncouth and almost macabre quality, a refreshingly unorthodox style which may best be studied in such late works as the *Glorification of the Inquisitor Alvise Foscarini* (1652, Vicenza, Museum) and those in the Oratories delle Zitelle and of S. Nicola da Tolentino (Vicenza). The ghostly *Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard* (Plate 136A; Verona, Museo di Castelvecchio) exemplifies his late manner, showing in addition how he transformed his debt to Domenico Fetti. The younger Mazzoni, the only artist of this generation who took the teachings of Fetti and Strozzi to heart, was surely impressed by Maffei's work. His brilliant and free brushwork, to be found as early as 1649 in the paintings in S. Benedetto (Venice), and, slightly later, in the most remarkable *Annunciation* (Plate 134B), makes him a real forerunner of the Venetian Settecento. Another Florentine, Mazzoni's contemporary Cecco Bravo, shows a similar unconventional handling of paint (Plate 134A).

With Giovanni Coli and Filippo Gherardi echoes of the Roman grand manner reached Venice, but the strongest impact came once again from Luca Giordano, whose pictures in S. Maria della Salute and other churches, painted in the late 1660s and the 1670s, show the light palette of his mature style, derived mainly from impressions of

Veronese. The stage was set for the artists born between about 1635 and 1660. They accepted Giordano's neo-Venetian manner to a greater or lesser extent and helped to prepare the way for the great luminous art of the eighteenth century. Andrea Celesti[78] (1637–c. 1711), whose masterpieces are in the parish church at Desenzano (Lake Garda); Federico Cervelli from Milan (active 1674–c. 1700), Sebastiano Ricci's teacher; Antonio Bellucci (1654–1727),[79] who spent his best years abroad, and many others[80] should here be named. But neither Maffei nor the *tenebrosi* were forgotten. Thus Celesti as well as Bellucci were indebted to Maffei, while Antonio Molinari[81] (1665–1727), working in Zanchi's manner and revealing Giordano's influence, also opened the way to Piazzetta's *tenebroso* style (Plate 137B).

In conclusion it must be said that, with the exception of Langetti, Mazzoni, and Maffei, few of these painters fully relinquished the facile decorative manner of a Forabosco and a Liberi, nor were they capable of a new and coherent vision – in spite of the fact that some of them lived far into the eighteenth century.

While Venice and the *terra ferma* were teeming with painters to whom magnificent opportunities were offered, Milan's decline after the Borromeo era was irrevocable. Apart from Francesco del Cairo, who has been mentioned, there were no painters of real rank. Carlo Francesco Nuvolone (1608–61), to whom reference has also been made, a minor master, a brother of the even weaker Giuseppe (1619–1703), had the most flourishing school.[82] Giovanni Ghisolfi (1623–83) contributed little to the art of his native city. At the age of seventeen he went to Rome, where he spent most of his life and made his fortune as Italy's first painter of views with fancifully arranged ruins (p. 325).

The Lombard tradition of the unadorned rendering of painstakingly observed facts was kept alive in Bergamo rather than Milan. Only recently have these qualities become apparent in Carlo Ceresa's (1609–79)[83] portraits, painted in an austere 'Spanish taste'. Ceresa was a contemporary of Evaristo Baschenis (1607?–77) and helps an understanding of the ambience in which the latter's art flourished. Probably Italy's greatest still-life painter, Baschenis, as is well known, concentrated on one speciality, the pictorial rendering of musical instruments. What attracted him was the warm tonality of the polished wood as much as the complex stereometry of the shapes. By means of a dry, almost 'photographic' realism he thus produced abstract-cubist designs in which highly sophisticated space definitions are supported by the contrast and superimposition of flat, bulging, smooth, broken, or meandering forms (Plate 143B). These truly monumental creations, so foreign to northern still-life painters, have, of course, their intellectual focus in Caravaggio's 'realistic stylization' of the Italian still life (p. 19).

Genoa

The beginning of the seventeenth century opened up rich possibilities for Genoese painters. A vigorous native school developed which flourished unbroken into the eighteenth century in spite of the disastrous plague of 1657. It is a sign of the innate strength of the Genoese school that it also survived the loss of its greatest Seicento painters; Bernardo Strozzi went to Venice, Castiglione spent most of his working life outside Genoa, and

Gaulli settled in Rome. While at the dawn of the century Genoa had been a melting pot of various foreign trends, after 1630 her artists influenced artistic events in Venice and Rome.

To be sure, these masters belong to the broad stream of the intra-Italian development and they received as much as they gave. Strozzi is a case in point. After his early 'dark' period with strong chiaroscuro effects (Plate 32), not independent of the early seventeenth-century Lombard masters, his palette lightened while he was still in Genoa; his colours became rich, warm, glowing, and succulent, and the flesh tones ruddy. The impression the great Venetian masters, above all Veronese, made upon him after his removal to Venice in 1630 should not be underestimated (Plate 31B), but the sketchy touch, the bravura of the brush-stroke, and the luminosity of his paint he owed to Fetti and Lys. In contrast, however, to the 'modernity' of these masters – Fetti's *petite manière* with its emotional intricacies and Lys's romantic extravagances – Strozzi remained essentially tied to the tradition of the grand manner with its focus on rhetorical figure compositions.[84] On the other hand, the painterly, festive, and dynamic qualities of his Genoese-Venetian manner destined him to become the third in the triad of 'foreign' artists who rekindled the spirit of great painting in Venice.

The influence exercised by Strozzi in Genoa can hardly be overestimated. Only recently it has been shown how strongly Giovanni Andrea de Ferrari (1598–1669) leant on him.[85] This prolific artist was himself the head of a large studio through which, among others, Giovanni Bernardo Carbone, Valerio Castello, and Castiglione passed. Ferrari's work – true to the special artistic climate at Genoa – reveals echoes of Tuscan Mannerism as well as of Caravaggism, of Rubens and Van Dyck as well as Velasquez who was in Genoa in 1629 and 1649. Unequal in quality, towards the end of his career he ridded himself of academic encumbrances and produced works of considerable depth of expression in a free and painterly style.[86]

Whether or not this happened under the influence of his pupil Valerio Castello (1624–59), son of Bernardo, is difficult to decide.[87] Valerio had also gone through Fiasella's school but soon set out on conquests of his own. Impressed by Correggio, Van Dyck, and Rubens, he produced a few masterpieces of extraordinary intensity during a career of hardly more than ten years. A real painter, he loved violent contrasts and fiery, scintillating hues; he is dramatic, sophisticated, and spontaneous at the same time. A work like the rapid oil sketch for the *Rape of the Sabines* (Plate 136B), dating from his last years, clearly prepares the way for Magnasco. Under Castello was trained the gifted Bartolomeo Biscaino who died during the plague of 1657 at the age of twenty-five.[88]

As the century advanced three different trends can be clearly differentiated, all developing on the foundations of the past: first, in the wake of Van Dyck an 'aristocratic' Baroque much to the taste of the Genoese nobility, mainly kept alive in the portraits of Giovanni Bernardo Carbone (1614–83) and to a certain extent in those of Gaulli; secondly, also of Flemish derivation, the rustic genre which triumphed in Castiglione; and finally, the great decorative Baroque fresco, for which Luca Cambiaso had prepared the ground.

Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione, called il Grechetto (before 1610?–65), ran through almost the whole gamut of stylistic possibilities in the course of his astonishing career.[89] Attracted early by the Flemish animal genre, he seems to have studied with Sinibaldo Scorza (1589–1631), who in turn depended on such Flemings as Jan Roos (1591–1638), Snyders's pupil, active in Genoa from 1614 on. At the same time a passionate student of Rubens and Van Dyck, he was also the first Italian to discover Rembrandt's etchings – as early as about 1630 –which means that Caravaggism reached him in the northern transformation. Rembrandt remained a permanent stimulus throughout his life. A stay in Rome for more than a decade from 1634 on led him to appreciate Poussin's as well as Bernini's art. In these years he evolved his fluent technique of brush drawings in oil on paper and invented the monotype technique. Back in Genoa in 1645, he painted such monumental Baroque works as the *St Bernard adoring Christ on the Cross* (S. Maria della Cella) and *St James driving the Moors from Spain* (S. Giacomo della Marina). Slightly later he treated philosophical subjects in a picturesque mood (Plate 123B) which shows him close to the Testa–Rosa current in Rome. His appointment as court painter at Mantua in 1648 brought him in contact with the art of Fetti, whose freedom of touch was soon reflected in his work. At the end of his career he produced ecstatic compositions of great intensity, reminiscent of Bernini's style of these years. Perhaps more clearly than any other artist Castiglione exposes the particular problems which assailed his generation, for throughout his life he was torn between a philosophical scepticism and an ecstatic surrender.

Being equally at home in the rustic genre and the grand manner – history, mythology, and religious imagery – a brilliant draughtsman and engraver, he influenced artists as distant in time and as different in style as Tiepolo and Fragonard. Nearer home, his rustic and bucolic manner found followers in his son Francesco (d. 1716), who succeeded him as court painter at Mantua; in Anton Maria Vassallo[90] (active *c.* 1640–60); and in a number of specialists of the animal genre, while his grand manner had a formative influence on the younger generation of great decorative painters.

The protagonists of the older Genoese fresco style are the brothers Giovanni Andrea (1590–1630) and Giovanni Battista (1592–1677) Carlone,[91] who belong to that fertile Lombard family which had great decorators among its members for three centuries. The later fresco style is mainly represented by Domenico Piola[92] (1628–1703) and Gregorio de Ferrari[93] (1647–1726). It is they, above all, who brought about the glorious climax of this art at Genoa. In their mature works both artists influenced each other, but the younger man proved to be the stronger master. The essential character of their later style derives from a wedding of Pietro da Cortona's grand manner with Bolognese *quadratura*[94] and of Castiglione's verve with Correggio's *sfumato* – resulting in an immensely rich, festive, and luminous manner with a strong emphasis on the ebullient decorative element (Plate 142B). The early Piola leant heavily on Castiglione, Strozzi, and Valerio Castello. It has been suggested that he turned to his Cortonesque manner under the influence of Giovanni Maria Bottalla, Cortona's assistant on the Barberini ceiling, who died, however, in 1644, the year he returned to his native Genoa. The Correggiesque note of the style was due to Gregorio de Ferrari who had spent four years at Parma (1669–73), an experience that contributed to the formation of the proto-Rococo character of Gregorio's art. His *Death of St Scolastica* (Plate 141B), one of his masterpieces on canvas, illustrates this style at its best. Still tied by a tender link to Bernini's late manner, the languor and sensibility of expression, the suppleness of the bodies, the great musical curve of the composition, the sweetness and elegant rhythms of the angels – all this presages the art of the Rococo. A manner similarly delicate and refined was practised by Bartolomeo Guidobono (1654–1709) who again had made Correggio his special study. He spent almost thirty years of his life at the court of Duke Vittorio Amedeo in Turin.

Naples

When Caravaggio came to work in Naples in 1606–7, the Mannerists were in full command of the situation, and he never swayed artists like Fabrizio Santafede (*c.* 1560–1634), Gian Bernardino Azzolino (*c.* 1572–1645), Gerolamo Imparato (1550–1621), and Belisario Corenzio (*c.* 1560–1643) from their course; they continued their outmoded conventions, largely indebted to the Cavaliere d'Arpino, through the first half of the seventeenth century. The only exception to the rule was Giovanni Battista Caracciolo, called Battistello (*c.* 1570–1637),[95] the solitary founder of the 'modern' Neapolitan school who, in opposition to the Mannerists, developed his new manner based on the deeply felt experience of Caravaggio. His *Liberation of St Peter* in the Chiesa del Monte della Misericordia (Plate 139), painted two or three years (1608–9) after Caravaggio's *Seven Works of Mercy* in the same church, is not only a monument of orthodox Caravaggism, but its specific qualities, the hard contrasts, the compositional austerity and mute intensity reveal a talent of the first rank. Yet the pattern of Baroque painting in Naples was determined neither by Caracciolo's early manner nor by him alone.

He had a younger rival in the Spaniard Jusepe de Ribera (1591–1652)[96] who, after journeys through Italy, settled in Naples in 1616 and soon painted Caravaggesque pictures utterly different from those by Caracciolo. While the latter hardened and stiffened the more flexible style of the master in an attempt at rendering internalized drama, the former loosened and externalized what he had learned from Caravaggio by an aggressive and vulgar realism and a painterly chiaroscuro with flickering light effects. Ribera found a powerful patron in the Duke of Osuna, the Viceroy of Naples, who appointed him court painter, and later viceroys and Neapolitan nobles were equally attracted by his art. It is an interesting phenomenon that Ribera's passionate and violent pictures satisfied the taste of the Neapolitan court society. What attracted them was probably the essentially Spanish sensual surface quality of Ribera's realism – his permanent contribution to European Seicento painting.[97]

From about 1630 on Naples was drawn into the main stream of Baroque painting owing to the considerable contributions made by painters coming from Rome. It is mainly three different trends that were acclimatized in Naples: Domenichino's Baroque classicism, Lanfranco's intense High Baroque, and the discursive Caravaggism of the second generation.[98] Domenichino's somewhat disappointing activity in Naples has been discussed in a previous chapter (p. 49). Lanfranco was more successful; he settled in Naples in 1633 for thirteen extremely active years during which he created, among others, four large fresco cycles: the dome of the Gesù Nuovo (1635–7, only the pendentives preserved), the nave and choir of the Certosa of S. Martino (1637–8), the entire decoration of SS. Apostoli (1638–46), and finally the dome of the Cappella di S. Gennaro in the cathedral (1641–3), where he vied with the pendentives painted by his arch-enemy Domenichino. Despite the hostility of the Neapolitan artists, Domenichino was an immediate success; the dynamic orchestra of Lanfranco's Correggiesque illusionism, by contrast, appealed above all to the masters of the second half of the century [99] and made possible the grand decorative phase of Neapolitan painting which began with Mattia Preti and rose to international importance with Luca Giordano and Solimena. Contact with the younger Caravaggesque trend was made through Vouet, who sent the *Circumcision* in S. Arcangelo a Segno [100] from Rome in 1623 and, more important, through Artemisia Gentileschi (1593–*c.* 1652), Orazio's daughter, who was born in Rome, spent some years in Florence (1614–20) – which were not without influence on the formation of her style – and settled in Naples in 1630, to leave this city only for a brief visit to her father in London (1638–9). An artist of a high calibre and fierce temperament, she showed an inclination for gruesome scenes painted in lively translucent tones and with a meticulous attention to detail (Plate 138). This almost romantic form of Caravaggism impressed the Neapolitans as much or even more [101] than Vouet's decorative Baroque manner, which hardly revealed his early infatuation with Caravaggio.

Long before Domenichino's coming to Naples, Caracciolo had turned to pre-Mannerist and Bolognese models, possibly stimulated by impressions he received during a hypothetical journey to Rome. In any case, his later work from the end of the second decade on, in the Certosa of S. Martino, in S. Maria la Nova, S. Diego all'Ospedaletto, and elsewhere shows the strong impact of Bolognese classicism. Equally, Ribera's early fire subsided in the 1630s, his realism mellowed, his compositions became dry and classicizing, and the chiaroscuro made way for a light palette with cool silvery tones prevailing.[102]

Although Neapolitan artists stuck tenaciously to the various facets of Caravaggism – epitomized by the names of Caracciolo, Ribera, and Artemisia Gentileschi – the swing towards Bolognese classicism from the mid 1630s on is a general phenomenon. It may be observed with minor masters such as Francesco Guarino (1611–54) [103] whose early Riberesque manner was followed by classicizing academic works, or Pacecco (Francesco) de Rosa (1607–56), a determined purist, the Sassoferrato of Naples, for whom Domenichino was specially important. Such purist tendencies may also be found in the paintings of Charles Mellin ('Carlo Lorenese', 1597–1649), a Frenchman from Nancy, who lived and died in Rome, but worked in Naples in 1643–7,[104] as well as in those of Giovanni Andrea Coppola (1597–*c.* 1659) who practised his art in distant Apulia.

A much greater artist than all these, the most important *caposcuola* of the mid century, Massimo Stanzioni (1586–1656), turned in a similar direction. His early development is still unclear; [105] but his Caravaggism is allied to that of Vouet, Saraceni, and Artemisia rather than to that of Caracciolo and Ribera. In his best works, belonging to the decade 1635–45, he displays a distinct sense for subtle chromatic values, melodious lines, gracefully built figures, and mellow and lyrical expressions. Stanzioni was famed as the 'Neapolitan Guido Reni'; and the refined, somewhat tame and nerveless quality of his art, characteristic of the second quarter of the century, will be apparent if his *Virgin with SS. John the Evangelist and Andrea Corsini* (Plate 140A) is compared with an equally characteristic work of the second decade such as Cavedoni's *Virgin with SS. Alò and Petronius* (Plate 26A). Stanzioni's painting also shows the Neapolitan blending of Caravaggism and Bolognese classicism. At the end of his career the Bolognese note, increasingly noticeable from the late 1630s on,[106] quelled the subtle qualities of his earlier manner (see the very late *Consecration of St Ignatius*, Naples, Palazzo Reale).

Stanzioni mediates between the art of the older generation and that of his pupil, Bernardo Cavallino (1616, not 1622, –56).[107] A *Caravaggista* strongly influenced by Artemisia, Cavallino gave his best in cabinet pictures. His work is in a category of its own; a great colourist, his tenderness, elegance, gracefulness, and delicacy are without parallel at this moment (Plate 140B). Yet *mutatis mutandis* such contemporaries as Furini in Florence and Valerio Castello in Genoa represent a similar stylistic phase. It is interesting to note that the giants of the Baroque epoch with their massive energy lived to a ripe old age (p. 197), while these effeminate artists of the mid century died before they reached full maturity. Their highly sophisticated art hardly contained the germs to generate a strong new style.

Other painters had a share in the rich life of the Neapolitan school during the three decades after 1630. The more important names should at least be mentioned: Andrea Vaccaro (1604, not 1598, –1670),[108] who found a rather vulgar formula of combining second-hand Caravaggism with Bolognese classicism (Reni, Domenichino), was a popular success at his time but a master of the second rank; the Riberesque Cesare (*c.* 1605–53) and Francesco (1612–*c.* 56) Fracanzano, sons of Alessandro, the younger brother being an artist of considerable calibre;[109] Aniello Falcone (1607–56), the specialist in luminous battle-pieces 'without a hero',[110] and his pupils Andrea de Leone (1610, not 1596, –1685)[111] and Domenico Gargiulo, called Micco Spadaro (1612–75), who under Callot's influence produced the typically Neapolitan topographical genre peopled with great numbers of small figures. In addition, reference must be made to the well known 'Monsù Desiderio' – a 'pseudonym' covering at least three different artists, as recent research has revealed.[112] The major figure of this trio, François Nomé, was born at Metz in 1593, came to Rome in 1602, settled at Naples not later than 1610 and seems to have spent the rest of his life there (the year of his death is unknown). His bizarre and ghostlike paintings of architecture, often crumbling and fantastic, belong to the world of Late Mannerism rather than to that of the Seicento, and the suggestion made by R. Causa that his style is ultimately derived from the stage settings of Buontalenti and Giulio Parigi has much to recommend it. The second artist, Didier Barra,[113] also from Metz, left his native city about 1608 and followed his compatriot to Naples, where he was still active in 1647. In contrast to Nomé he was a faithful recorder of views, while the third – hitherto anonymous – artist imitated Nomé's work. Unduly boosted in our own days, 'Monsù Desiderio'–Nomé was in fact a minor figure, but it was he who opened up a taste in Naples for the weird type of cabinet picture and thus helped to prepare Micco Spadaro's microcosmic views as well as Salvator's romantic battle-pieces.

All the Neapolitan painters so far mentioned belong essentially to the first half of the century. The social upheaval caused by Masaniello's revolt in 1647 also resulted in some artists leaving the city;[114] but more serious was the great plague of 1656 during which many of them died. Pacecco de Rosa, Falcone, and, above all, Massimo Stanzioni and Cavallino were among the victims. The year of the plague may therefore be regarded as an important turning-point.

The character of Neapolitan painting in the second half of the century differs indeed considerably from that of the first half. The change is mainly due to two masters of the first rank, Mattia Preti from Calabria ('Cavalier Calabrese', 1613–99) and Luca Giordano (1634–1705). Although belonging to two different generations, they are similar in that both show in their work an immense vigour, an innate power and dynamic quality almost without parallel in Italy or elsewhere at this moment. They are also similar in that their art received lasting stimuli from Venetian colourism as well as from the Roman grand manner. Moreover, it was with them that Neapolitan painting assumed an intra-Italian and even international status. In other respects they differ most decisively: Preti, grave, problematical, dramatic, a moralist, and throughout his life a *Caravaggista*, is a man typical of the Seicento, while Giordano, in all and everything the antithesis, truly belongs to the eighteenth century. It is for this reason that more about him will be said in a later chapter (p. 305).

Preti's career took him up and down the peninsula. As early as 1630 he was in Rome painting, it seems, Caravaggesque pictures;[115] between 1640 and 1646 he stayed intermittently in Venice[116] but returned to Rome in 1641–2, 1650–1, and once again, 1660–1. It was during the fifth decade that Sacchi, Domenichino, and Reni attracted him;[117] the frescoes in S. Biagio at Modena, executed between 1653 and 1656, still reveal that influence.[118] In the mature works created during his Neapolitan period (1656–60) he wedded reminiscences of Battistello, Ribera, and Guercino with those of Tintoretto and Veronese; nor was he impervious to Luca Giordano's early work. The result was a powerful dramatic style *sui generis*, the apocalyptic quality of which is well illustrated by the bozzetto (Plate 141A) for one of the frescoes, now lost, painted as an ex-voto on the city gates during the plague of 1656. In 1661 Preti went to Malta where he stayed, with brief interruptions,[119] to the end of his life. His major work there was the decoration of the immense vault of S. Giovanni at Valletta (1661–6) with frescoes in which Venetian luminosity prevails. But never again did Preti rise to the dramatic height of his Neapolitan period.

His contemporaries Luca Forte (active *c.* 1640–70) and Paolo Porpora (1617–73) open the long line of Neapolitan still-life painters by their sumptuous Caravaggesque flowerpieces, and a few pictures have now also been ascribed to Porpora's teacher, Giuseppe Recco's father Giacomo (1603–54) – with how much justification it is still too early to say.[120] Porpora's most distinguished pupils, Giovan Battista Ruoppolo (1629, not 1620, –93) and Giuseppe Recco (1634–95),[121] both much better known than their teacher, continued the tradition to the end of the century. The name of Giovan Battista Recco, probably Giuseppe's elder brother, has to be added to theirs. A recently discovered painting (signed and dated 1654) of exceptional quality stimulated a tentative reconstruction of Giovan Battista's *œuvre*.[122] Ruoppolo is famed for his vigorous, succulent, and ample flower-pieces (Plate 143A), monumental like Preti's paintings in the grand manner and thus utterly different from Flemish still lifes with which, however, he must have been conversant.[123] Giuseppe Recco's temperament was less exuberant. His speciality was fish-pieces, painted with impeccable taste and an incomparable sense for tone values. Dominici reports that in his youth Recco spent some time in Milan working with a famous still-life painter. On this slender evidence art historians have concluded that he was trained by Baschenis. Whether true or not, Recco's still lifes often have a Lombard quality of austerity and immobility. Intimate and noble rather than extrovert and grand, they seem to presage the age of Chardin.

No such painter arose in Rome, and this is indicative of the future course of events. In the last analysis it was the memory of Caravaggio's conquests, always treasured in Naples in contrast to Rome, that made possible the remarkable ascendancy and variety of the Neapolitan school.