The foregoing chapters have been devoted to the three great masters of the High Baroque. Older artists, mainly Guercino and Lanfranco, had decisively contributed in the 1620s to the Baroque surge, to which the Bolognese classicism of the second decade had to yield. Although the authority of all these masters was tremendous, it remained by no means unchallenged; the voices of moderation, rationalism, and partisanship with the classical cause were not drowned for long. In the 1630s new men formed a powerful phalanx. They knew how to fight and even win their battles. The most distinguished artists of this group are the Frenchman Poussin, the Roman painter Andrea Sacchi, and two sculptors, the Bolognese Alessandro Algardi and the Fleming Francesco Duquesnoy. What they stand for is not a straight continuation of Bolognese classicism, but a revised version, tinged by the influence of the great masters and, in painting, by a new impact of Venetian colourism which was shared by the leading ‘Baroque’ artists, Lanfranco, Cortona, and Bernini. Compared with the Early Baroque classicism, the new classicism was at first rather boisterous and painterly; it has a physiognomy of its own, and it is this style that rights may be termed ‘High Baroque classicism’.

ANDREA SACCHI (1599–1661)

For Poussin’s development and the principles he believed in, the reader must be referred to Anthony Blunt’s masterly presentation. The Italian leader of the movement was Sacchi. Reared in Rome, he was trained by Albani, first in his native city, later at Bologna; but from about 1621 he was hack in Rome for good. In contrast to the dynamic Baroque artists a slow producer, critical of himself, bent on theorizing, he was by temperament and training predisposed to embrace the classical gospel. Yet his earliest large altarpiece, the Annunciation (after 1622, S. Isidoro), is still much indebted to Lodovico Carracci. Probably less than three years later he painted the St Gregory and the Miracle of the Corporal (1625–7, Vatican Pinacoteca) [104], which reveals a mature and great master. With its rich and warm colours painted in a light key and its splendid loose handling, this work may be regarded as the first masterpiece of the new manner. The story, taken from Paulus Diaconus, illustrates how the cloth with which the chalice had been cleaned is pierced with a dagger by the Pope and begins to bleed. The stranger who had doubted its magic quality sinks on to his knee, amazed and convinced. His two companions echo his wonderment, but the pope and his deacons are unperturbed. Sacchi had learned his lesson from Raphael’s Mass of Bolsena and rendered the story ‘in similar psychological terms: the calmness of those firm in their faith is contrasted to the excitement of the uninitiated. The minimum of figures, six in all, invites detailed scrutiny and enhances the effect of the silent drama. The organization of the canvas with its prominent triangle of three figures is essentially classical. But there is no central axis, and the cross of spatial diagonals allies the design to advanced compositional tendencies. Moreover the tight grouping of massive figures and the emphatic pull exercised by those turned into the picture belong to the Baroque repertory. The St Gregory is exactly contemporary with Cortona’s Bibiana frescoes [194], and it is evident that at this moment the antagonism between the two artists, though latent, has not yet come into the open - on the contrary, both works reveal similar intense qualities and clearly form a ‘common front’ if compared with works of the older Bolognese or the Caravaggisti.

104. Andrea Sacchi: St Gregory and the Miracle of the Corporal, 1625–7, Rome, Vatican Pinacoteca
We have seen that shortly after the St Gregory Sacchi worked with and under Cortona at Castel Fusano (1627-9). At that time their ideological and artistic differences must have begun to clash. A few years later Sacchi had moved far from the position of the St Gregory, as is proved by his best-known work, the Vision of St Romuald’ (Vatican Pinacoteca) [105]. Here under the shadow of a magnificent tree, the saint is telling the brethren his dream about the ladder leading to heaven on which the deceased members of the Order ascend to Paradise. The choice and rendering of the subject are characteristic for Sacchi: instead of employing the Baroque language of rhetoric, he creates real drama in terms of intense introspection in the faces and attitudes, and the soft Venetian gold tone permeating this symphony in white is in perfect harmony with the pensive and deeply serious frame of mind of the listening monks. Within Sacchi’s range, the St Gregory is by comparison ‘loud’ and trenchant colourist, compositionally, and psychologically. The Baroque massiveness of the figures has now been considerably reduced; in addition they are moved away from the picture plane and face the beholder. All his later work is painted in a similar low key and with a similar attention to psychological penetration and concentration on bare essentials. In the 1640s he went a step further beyond the St Romuald, Til, principal work of this period, the eight canvases illustrating the Life of the Baptist painted for the lantern of S. Giovanni in Fonte (1641-9), shows that he wanted to strip his style of even the slightest embroidery. Trained on Raphael, he reached a degree of classical simplicity that is the precise Italian counterpart to Poussin’s development of these years.

Sacchi’s and Cortona’s ways parted seriously during their work in the Palazzo Barberini. As Cardinal Antonio Barberini’s protege, Sacchi was given the task of painting on the ceiling of one room Divine Wisdom (1629-33) [111], illustrating the apocryphal text from the Wisdom of Solomon (6:22): ‘If therefore ye delight in thrones and sceptres, ye princes of peoples, honour wisdom, that ye may reign for ever.’ Possibly finished in the year in which Cortona began his Divine Providence, the two works, with their implicit allegorical references to the Barberini Pope, supplement each other as far as the theme is concerned. But how different from Cortona’s is Sacchi’s approach to his task! Dieinc Wisdom enthroned over the world is surrounded by eleven female personifications symbolizing her qualities in accordance with the text. Sacchi represented the scene with the minimum number of figures in tranquil poses; they create their sublime role by their being rather than by their acting. Raphael’s Parnassus was the model that he tried to emulate. He renounced illusionism and painted the scene as if it were a quadro riportato - ap easel-painting. But he did not return to the position of Bolognese classicism, for the fresco is not framed and the entire ceiling has become its stage. Although the affinities with Domenichino cannot be overlooked, the light and loose handling is much closer to Lanfranco.

**The Controversy between Sacchi and Cortona**

Cortona’s and Sacchi’s vastly different interpretations of great allegorical frescoes reflect, of course, differences of principles and convictions, which were voiced in the discussions of the Accademia di S. Luca during these years. The controversy centred round the old problem, whether six or many figures should be used in illustrating a historical theme. The partisans of classical art theory had good reasons to advocate compositions with few figures. According to this theory, the story in a picture should be rendered in terms of expression, gesture, and movement. These are the means at the painter’s disposal to express the ‘ideas in man’s mind’ - which Leonardo regarded as the principal concern of the good painter. It is only in compositions with few figures (Alberti admits nine or ten) that each figure can be assigned a distinct part by virtue of its expression, gesture, and movement, and can thus contribute a characteristic feature to the whole. In a crowded composition, single figures...
Another aspect supported these conclusions. Since painters had always borrowed their terms of reference from Poetry, (stimulated by Horace's 'ut pictura poesis'), they maintained that a picture must be 'read' like a poem or tragedy, where not only does each person have his clearly circumscribed function, but where the Aristotelian unities also pertain.

Pietro da Cortona fully accepted the traditional assumption that the familiar concepts of poetical theory apply to painting. But he pleaded for paintings with many figures, thus departing from classical theory. He compared the structure of painted plots to that of the epic. Like an epic, a painting must have a main theme and many episodes. These are vital, he maintained, in order to give the painting magnificence, to link up groups, and to facilitate the division into compelling areas of light and shade. The episodes in painting may be compared to the chorus in ancient tragedy, and, like the chorus, they must be subordinate to the principal theme. Sacchi, by contrast, insisted unequivocally that painting must vie with tragedy: the fewer figures the better; simplicity and unity are of the essence. It is now clear that both masters made the theoretical position which they defended explicit in their work.

If we can here follow the formation or rather consolidation of two opposing camps, it is also evident that Cortona dreamed of throwing overboard the whole intellectual framework of classical art theory. Like Bernini, he subscribed to its basic tenets but modified them in a particular direction. On the other hand, the circle round Poussin, Sacchi, Algardi, and Duquesnoy was a strong party which never waives its convictions. His French rationalism and discipline carried Poussin even further than Sacchi; as cark as the end of the 1620s he endeavoured to emulate ancient tragedy by reducing the Massacre of the Innocents (Claintilly) to a single dramatic group. The stiffening of the theoretical position may be assessed by comparing Poussin's Massacre with Reni's, of 1611.

Sacchi himself further clarified his theoretical standpoint in the studio talk given at about this time to his pupil Francesco Lauri (1610-35), and later in a letter written on 28 October 1651 to his teacher, Francesco Albani. In the loaner document he reiterated the basic repertory of the classical theory by concentrating on decorum and the rendering of the affetti, - gestures and expression. He advocated natural movement and turned against the obscursantism produced by rhetorical embroidery and every kind of excess, such as the overdoing of draperies. In the letter to Albani, concerned with similar problems, he laments with extreme sharp words the neglect of propriety and decorum which has caused the decay of the art of painting. Albam, in his answer, strikes a new note by deriding the choice of tavern settings and Annibale Carracci.

Ilbam's targets were, of course, the Bamboccianti. Sacchi's controversy with Cortona, by contrast, was on the high art. Equal is speaking to equal, and the differences are fought out in the lofty atmosphere of the Academy. The theoretical rift, though, and its practical consequences are clear enough. It did not, however, prevent Cortona from frequenting the circle of artists who were opposed to his views. We are not astonished to find that Cortona, in the Treatise which he published together with the Jesuit Ottonelli in 1652, upheld the traditional ideals of propriety and decorum and also insisted on the moral function of art. But side by side with this appears the concept of Art as pure form without an extraneous raison d'etre. Thus the Baroque antithesis docere-delectare makes its entry into the theory of art, and the hedonistic principle of delight as the purpose of painting comes into its own. In keeping with this, Cortona's art has an outspoken sensual quality, while Sacchi, classicist and moralist like Poussin, refrains more and more from appealing to the senses.

There is no doubt that Sacchi and his circle won the day. Not only did he and his confreres pursue relentlessly the aim of cleansing their art of Baroque reminiscences, but they extended their influence to Cortona's pupils, such as Francesco Romanelli and Giacinto Gimignani (1606-81), and made possible in the 1640s the ascendancy in Rome of archaizing painters like Sasoferrato (1606-85) and Giovan Domenico Cerrini (1606-81). Even the great Baroque masters were touched by their ideas, and Bernini himself, after his abortive classicizing phase of the 1630s, found a new approach to this problem in his old age. The classical wave surged far beyond the confines of the artistic capital and threatened to quell a free development in such vigorous art centres as Bologna. Moreover the classical point of view received literary support, not dogmatically perhaps, from the painter and biographer of artists Giovanni Battista Passeri, the friend of Algardi and Sacchi, and most determinedly from Giovanni Bellori (1615-86), the learned antiquarian, the intimate of Poussin and Duquesnoy, and the mouthpiece and universally acclaimed promoter of the classical cause.

Even if it is correct that Monsignor Agucchi (i: p. 14) anticipated Bellori's ideas, the old battles were fought on new fronts. While Agucchi had turned against Caravaggio's 'naturalism' and the maniera painters, Sacchi, Bellori and the rest sustained the classic-idealistic theory against the Baroque masters and the Bamboccianti, the painters of the lower genre. In the light of this fact, we may once again confirm that 'Baroque classicism' dates from the beginning of the 1630s. Before that time no serious collision took place. It was only from the seventeenth century on that there existed real dissenters, and, therefore, classicism had to dig in. While at the beginning of the century there was a large degree of theoretical flexibility, the attitude of the defenders of classicism had to become, and became, less tractable after 1630; and as the century advanced the breach between the opposing camps widened - until in the wake of Poussin the French Academy turned the classical creed into a pedantic doctrine. The Italians proved more supple. Sacchi's position was taken up by his pupil Carlo Maratti, who handed on the classical gospel to the eighteenth century and ultimately to Mengs and to Winckelmann, the real father of Neo-classicism and passionate enemy of all things Baroque. Pietro da Cortona, on the other hand, must be regarded as
the ancestor of the hedonistic trend which led via Luca Giordano to the masters of the French and Italian Rococo.

**ALESSANDRO ALGARDI (1598-1654)**

No sculptor of the seventeenth century bears comparison with Bernini. Indeed, in the second quarter of the century there existed in Rome, apart from his studio, only two independent studios of some importance: those of Algardi and Duquesnoy. The latter was a solitary character; with the exception of the statue of St Andrew in St Peter’s, he never had a large commission, he never had a devoted pupil, and his considerable influence was exercised through the objective qualities of his work rather than through the fascination of his personality.

The case of Algardi is different. For a short time his studio had some similarity to that of Bernini. During the last fifteen years of his life he had to cope with numerous and extensive commissions; and, after Bernini’s death in 1654, his reputation as a sculptor had no equal between about 1630 and 1654. At the beginning of Innocent X’s reign (from 1644), at a time when the greater man was temporarily out of favour, he even stepped into Bernini’s place.

Algardi, coming from Bologna where he had frequented the Academy of the aged Lodovico Carracci and studied sculpture with the mediocre Giulio Cesare Comenti (1577-1640), reached Rome in 1624 after a stay of some years at Mantua. He came with a recommendation from the Duke of Mantua to Cardinal Lodovico Ludovisi, himself a Bolognese and the owner of a celebrated collection of ancient sculpture, and established contact with his Bolognese compatriots, above all with Domenichino. Cardinal Ludovisi entrusted him with the restoration of antique statues, while Domenichino negotiated for him his first Roman commission of some importance: the statues of Mary Magdalen and St John the Evangelist for the Cappella Bandim in S. Silvestro al Quirinale (c. 1628). These data indicate the components of his style, which derived from the classically tempered realism of the Carracci Academy, the close study of, and constant work with, ancient statuary, and his association with men like Domenichino, the staunch upholder of the classical design.

As one would expect, for the rest of his life Algardi belonged to the younger circle of artists with classical inclination.
and Poussin, Duquesnoy, and Sacchi were among his friends.

Yet in spite of the difference of talent and temperament, education and artistic principles, Algardi was immediately fascinated by Bernini: witness his figure of Mary Magdalen of 1610, the style of which is half-way between the subjectivism of Bernini’s Bibiana and the classicism of Duquesnoy’s Susanna [114]. In fact Algardi remained to a certain extent dependent on his great rival. This is also apparent in his early portrait busts; that of Cardinal Giovanni Garzia Millini (d. 1629) in S. Maria del Popolo is unthinkable without Bernini’s Bellarmine, while of Monsignor Odoardo Santarelli in S. Maria Maggiore, probably belonging to Algardi’s earliest productions in this field, follows closely Bernini’s Montoya.

Nevertheless, Bernini’s and Algardi’s approach to portraiture differed considerably. A comparison between Bernini’s Scipione Borghese of 1632 [7] and Algardi’s perhaps earlier Cardinal Laudovico Zacchia in the Staatsliche Museum, Berlin [167,1] makes this abundantly clear. In contrast to the transitory moment chosen by Bernini, Algardi represents his sitter, with his mouth closed, in a state of permanence and tranquil existence. Scipione Borghese seems to converse with us, while Algardi’s cardinal remains static, immobile for ever.

This tomb was commissioned in 1637 Q. Montagu, 1985.

01. Ombrowski (1997) has demonstrated that this bust does not represent Laudovico Zacchia; his attribution of it to Giuliano Finelli is more tellurial.

The most meticulous attention to detail, down to wrinkles and warts, and the most able treatment of skin, hair, and fur does not help to give such portraits Bernini’s dynamic vitality. Compared with Bernini, who never loses sight of the whole to which every part is subordinated, Algardi’s busts look like aggregates of an infinite number of careful observations made before the sitter. All forms and shapes are trenchant and precise and retain their individuality: this is a decisive aspect of Algardi’s ‘realist-classicism’. But for solidity and seriousness his portraits are unequalled; the mere bulk of any of his early busts brings the sitter physiologically close to us, and in this weightiness consists the High Baroque community of spirit not only with Bernini but also with Cortona and the early Sacchi."

Algardi’s genius for the sober representation of character has always been admired. The number of portrait busts by his hand is considerable, and it seems that many of them were done during his first years in Rome. In any case, it would appear that already in the course of the 1630s Algardi had begun to move away from his intense realism. Abandoning the warm and vivid treatment of the surface and the subtle differentiation of texture, he replaced the freshness of the early works by a noble aloofness in his later busts. One of the finest of that period, the stylish a member of the Pamphili family (after 1644, Rome, Palazzo Doria) [169], exhibits this classicism to perfection.” Thus, not unlike Sacchi, Algardi steers towards a more determined classicality.

In 1629 Algardi’s reputation was not yet sufficiently established for him to be considered for one of the four
monumental statues under the dome of St Peter's. He was in his fortieth year when the first great commission, the tomb of Leo XI, fell to him; and it was not until 1640 that he was offered another monumental task: the over-life-size statue of St Philip Neri in S. Maria in Vallicella, in which he followed closely the example set by Guido Reni in the same church. Then, under Innocent X, the commissions came in quick succession. Between 1649 and 1650 he executed the memorial statue of Innocent X in bronze as a counterpart to Bernini’s earlier statue of Urban VIII (Palazzo dei Conservatori). Once again Algardi was impressed by Bernini; but instead of suppressing detailed characterization as Bernini had done, his pope has been rendered with minutest care and is, indeed, a great masterpiece of portraiture. Yet for all its intimate qualities the statue lacks the visionary power of its counterpart. Algardi did not accept the hieratic frontality of Bernini’s Urban; he turned his statue in a more benevolent attitude towards the left; he considerably toned down the great diagonal of the papal cope, and transformed an energetic and commanding gesture into one of restraint and halting movement. He weakened the power of the blessing arm by the linear and decorative folds of the mantle, while Bernini enhanced the poignancy of benediction by pushing the arm forcefully forward into the beholder’s space.

The execution of Leo XI’s tomb [i, ii, iii], extending over many years, ran parallel with that of Bernini’s tomb of Urban VIII. But Algardi, beginning six years after Bernini, must have been familiar with Bernini’s design. Leo’s tomb is, in fact, the first papal tomb dependent on that of Urban VIII. All the salient features recur: the pyramidal arrangement of three figures, the blessing pope above the sarcophagus, and
the allegories standing next to it in a zone before the papal figure. Algardi had to plan for an unsatisfactory position in time of the narrow passages of the left aisle of St Peter's. Bound by spatial restrictions, he reduced the structural parts to a minimum. At the same time, the absolute preponderance of the figures suited his classicizing stylistic tendencies. Algardi also supplied a narrative relief, for which there was no room in the dynamic design of the Urban tomb. But during his classical phase Bernini did introduce a relief on the sarcophagus of the Countess Matilda monument in St Peter's (begun 1633), and slightly later on the tombs of the Ilaimondi Chapel in S. Pietro in Montorio. Algardi made use of this device, and his debt to the Matilda monument is borne out by the fact that he fitted his narrative biographical relief into a similar trapezoid shape.

If the compositional elements of Leo XI's tomb were thus derived from Bernini, Algardi departed from him most decisively in other respects. The tomb consists entirely of white Carrara marble. Algardi avoided the use of colour as emphatically as Bernini accepted it. Instead of a warm rendering of the skin and a luminous sparkle of the surface such as are found in Bernini's Urban tomb, Algardi's evenly-worked marbles have a cool, neutralized surface which is particularly evident in the head of the allegory of Courage. Instead of the transitory moment represented in Bernini's allegories, we find a permanent condition in those of Algardi. In fact, Algardi asserts his classical convictions in all and every respect, but I am far from suggesting that the result is a truly classical work. It is as far or even farther removed from Canova's classicism as Sacchi's paintings are from those of Mengs. Under the shadow of Bernini's overpowering genius, Algardi never even attempted to follow
the whole way. His tomb of Leo XI is a true monument of High Baroque classicism.

In contrast to this papal tomb, Algardi created a new grand tour species in his largest work, the relief representing the meeting of Leo and Attila (1646-53, St Peter's) \[112\].

The historical event of the year A.D. 452 was always regarded as a symbol of the miraculous salvation of the Church from overwhelming danger, and it was only appropriate to give this scene pride of place in St Peter's. Much indebted to Raphael's example, Algardi's interpretation of the event is simple and convincing. As in Raphael's fresco, only pope and king perceive the miraculous apparition of the Apostles; the followers on both sides are still unaware of it. The rigidly maintained triple division of the left half, right half, and the upper zone results from the story, the protagonists of which dominate the scene. Once the traditional reserve towards this relief has been overcome, one cannot but admire its compositional logic and psychological clarity. Its unusual size of nearly 25 feet height has often led to the fallacious belief that its style, too, has no forerunners; but in fact the history of the illusionistic relief dates back to the early days of the Renaissance, to Donatello and Ghiberti. In contrast, however, to the rilievo scacciato of the Renaissance, Algardi desisted from creating a coherent optical space and used mainly gradations in the projection of figures to produce the illusion of depth. The flatter the relief grows, the more the figures seem to recede into the distance, while the more they stand out, the nearer they are to us. Those in the most forward layer of the relief are completely three-dimensional and furnish transitions between artistic and real space; the problem of spatial organization is thus turned into one of psychological import and emotional participation.

After Algardi had created this prototype, such reliefs were preferred to paintings whenever circumstances permitted it. This was probably due to the fact that a relief is a species half-way, as it were, between pictorial illusion and reality, for the bodies have real volume, there is real depth, there is a gradual transition between the beholder's space and that of the relief. More effectively than illusionist painting, the painterly relief satisfied the Baroque desire to elide the boundaries between life and art, spectator and figure. Only periods which demand self-sufficiency of the work of art will protest against such figures as the Attila, who seems to hurry out of the relief into our space; for people of the Baroque era it was precisely this motif that allowed them fully to participate in Attila's excitement in the presence of the miracle. But now it is important to realize why it was Algardi rather than Bernini who brought into emphasis the pictorial relief of the Baroque.

In Bernini's work, reliefs are of relatively little consequence: it seems that they did not satisfy his desire for spatial interpenetration of sculpture and life. A relief is, after all, framed like a picture, and consequently the illusion it creates cannot be complete. If we recall Bernini's handling of plastic masses which invade real space without limiting frames (p. 14), Algardi's Attila appears by comparison temperate, controlled, and relegated to the sphere of art. It would not be difficult to show that this difference between Bernini's and Algardi's approach cannot be explained by the hazards or demands inherent in different commissions. While Bernini seeks to eliminate the very difference between painting, relief, and free-standing sculpture, Algardi meticulously preserves the essential character of each species.

His interpretation of a free-standing group can best be studied in his Decapitation of St Paul (1638-43, Bologna, S. Paolo) \[113\]. The two figures of the executioner and the saint are placed within a framing semicircle of columns behind the main altar. Entirely isolated, each figure shows an uninterrupted silhouette and preserves its block-like quality. It would have been contrary to Algardi's principles to detract from the clarity of these figures by placing them against a sculptured or 'picturesque' background. This is particularly revealing in view of the fact that he was stimulated by pictorial impressions: it was Sacchi's Martyrdom of St Longinus at Castelgandolfo that had a formative influence on his conception."

The Attila relief was Algardi's most important legacy to posterity. While a work like the Decapitation of St Paul with its Sacchesque gravity, simplicity, and psychological
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113. Alessandro Algardi: The Decapitation of St Paul, 1638-43. Bologna, S. Paolo
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penetration illustrates excellently his partisanship with the classical cause. The more 'official' relief shows that, confronted with a truly monumental task, Algardi was prepared to compromise and to attempt a reconciliation between the leading trend of Bernini's grand manner and the sobriety of classicism - between the impetuous art of a genius and his own more limited talents.

FRANCESCO DUQUESNOY (1597–1643)

Duquesnoy was probably a greater artist than Algardi; in any case, he was less prepared to compromise. Born in Brussels in 1597, the son of the sculptor Jerome Duquesnoy, he came to Rome in 1618 and stayed there until shortly before his premature death in 1643. He was so thoroughly acclimatized that even the discerning eye will hardly discover anything northern in his art. Soon Duquesnoy was a leading figure in the circle of the classicists; after Poussin's arrival in Rome he shared a house with him, and he was on intimate terms with Sacchi. He also soon belonged to the group of artists who worked for Cassiano del Pozzo's corpus of classical antiquity (p. 63). But ten years went by before he became a well-known figure in the artistic life of Rome. Between 1627 and 1628 Bernini employed him on the sculptural decoration of the Baldacchino. His reputation established, he was chosen to execute the St Andrew, one of the four giant statues under the dome of St Peter's. And in 1629 he received the commission for his most famous work, the statue of St Susanna in the choir of S. Maria di Loreto.

For a study of Duquesnoy, one should first turn to this celebrated figure. Susanna originally held the martyr's palm in her right hand; with the left she is making a timid gesture towards the altar, while her face is turned in the direction of the congregation. Bellori, a devoted admirer of Duquesnoy's art, maintained that it was impossible to achieve a more perfect synthesis of the study of nature and the idea of antiquity. Duquesnoy, he relates, worked for years from the model, while the ancient statue of Urania on the Capitol was always before his mind's eye. The stance and the fall of the drapery are, indeed, close to the Urania and other similar ancient figures. The contour of the statue is clear and uninterrupted and the studied contrapposto is utterly convincing: the leg on which the weight of the body rests, the free-standing leg, the sloping line of the shoulders, the gentle turn of the head - all this is beautifully balanced and supported by the fall of dress and mantle. The folds are gathered together on the slightly protruding right hip, and it was precisely the classically poised treatment of the drapery that evoked the greatest enthusiasm at the time. Bellori regarded the Susanna as the canon of the modern draped figure of a saint. This judgement was perfectly justified, since there is hardly any other work in the history of sculpture, not excluding Bernini's most important statues, that had an effect as lasting as Duquesnoy's Susanna.

114. Francesco Duquesnoy: St Susanna, 1629–33. Rome, S. Maria di Loreto
115. Francesco Duquesnoy: St Andrew, 1629–40. Rome, St Peter's
A comparison between the *Susanna* and Bernini’s *Bibiana* of five years earlier [4] makes the limpid and temperate simplicity of the *Susanna* all the more obvious, particularly if one considers that the *Bibiana* was well known to Duquesnoy, and that even he could not entirely dismiss her existence from his thoughts. Coming from the *Susanna*, one finds the stance of Bernini’s figure ill-defined and the mantle obscuring rather than underlining the structure of the body. In contrast to the wilfully arranged fall of the folds in the *Bibiana*, the mantle of the *Susanna* strictly follows the laws of gravity; in contrast to the individual characterization of Bibiana’s dress, Susanna is shown in the timeless attire of classical antiquity. Duquesnoy abstained from any indication of time and space; a simple slab, instead of a rock with vegetation, forms the base of the statue. It was not the individual fate of a saint, but the objective state of sainthood which he desired to portray. Consequently, he represented his saint in a state of mental and physical repose instead of selecting a transitory moment as Bernini had done. He gave shape to an ideal norm with the same compelling logic with which Bernini had characterized a fleeting instant and a fluctuating movement. No light is playing on the surface, the forms are firm, clear, and unchangeable, and any departure from such objectivity is carefully avoided.\(^\text{17}\) The face of Susanna is shown with her mouth closed and her eyes gazing into space with the blank eyeballs of Roman statues; whereas Bernini made it a point to incise the iris and pupil, which gives the look direction and individual expression. Behind these two contrasting interpretations of saints lie the two different approaches: the Baroque and the classical, a subjective as opposed to an objective conception, dynamic intensity as opposed to rational discipline. The similarity of Sacchi’s and Duquesnoy’s developments is more than mere coincidence; both turn over a new leaf in 1629, the one with the *Divine Wisdom*, after having worked under Cortona at Castel Fusano, the other with the *Susanna*, after having worked under Bernini in St Peter’s.

So far I have treated the *Susanna* and *Bibiana* as basically antagonistic, but this is not the whole story. Nobody with any knowledge of the history of sculpture would fail to date the *Susanna* in the seventeenth century. Sacchi’s and Algardi’s works have shown that this “Baroque classicism” reveals symptoms characteristic of the period. The head of the *Susanna* displays a lyrical and delicate sweetness (Bellori called it ‘un’ aria dolce di grazia purissima’) such as is found neither in classical antiquity nor in the adored models of Raphael and his circle; but we do find the same sort of expression in paintings of the period, such as the almost
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116. Francesco Duquesnoy: Tomb of Ferdinand van den Eynde, 1633-40, Rome, S. Maria dell’Anima
117 (right). Francesco Duquesnoy: A Putto from the Andrien Vryburch Tomb, 1629. Rome, S. Maria dell’Anima
118 (far right). Francesco Duquesnoy: A Putto, after 1630. Terracotta.
exactly contemporary frescoes by Domenichino in the choir of S. Andrea della Valle; and conversely, echoes of the head of the Susanna are frequent in Sacchi’s pictures. This essentially seventeenth-century sensibility and the stronger sensations of ecstasy and vision do not differ intrinsically, but in degree. The blending of classical purity of form with the expression of seventeenth-century susceptibility had an immense appeal for contemporaries, a fact which is borne out by the many replicas of the head of Susanna.” Moreover, a direct line leads from here to the often sentimental prettiness of the ‘classicist Rococo’ of which Filippo della Valle’s Temperance [69] may serve as an example. Not only has the head of the Susanna a distinctly seventeenth-century flavour: the porous and soft treatment of the surface, of skin, hair, and dress, which seems to impart warm life to the statue - a life that is completely lacking in most of the ancient models known to the seventeenth century - is typical of the spirit of the Baroque. Finally, with the subtle relations between the statue, the altar, and the congregation, Duquesnoy enlarged the spiritual relevance of his figure beyond its material boundaries. Thus he advanced some steps along the path which Bernini followed to the end.

The case of the Susanna is closely paralleled by Duquesnoy’s StAndrew [1629-40] [115]. The stance of the figure and the fall of the drapery are of almost academic classicality, adapted from ancient statues of Jupiter. A comparison with Bernini’s Longinus [5] illustrates emphatically the deep chasm that divides the two artists. But even this figure is not self-sufficient, for St Andrew turns with pleading gesture and devotional expression towards the heavenly light streaming in from the dome, while the ample cloak endows him with Baroque mass and weight. Duquesnoy’s eminence, however, lay in the handling of works of smaller dimensions, and this monumental statue lacks the convincing oneness which in those very years he was able to give to his St Susanna. The statuesque body of the figure contrasts with the emotional expression of the head; and the transference of the heroic Jupiter type to the Christian saint is as unsatisfactory as the Baroque diagonal going through shoulders and arms is petty and feeble.

During his first Roman years Duquesnoy had earned his living mainly by small sculpture in bronze and ivory, by wooden reliquaries, and by restoring ancient marbles. Nor are many of his later works in marble of large size; neither the tomb of Andrien Vryburch of 1629 [11-7] nor that of Ferdinand van den Eynde of 1633-40 [116], both in Maria dell’Anima, nor the earlier tomb of Bernardo Guillelmi (S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura), in which he fol-
Duquesnoy's special interest was focused on representations of the putto. He really gave something of the soul of children and modelled their bodies so round, soft, and delicate that they seem to be alive and to breathe; the subtle transitions between one form and another and the tenderness of the surface can be as little reproduced as the quivering sfumato of Correggio's palette. It was Duquesnoy's conception of the bambino that became a general European property and, consciously or unconsciously, most later representations of small children are indebted to him.

But Duquesnoy's rendering of the putto was not static, and this is reflected in the differences of opinion about the Vryburch and van den Eynde tombs. Some critics regarded only the one, some only the other as original. The truth seems to be that the putti of both monuments are entirely by the hand of the master; but while the Vryburch monument, the earlier of the two, shows a type close to Titian, those of the van den Eynde monument are evidently indebted to Rubens.

Even if Bellori and Passeri had not related it, it would be impossible to overlook how carefully Duquesnoy had studied Titian. We know from the sources that he was fascinated by Titian's Children's Bacchanal, now in the Prado, at that time in the collection of Cardinal Ludovisi - a fascination which he shared with Poussin. The putti of the Vryburch monument comply closely with Italian standards of beauty and show a comparatively firm treatment of the skin, while those of the van den Eynde tomb have the fat bellies and soft flexibility of children by Rubens. There are other works which testify to Duquesnoy's intimate study of Titian, and I would date these, analogous to Poussin's Venetian period, in the early years, before or about 1630. On the other hand Flemish characteristics become more prominent towards the end of Duquesnoy's career, the most important example being the relief with singing putti on Borromini's altar of the Cappella Filomarino in SS. Apostoli, Naples.

It appears that Duquesnoy returned to his native Flemish realism, which had lain dormant under the impact of the Italian experience, and that he imparted it above all to his putti - in other words when he was not concerned with work on a large scale, and therefore felt free from the ideological limitations of the classical doctrine. He thus inaugurated a specific Baroque type, the influence of which not even Bernini and his circle could escape.
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13. Alhamb had planned to write an art theoretical treatise together with a Dr Orazio Zamboni (b. 7 January 1606), about whom little is known. Notes for this work, which can be dated between the early 1640s and Albani's death in 1660, were incorporated by Malvasia in his *Felsina pittrice* (1644, 249ff.) but see now A. Sutherland Harris's monograph (1977).


16. It will be noticed that Cortona as a decorator (see p. 81) and as a painter had his following on different sides of the fence.

17. The traditional birth-date 1595 has to be changed to 1598; see the document published by A. Arfelli, *Arte Antica e Moderna*, ii, no. 5 (1959), 462.

18. There were, however, many in his own generation who held him in high esteem: I mean not only the small circle of close friends, such as Poussin and Sacchi, but foreigners like Blanchard and Van Dyck, who painted his portrait, and Rubens, who wrote him a most flattering letter. R. S. Majum, in *Burl. Mag.* (1950), 242. For the subject, see Passeri-Hess, 29; H. Tetius, *Aedes Barberinae*, Rome, 1642, 83. Incisa, *loc. cit.* (ibid., op. cit., 38; Haskell, Patrons, 50. For this type of allegorical fresco, see E. Gombrich in *W.CI.*, xxii (1948), 186. For drawing related to *Divine Wisdom*, see Harris-Schaar, op. cit. 29.
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21. If the apocryphal date is correct, the bust was made as early as 1626. In any case, it dates from before - and probably some years before - the Cardinal's death on 7 August 1637. For this bust, see P. Posse, *Jahrb. Kunstw*. Kunsthist., xxv (1905), and J. Pope-Hennessy, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*, London, 1963, Catalogue, 142, with further references.

20. In the first (hardback) edition I showed on Plate 96A the bust of Francesco Bracciolini (Victoria and Albert Museum), traditionally and - as it seemed to me - correctly attributed to Algarotti. A. Nava Cellini, in *Paragone*, viii (1957), 11 and no. 84, 67, attributed this bust to Finelli and reasserted her attribution *ibid.*, xi (1959), no. 131, 16. It now appears that she is right, for there is contemporary evidence for this attribution (see J. Pope-Hennessy, *Catal. of It. Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum*, London, 1964, 116, 606ff., 116, 643). The bust shows to what extent Finelli was dependent on Algarotti.
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Together with the bust of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger, the Bracciolini must be regarded as his highest achievement as a portrait sculptor.

33. See M. A. Mufioz’s generic discussion of Algardi’s portrait busts (Dedalo, 1[1920], 289), the problem was not treated for forty years. In 1956 O. Raggio (The Connoisseur, xxix/vii (1956), 203) published Algardi’s bust of Cardinal Scipione Borghese in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, with some pertinent remarks. Few of the busts are dated and the following sequence, taking into account only part of Algardi’s production, is an attempt at a chronological order. The Santarelli seems to be quite early, perhaps the earliest Roman portrait. The busts of Doria-Pamphili and of the Pamphili prince [i.e., 1638], after 1640, the year of Innocent X’s accession to the papal throne. (Bellori called the latter bust ‘Benedetto Pamphili’, who was the Pope’s brother; it is now usually called Panfilo Pamphili but may represent Camillo, the son of Panfilo and Olimpia.) The three posthumous Frangipani busts in S. Marcello al Corso (first mentioned in P. Totti, Ritratto di Roma moderna, Rome, 1638) seem to mediate between the early and late group of busts; they clearly display strong classicizing tendencies. Finally, the bust of Mario Millini in S. Maria del Popolo obviously echoes Bernini’s Francis I of Este and must date from after 1650, but it was probably executed by a studio hand. My chronology of Algardi’s busts is at variance with that suggested by V. Martinelli in Il Seicento europeo. Rome, 1957, Catalogue, 40ff. Another chronology has been attempted by A. Nava Cellini in Dizionario Biografico degli italiani, u (1960), 355, and idem, Paragone, xv (1964), no. 177, 173. For Algardi’s busts of Innocent X in the Palazzo Doria, they are usually attributed to Bernini or Wittkower, Bernini, 211.
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