A poem, a collection of antiquities and a Saviour by Raphael: a case-study in the visualization of sacred history in early seventeenth-century Rome

MAARTEN DELBEKE

AN ANONYMOUS POEM ON AN UNKNOWN PAINTING

Amongst the unpublished manuscripts that belonged to the Jesuit and Cardinal Sforza Pallavicino (1607–67) now in the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome there is a lengthy poem on imitative art which culminates in the description of a painting.1 The poem bears no title and is not attributed.2 The other material in the volume in which the poem can be found spans the whole seventeenth century, providing no indications that allow the poem to be dated more precisely.3

The poem seeks to demonstrate how art compensates for man’s limited perception of the natural and supernatural world.4 Nature has condemned man to perceive everything that lies beyond the soul’s confines of the body through five narrow windows—the senses—allowing only impure reflections to filter through. This confinement blinds man to the trances of celestial beauty that God has hidden in even the most vile of creatures (stanza 1). Man is not only limited when seeing into the future or even the past, but his sphere of perception is also narrowly restricted in the present. Meanwhile, the human intellect is helpless if it does not receive sense perceptions (stanza 2–3). Luckily, ingenious art can imitate nature’s vigour to render things present; pen, chisel and brush recreate past and distant objects, people or events (stanza 4–5). Amongst these arts, sculpture lacks colour (stanza 6). Writing is done with complex characters that change with place and era, and therefore often become illegible (stanza 7). Painting, prone to none of the defects that hamper sculpture and writing, is the best helper for the confined human spirit. But precisely because it is so universal, and so powerfully moves the beholder, the greatest care should be taken when choosing a subject-matter. Lascivious and pagan subjects are abhorred (stanza 8–9). An excellent example of a good painting, amongst a thousand others, is to be found in the museum of a certain Gualdi (stanza 10). The poem then proceeds with a description of the painting, an exaltation of its painter, and a concealed comparison between the painting’s subject-matter and divine creation. This comparison reflects the first stanza: this painting contains a trace of God’s creativity (stanza 11–14).

The poem touches on several familiar themes: art’s ability to transcend time and space, the paragone between poetry, painting and sculpture, the risks presented by pagan and lascivious iconography and painting’s ability to arouse its beholders to emulation of a painting’s subject-matter. These issues gain weight because they are related to an eminent exemplum. The painting is a portrait of Christ; there are no references to other persons or actions and the poem focuses on the Saviour’s face, which seems to diffuse light. The poem stresses how Christ’s incarnation and the sacrifice it implies have allowed man to become immortal (stanza 11). It raises the question of how the painter has been able to find the Idea of such lofty subject-matter: could he have gathered the most beautiful parts from different faces (stanza 12)? The painting’s creator is highly esteemed. He earns praise for ‘the high city, which carries the oak as its weapon’ and his work is admired on the Vatican hill. His mastery turns him into an example for all to follow (stanza 13). Amongst the hundreds of works he painted, the one described is his best. And amongst the marvels in Gualdi’s museum, it is superior to the ‘giant’s bone’ and produces greater stupore than ‘the wood turned into stone’ for ‘the water transformed into diamond’ that are there to be seen. For it seems that God himself has made the painting (stanza 14).

Notwithstanding the scarce information provided by the poem and the rather limited amount of available documentary evidence, it is possible to propose an identification of the painting. The arguments in favour of this identification will point towards two larger issues, which, as I hope to show, are closely related and lead towards the central argument of this essay: namely, to show how reflections on poetic, artistic and archeological artefacts produced in early seventeenth-century Rome suggest that these artefacts were considered as truthful representations of sacred history and, thereby, of divine truth. These reflections not only viewed the visual arts, poetry and archeology as equivalent visualizations of sacred history but, in doing so, also legitimized the contemporary Church and its visual splendour.

The first issue that arises when identifying the painting is a question of literary heritage. The painting I would like to propose as the subject of this poem, a Bust of the Saviour by Raphael, had been the object of an earlier poetic description. While this older poem gives a highly inaccurate description of
In an exalted description of Gianlorenzo Bernini's sculptural group Apollo and Daphne, Borboni asserts that the sculptor must have had the same words from Apuleius in mind as Raphael from Urbino, when the latter painted a portrait of the Saviour: 'his flowing hair unshorn, his cheeks blooming ... his body most pleasing, his limbs dazzling, his tongue prophetic'. A marginal annotation ascribes the quotation to Ex Musae Gualdi super Imagin. Salutat, 'From Gualdi's museum on an image of the Saviour', a text of which all trace is lost. The identification of Raphael as the author of the painting fits with the summary indications provided by the poem in Pallavicino's papers. Raphael's native town Urbino carries the della Rovere oak in its arms. Raphael indeed earned praise in the Vatican.

To identify the painting we must therefore turn to Raphael's established body of work. The hints provided by the poem and Borboni produce two possibilities. The literary heritage attached to one of these two paintings will allow a hypothesis for the identification, while providing a key to reading the manuscript poem. In the absence of documentary evidence, and with the current, rather fragmentary state of archival research into the collections and families involved, it is useful to present briefly the discarded possibility.

The poem probably does not describe Raphael's Christ Blessing, now in Brescia (figure 1). This painting, a small...
wooden panel, shows a half figure of Christ, who makes a blessing with his right hand. He bears the crown of thorns and the stigmata; a veil covers his right shoulder and envelopes his lower body. The provenance of this painting is first recorded in an undated Memoria, written by Giovanni Battista Mosca, who recalls how ‘Carlo Barzi Mosca, Cavaliere di S. Stefano’ bought in 1770 a ‘quadroetto Ecce Homo dipinto dal celebre Autore Raffaele di Urbino’ from the antiquarian Antonio Furini in Pesaro. The antiquarian claimed that the painting then still belonged to the ‘Casa Antica’ for which Raphael had made the painting. Moreover, according to the note, the antiquarian stated that Raphael ‘si ritrattò da se per Ecce Homo come infatti le sue carze’, thus making a pun on his reputation as ‘Eccelelente Uomo’.13 It cannot entirely be excluded that the Gualdi, one of the most respected families of Rimini, a short distance from Pesaro, are the ‘old family’ in question.14 However, the current state of research on both the Gualdi and provenance of the Brescia Pax Vobiscum does not allow us to draw a final conclusion.15

The painting I suggest to be the object of the poem in Pallavicino’s papers is ‘un quadroeto in tavola con la testa di nostro Signore, con cornice dorata’ recorded in the post mortem inventory of Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani (1554–1621), drawn up in March 1621 following his death.16 The ‘quadroeto’ then passed into the famous collection of Vincenzo Giustiniani (1561–1638), where it is recorded in 1639 as ‘Un quadro con la testa del Salvatore dipinto in tavola di mano di Raffaello d’Urbino alto pal. 3 di scarsa misura e larg. palmi 2 con sua cornice dorata’.17 Trace of the painting has been lost after the entire collection of Giustiniani paintings was sold to the king of Prussia in 1812. A list of the king’s holdings from 1826 records the painting for the last time.18 Part of the collection found its way into the German museums which grew out of the Prussian royal holdings.19

The dispersed Giustiniani collection is progressively being retraced, but this painting has so far eluded identification.19 Although there are to my knowledge no documented exchanges between Gualdi and the Giustiniani, they must have known each other rather well, as prominent members of the tightly knit Roman circles engaged in the collecting and researching of archeological material.20 The transfer of a piece from Gualdi’s collection to the Giustiniani is far from improbable.

There are few traces of this painting. The only visible record is a small line engraving in a catalogue published when the Giustiniani collection went on sale in Paris, in 1812 (figure 2). It shows a bust of a bearded Christ, his head surrounded by a halo, looking heavenward, the lips slightly parted; the attribute of the Salvator Mundi, the globe crowned with a cross, is indicated in the lower right corner.21 This image shows Christ as the just and merciful ruler of a saved world.

As pointed out by Luigi Salerno and Silvia Danesi Squarzina, the painting was also the subject of a poem by Giovanni Michele Silos (1601–74), Salvatoris Vultus. Raffaelis apud eundem Princ. Iustin., published in his Pinacotheca sive Romana Pictura et

Figure 2. Charles Paul Landon, Annales du musée et de l'école moderne des beaux-arts. Seconde Collection. Partie ancienne. (Tome complémentaire). Galerie Giustiniani, ou catalogue figuré Des tableaux de cette célèbre Galerie, transportée d’Italie en France; accompagné d’Observations critiques et historiques, et de soixante-douze Planches gravées au trait, contenant environ cent cinquante sujets. Paris, chez l'Auteur, 1812, p. 152, fig. 73. © Bodleian Library, Oxford, Sculptura (Rome, 1673).22 As we shall see, the problematic relation between this poem and the painting points back towards an earlier epigram on the same painting, penned by Giambattista Marino (1569–1625), which predates the manuscript poem. Marino allows himself considerable licence when addressing the painting’s subject-matter and its actual appearance. While Silos’s poem claims to describe the Raphael, it actually emulates Marino’s poem, thus enlarging the gap between the painting and its description. Marino’s and Silos’s attitude towards the painting then suggests how the manuscript poem should be read: the careful exploration of the role of imitative arts in revealing the divine aspects of creation in the manuscript is a refutation of the poetic liberties that characterize Marino’s earlier literary evocation of the same painting.
If it is the portrait from the Giustiniani inventories that Silos’s poem describes and the 1812 engraving represents — and there is absolutely no reason to doubt this — then a closer look at Silos’s epigram confronts us with two distinct but intertwined problems. First, the epigram offers to the reader a feature that is conspicuously absent from the portrait, Christ’s bleeding forehead. The epigram, while referring to “the face of the Saviour”, actually evokes an image more closely akin to an Ecce Homo, where Christ is conventionally shown as bearing the traces of his torture and wearing the crown of thorns. In other words, leaving aside the rather improbable hypothesis that Silos mistook one of the many Ecce Homo works in the Giustiniani collection for the Raphael, the poet deliberately evokes iconographical elements that are absent from the painting. In doing so, he links two iconographies of Christ centred on his sacrificial role in the salvation of humanity by focusing on Christ’s incarnation, the first instance of his sacrifice, Silos then compares the incarnation to the artifice of the painting. In allowing himself this liberty, and this is the second issue, Silos not only perpetuates an important characteristic of the epigrammatic tradition, that is, the loose relation between the epigram and the object it claims to “describe”, but also reflects on an earlier poetic attempt to deal with the same Raphael.

According to Daniela Danesi Squarzina, the Raphael is also the subject of Giambattista Marino’s poem Ecce Homo di Raffaello da Urbino, published in his Galeria (1619). Silos must have known this poem: it appears both in Marino’s Rime (1602) and the Galeria. These works were frequently reprinted until 1675. This precedent could explain Silos’s choice of his poem’s theme. Just as his entire Pinacoteca entered into competition with Marino’s Galeria, so Silos’s epigram may be as much a poetical response to Marino’s poem as an actual description of the Giustiniani painting. Indeed, Marino read Raphael’s Salvator Mundi as an Ecce Homo. Central to his poem are two intertwined antitheses, one between the beauty of the face of Christ (vv. 1–8), now ‘ragged and red’, the other between the ‘cruel hand’ that committed Christ’s torture and the pious painter of his effigy (vv. 9–11). The image evoked by Marino seems a far cry from the definitely blessed expression on the Raphael’s Christ in the Landon engraving. This disjunction between poem and painting perfectly corresponds to Marino’s own stated literary aims. Marino himself defined his goal in the Galeria as ‘to let the mind play about certain few [works of art] in accordance with poetic ideas which are produced in the fancy’. It would therefore be wrong to interpret Marino’s poems as objective descriptions of specific works of art, an argument bolstered by the fact that numerous editions of the Rime simply do not mention the paintings that are later ‘described’ in the Galeria with exactly the same poems. Marino’s Galeria challenges painting on precisely those grounds where poetry is thought to be superior to painting, privileging the ‘narrative succession over pictorial simultaneity in a type of painting that is least narrative [the portrait]’, while reproducing pictorial effects in language to attain the immediacy painting usually claims as its prerogative.

Marino’s poetical reaction to the painting is less a subservient rendering of its subject-matter, disposition and effect, than a ‘[celebration] of Idea with his own poetic recreation of painting’. In this particular case, it is not impossible to read Marino’s poem as a reflection on an exceptionally beautiful image of Christ, which in the ambiguous act of seizing the celestial beauty of God into an image made by human hands parallels Christ’s incarnation, thus foreboding his deformation at the hand of his torturers. The line ‘Ahi fu ben empio/l’uom, ch’è Dio tose d’uom forma e sembiantel’ can refer to both painter and torturer, and the effect of this equivocation would be much reinforced if the pious painter actually showed Christ as beautiful as imaginable.

If the manuscript poem describes the same painting, then of the three poems encountered so far it follows most closely the Giustiniani painting. It does not refer to any signs of Christ’s torture or mocking, and seems to present a radiating picture of Christ, just like the citation used in Borboni’s Delle Statue, which, we should remember, is taken from a text on a ‘Saviour’. The poem also points out that it seems as if Christ opens his mouth, to invite us to heaven. The manuscript also seems to echo Marino. The line ‘Ecce ch’uomo, e mortal mi son fatt’io’ forms part of a concetto on the parallel between the act of painting and Christ’s incarnation, an idea which also informed Marino’s poem. The same idea motivates the use of the word ‘spoglia’, a reference to Christ’s triumph and sacrifice, to denote both Christ’s body and its depiction. This concetto underlines the importance of the incarnation for man’s salvation, ‘mortal mi son fatt’io/Per far l’uomo immortal per farlo un Dio’, which can be read as referring to the Salvator Mundi iconography. Moreover, the manuscript poem pays the same close attention to the eyes and brows of Christ as Marino’s poem, presenting it as a literally glowing example. The power of creation, however, resides with God: ‘Da divino Pittor veggio Dio stesso’.

Considered against this background, it becomes likely that, just like Silos’s epigram, the manuscript poem should be read as an answer to Marino’s poetical invention, taking the same painting by Raphael as its starting point. The question then is: What does the manuscript poem want to demonstrate by emulating or criticizing Marino? A start of an answer is provided by Marino’s and Silos’s liberties when ‘describing’ Raphael’s painting. If a Salvator Mundi can become an Ecce Homo, if a glowing face can become a ragged effigy, where do the limits of poetic invention lie? The manuscript poem may well be a corrective to this, by closely adhering to the actual painting. Furthermore the poem as a whole hints of issues related to Marino’s poetry. In the manuscript poem, the description of the painting does not stand by itself, but concludes a more elaborate argument on the subservience of the imitative arts — sculpture, writing and painting — to attaining knowledge of the highest forms of truth, the knowledge of God. At the same time, amongst these subservient arts those that appeal to ‘seeing’, as
opposed to ‘touching’, are clearly favoured, and painting, the art with the most universal scope, is privileged. In other words, the poem suggests that the visual is the privileged means of communicating divine truth, on the condition that visual expression limits the freedom of its invention.

PAINTING, POETRY AND THE VISUAL

The two different poetic reactions to the same painting exemplify two positions on the role of poetry and the visual arts as a means to address divine truth. While both positions celebrate the inherent visuality of poetry, they profoundly and explicitly enter in conflict when trying to define what constitutes the basis, the aims and the limits of this visuality. This difference brings us to the heart of an important literary controversy in early seventeenth-century Rome. Giambattista Marino and Sforza Pallavicino — amongst whose papers the manuscript poem was found — are key players in this debate. A closer analysis of their — and their allies — thoughts on visuality and the arts provides a theoretical framework not only for the manuscript poem but also for the reception of Raphael’s Bust of the Saviour. Moreover, it opens the way towards the larger theoretical issue at stake, which is the significance of visual objects as testimonies to sacred history and the divine.

Marino’s poem on the Raphael in the Galera exemplifies a general characteristic of his poetry, and the challenges it imposes on contemporary artistic canons, both in poetry and in painting. Rather than carefully evoking the image it refers to, Marino’s poetry departs from the painting in order to celebrate the liberties that language affords him. As has been pointed out by several authors, one of Marino’s techniques to do so is precisely to use explicit references to actual works of art. These artworks serve to focus on a detail of the action. Furthermore, they allow the poet to fully explore the paradoxes of life, liveliness and death, and its correlated effects in marble or paint. These paradoxes are developed in endless variations on speaking likeness topoi and arguments taken from the paragone discussion. It is no accident then that his challenge was widely picked up by artists, for Marino’s poetry goes beyond the descriptive to such a degree that it elicits a pictorial response. As has been shown by Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, in the case of Marino’s Strage degli innocenti, posthumously published in 1632, his poetry so eagerly pushes the limits of pictorial expression that it induced painters ‘to rival in paint the poet’s copiousness of invention and expressive energy, to capture in another medium the excitement and sparkle of his poetry’. Cropper and Dempsey convincingly demonstrate how painters, spurred by Marino’s poetry to test the limits of pictorial invention, refrain from the sometimes excessive pictoriality Marino eagerly employs to marvel his reader. In other words, painters recognize both the extreme ambitions of Marino’s expressiveness and the unsuitability of his excessive use of ‘poetical colour’ when applied in painting. In reaction to this excess of expressiveness they try to claim as theirs the ability ‘to give life to shades, and to animate canvases’ and seize ‘the palm of immortality, the symbol of the achievement of heavenly perfection’. In the artist’s contest with Marino in the depiction of sacred subject-matter, Cropper and Dempsey note, ‘the work of salvation comes perilously close to being an artistic enterprise’.

The manuscript poem is found amongst the papers of Sforza Pallavicino. This Jesuit and Cardinal has produced a voluminous theological, historical and controversial oeuvre rich in reflections on poetry and the visual arts. It can be argued that claiming ‘heavenly perfection’ achieved in art can equal divine powers of creation is one of the major assumptions on art that Sforza Pallavicino ardently attacks throughout his entire oeuvre. In his Trattato dello stile e del dialogo (1646/1662) Pallavicino severely criticizes a verse taken from Marino, ‘Tu pur Dio sei; Che Dio sol è chi può dar vita ai marmi’, precisely because it transforms a divine quality a poet can metaphorically ascribe to a sculptor into a real attribute of man, who thereby gains ‘divine powers’. This remark is only an instance of Pallavicino’s much larger attempt to contradict the claim that ‘the work of salvation’ could be considered an artistic enterprise. Subsequently, for Pallavicino, poetical depiction — especially in the case of sacred subject-matter — is not the locus of an invention that seeks to dazzle the reader by using every poetical trick in the book. It should present the reader with a safe means to gather some otherwise unattainable truth.

According to Pallavicino, the functionality of art is determined by its ability to render visible what can — and should — not be understood by the intellect, the truths of faith. Pallavicino proposes the arts aimed at attaining evidenza or actuality, those arts that put their subject in front of the reader’s, listener’s or beholder’s eyes, as the best instruments to express these truths. The arts that produce evidenza comprise painting and sculpture, but also the different forms of poetry, all treated by Pallavicino as ‘visual’ arts. According to Pallavicino, an ‘actual’ image should open a window allowing the perception of otherwise unattainable truths of faith in a pre-rational moment and deeply moving the beholder — or the reader — to rediscover the higher truths of faith that lie hidden in his/her own heart. Likewise, a painting like Raphael’s Christ, and any poem devoted to that painting, should induce the reader or beholder to see Christ’s suffering, and thus recall Christ’s role in his own redemption. As Sforza Pallavicino suggests in his 1644 Del Bene, when a portrait of the tortured Redeemer moves us to tears it is not because he appears to be standing in front of us and we re-experience his suffering as a real event, but because the actuality of the painting calls his suffering to mind in an overwhelming way, and offers a glimpse into the history of salvation.

If in his times Pallavicino was probably the thinker who devoted most energy in trying to theorize the limits and the possibilities of poetry and the other ‘visual’ arts to explore the truths of faith, he was not alone in practising these tenets. In his Arte della Perfezione Cristiana (1664) Pallavicino makes a reference
to his intellectual milieu of the 1620s to condemn the poetical excesses committed out of ‘vaghezza per la sola eccellenza dell’arte’, a criticism clearly aimed at Marino and his followers. Pallavicino praises the Jesuits Famiano Strada (1572–1649) and Vincenzo Guinigi (c. 1588–1633), Pope Urban VIII and his good friend Giovanni Ciampoli (1590–1643) as the most worthy defenders of sacred poetry.32 These writers are closely linked to the court of Urban VIII and the Jesuit Collegio Romano, where Famiano Strada and Vincenzo Guinigi laid down the precepts for sacred rhetoric based on reformed ciceronianism.33 At the same college, the Poemata written by Urban VIII is used to teach poetry. The 1631 edition of Urban’s Latin poetry carries an introductory elegy that exhorts the reader to emulate Urban’s noble example, and lend the pen only to sacred subject-matter.34

Together with Virgilio Cesarini and Agostino Mascardi, the last author listed by Pallavicino in this passage of the Arte della Perfezion Cristina, Giovanni Ciampoli, forms part of the circles that try to define a poetics that moderates the perceived excesses of Marino’s work.51 After Giovanni Ciampoli lost his assignment as Urban’s secretary of the breviary in 1632, his subsequent banishment from Rome and his death in 1644,52 Pallavicino took care of Ciampoli’s literary heritage.53 Pallavicino’s papers in the Biblioteca Casanatense contain an unpublished dialogue by Ciampoli, featuring Pallavicino as one of the interlocutors.50 The work referred to in the Arte della Perfezion Cristina is Ciampoli’s Poetica sacra, which Pallavicino published in the Rome (Rome, 1648), a collection of Ciampoli’s poetry.56 Written between 1625 and 1629,56 the Poetica sacra forms the culmination of Ciampoli’s efforts since the 1610s to redefine sacred poetry, an effort explicitly directed against the work of Giambattista Marino.57 It is one of the most important manifestos of poetical reform of the 1620s.58

A closer analysis of the Poetica sacra will offer a more detailed view of the ideas on sacred painting and poetry that underlie the manuscript poem. Moreover, the Poetica sacra not only clarifies how the manuscript poem attempts to recast the description of Raphael’s painting according to the tenets of sacred poetry, but also evokes the literary and historical contexts in which the poem should be read: the group of intellectuals and letterati who flocked around Maffeo Barberini, later Urban VIII, and their perspective on the papacy and the place of Urban’s reign in sacred history.

The Poetica sacra is a dialogue in verse between personifications of Devotion and Poetry. As Sforza Pallavicino stresses in his introduction to the Rome, one of the main principles of the Poetica sacra is to teach by example.59 Indeed, the most elaborate poetic digressions are recited by Devotion. With the first of these she aims to convince Poetry of the beauty of truth. The interest of the passage lies in Ciampoli’s choice of an ekphrasis of two statues, pronounced by Devotion, as the means to win over Poetry. Devotion tells how one day she visited the lonely cave of a hermit, who dedicated his life to ‘sculpting new hymns’.60 With such a song, he invites Devotion to see — ‘faccero al guardo mio leggiardi invitati’ — ‘two carved stones’, ‘where Truth and Deceit appeared clothed in different habits’.61 Truth is represented as a woman standing on a heavenly globe, holding a lighting bolt and a sceptre in her right hand. From within her breast shines the sun, visible through a heart-shaped glass. The passage emphasizes the subtle veil which is cast by the shining heart, revealing the parts of her body as if they were ‘the stars in the sky’. The shape is surrounded by beams, and speckled by ruby lips, starry eyes and the splendour of her hair.62 Next to the figure, the viewer discovers a ‘beautiful theatre’. A silver river leads to a small lake. Doves are playing in the water and they seem to open their snow-white wings in a dance. The misty drops of water they splash around reinforce the suggestion of a uniform, glowing haze. Herds of all sorts of animals gather together. Even the lion and the leopard are tame and innocent.63

Only two animals are excluded from this scene, the fox and the serpent, and they appear as attributes to the other sculpture, Deceit. Devotion starts by stressing the intimate link between the lying heart, the face and the whole body of this figure. The temperament of falsehood generates a repellent person, who is forced to hide from head to toe in an ever-changing cloth, ‘monstrous to look at’. Just as Truth is qualified by a uniform white glow, so Deceit’s main aspect is an ever-changing colour: ‘Oh how many various aspects are to be admired in [its cloth]’, explains Devotion. Now it appears as a sapphire sky, now as an emerald meadow, now as a wheatfield on a hot day, now as flames or ashes or like a silver wave, and often it blurs into thousand appearances of different colours. The flaws of her face are hidden by a mask. Idly she invents apemen, centaurs and other chimeres.64 The scene represented next to Deceit, the ‘counterfeit theatres’, shows a labyrinth of caves immersed in eternal night, a lair of treason. A meander braids between woody shores, turning and hiding its source and mound.

After the two lengthy descriptions, Devotion admits how she managed only with difficulty to turn away from the work, which left her both glad and sad. The hermit, too, was pleased to see her enjoyment.65 Thus it is made clear that the ekphrasis of the two sculptures serves a double purpose: first, it demonstrates the revealing powers of poetry, by giving an accurate and gripping description of the statues that produces evidenza. Devotion’s rendering of the two statues in her conversation with Poetry actually doubles the hermit’s song about the two sculptures, which she praises as ‘pittura bella’.66 Second, the ekphrasis shows how these descriptions relate to either truth or falseness. Truth is revealed by the light it emanates, and invites the poet to describe carefully every single component of a harmonious whole, generating stupore and joy. When describing Deceit, Ciampoli is careful to use verbs that indicate how her veil resembles or imitates other materials or objects, leaving open the question as to whether the impression of changing variety is caused by the transformation of the veil.
or by the perception of the beholder. This causes the beholder — and the poet — to be confused and sad, unable to seize the image.

To explain this difference between truth and deceit, after the ekphrasis Devotion elaborates on the revelatory powers of truth. She exalts truth as the queen and producer of all that exists on earth and in heaven. Because she brings forth creation and tinges it with beauty, she reveals the divine. When asked how deceit is conceivable if every object stems from truth, Devotion states that man has to grasp the world through appearances seized by the senses, which are then presented to the intellect. If every object is ‘truth in action’ and celebrates God, then every ‘fantasma’ in the human mind is ‘a true effigy’. And it is there that falseness can occur. The liveliness of the mental effigies allows them to change shape and to form ‘unknown monsters’, just as the wind shapes clouds into recognizable figures, ‘sezn’arte’. Falseness can lure man because it dresses itself in the outward signs of beauty, like gold and exuberant colours, thus imitating ‘the voice and the aspect’ of truth.

The fact that man never seizes an actual object but always its appearance leads Devotion to admit that all the imitative arts, such as painting and poetry, necessarily ‘are forced to lie’, for they can never completely reveal the truth. The only way to guarantee that the artful semblance of truth partakes in truth and not in deceit, Devotion suggests, is to root invention in sacred history. Ciampoli states how the poetry of Urban VIII and the marvelous paintings of Titian, Raphael and Michelangelo show the results of this procedure. Conversely, and Ciampoli deals with this issue at great length, idolatry does not stem from a perverse desire to worship images but from the use of images, the ‘guise of truth’, to represent false gods. The statues and temples of Egyptians and Romans abuse the falseness that is an inevitable part of every image. According to Ciampoli the ‘falseness’ of the image does not turn it into an inappropriate means to worship and explore the divine; man cannot escape the image, it is his only access to God. But precisely because of that the image should be used for only the most noble of missions. The arts fall under the moral obligation to render the divine visible. This mechanism is perverted by idolatrous practices and negated by iconoclasts. On the other hand, this appraisal of the image leaves the door open for the appreciation of classical forms, as long as they are used in the service of a rightful message. Ciampoli’s attitude thus accords to the visual an essential role in the communication and manifestation of divine truth, an issue, as we have seen, Sfarza Pallavicino develops theoretically in his own work.

The argument of Ciampoli’s Poetica sacra calls to mind the manuscript poem on Raphael’s Saviour. Like the Poetica sacra, this poem assumes that God’s beauty is visible in Creation, but that man has only a limited ability to grasp it. Because man needs images to seize the divine, every art that produces these images is exhorted to help man with this daunting task.

If the arts perform this operation, they parallel the revelatory activity of truth in creation. In the Poetica sacra, this process is exemplified in an ekphrasis of Truth. This description demonstrates how Truth can be rendered visible in the act of faithful description, an impossible task when confronted with Deceit. Truth can then be equated to sacred history, and its resplendent ekphrasis to the expression of sacred history in objects, works of art or poetry, for both Truth and sacred history produce harmonious and self-revealing images, resplendent and harmonious. These are the qualities the manuscript poem attributes to Raphael’s Saviour.

THE EVIデンZA OF SACRED HISTORY

The identification of the painting has allowed an assessment of the larger argument in the manuscript poem, on the relation between divine truth and imitative art. This argument applies as much to the poem itself as to Raphael’s painting. Now, as we have seen, the manuscript not only offers a theoretical context for the painting, it also says that the Raphael can be seen in the museo of Francesco Gualdi. This contextual element, too, ties in with the argument of Ciampoli’s Poetica sacra. Both Gualdi’s museum and Ciampoli’s poem offer a specific view on the relation between visual objects and sacred history, and both do so within the context of the pontificate of Urban VIII. Contemporary literature, sponsored by Urban and often immediately linked to Gualdi’s museo, accords this papacy precisely the visuality that the manuscript poem attributes on a much smaller scale to the Raphael, and that Gualdi himself, with the help of the letterati of Urban’s court, claims for his collection of antiquities and mirabilia.

As we have seen, Ciampoli considers the image justified when it parallels the manifestation of the divine in the world. Likewise, the historical revelation of the divine is visible in the progressive establishment of the true rites and their righteous splendor, as enacted in sacred history and the establishment of the Church. In the Poetica sacra, the ultimate proof of sacred history’s potential as a source for poetic invention is an evocation of important ceremonies on the Vatican during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Devotion recalls among other things pope Adrian VI’s coronation of Charles V, before presenting the events orchestrated by Urban VIII, such as the canonization of Elizabeth of Portugal in 1605, as the apex of Vatican glory. She describes the new Saint Peter’s, reserving a central place for Urban’s bronze baldacchino. By emphasizing the important role of Urban VIII in both the realization of a new sacred poetry and of the baldachin, the bronze structure is presented as the perfect subject-matter for good poetry and as its visual counterpart. This ultimate enumeration finally convinces Poetry to declare her subservience to the ideals of sacred poetry, and with Devotion she concludes that ‘of resounding verse Christ, who is the new Apollo, carries the crown’.

Urban’s pontificate is presented as the endpoint of a process fusing the — originally pagan — artifice of poetry with sacred
subject-matter, a synergy successfully employed in contemporary religious pageantry. This culmination is expressed with an interesting metaphor which leads us back to Raphael’s Saviour. The closing lines of the Poetica sacra clearly refer to the identification of Saint Peter’s as a christianized shrine of Apollo, while Apollo himself becomes an image for Christ and Pope Urban VIII. This topos has a high currency during Urban’s reign. Urban cultivates an image of poet-pope, a key aspect of the exemplary ruler who will bring about a christianized Golden Age. The same fusion of Christ and Apollo is suggested by the text quoted in Borboni’s Delle Statue assessing the presence of Raphael’s Saviour in Gualdi’s collection, since the passage cites from Marsyas’s mock praise of Apollo: ‘his hair arranged in curls and beads fall on his forehead and float on his temples, his body most pleasing, his limbs dazzling, his tongue prophetic, as you wish, in prose or poetry, with equal eloquence’, qualities which the unknown author attributes to Raphael’s Saviour, and Borboni to Bernini’s Apollo (figure 3).

It is hard to fathom the extent to which Borboni, writing some 40 years after the Raphael was seen in Gualdi’s collection, consciously quoted the comparison between Raphael’s Saviour and Apollo to cast also the Apollo and Daphne in a religious light. Likewise, until further documentation is unearthed, it is impossible to know whether Raphael’s Saviour once shared the rooms of Gualdi’s museum with the statues of Apollo, the muses and the busts of the exemplary poets Dante, Petrarcha and Tasso that Silos saw there.

However, the close association of Raphael’s Saviour with sacred poetry established by the manuscript poem does find a close parallel in Bernini’s sculptural group, commissioned by Cardinal Scipio Borghese in 1622. Bernini’s statue has convincingly been related to contemporary poetical debates. Andrea Bolland writes how the Latin diptych Urban VIII composed to defend the Apollo and Daphne against accusations of lasciviousness “has its place in the opposition between Petrarchan poetics [i.e. a poetics in which the sensual pleasure of touch is superseded by a vision of beauty] and Marinismo”, and she considers it “equally likely that Bernini made his statue... in full awareness of the literary debates going on around him”. Just like Raphael’s painting, Bernini’s sculpture thus takes up its place in discussions on sacred poetry that greatly occupied the intellectual elite gathered at Urban’s court.

This parallel can be taken one step further. In line with Ciampol’s argument in the Poetica sacra, the interest of letenati in paintings of Christ and sculptures of Apollo may well stem from the essential role they attribute to visual testimonies of history, sacred and profane. The preoccupation of these literary circles with the revitalization of the tenets of classical poetry in the service of religion and the papacy often assumes the shape of descriptions and literary celebrations of objects testifying to the Christian victory over paganism and the historical continuity of the Roman Church. An important example of the spoliation of ancient monuments and the restoration of early Christian churches by the Barberini in order to legitimize their authority and the political claims of Urban’s papacy, Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s conspicuous restoration of the triclinium of Leo III in the Lateran, spurs the publication of Niccolò Alemanni’s De Lateranenibis paneinix... dissertatio historica (Rome, 1625). This book intertwines archeological, historical, philological and visual evidence to underscore the legitimacy of the ecclesiastical aspirations on temporal power under Urban’s reign. The preoccupations of the Barberini thus closely parallel the activities of the Milanese Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1563–1631), who shared the ambition to reform poetry according to Christian tenets with an active interest in sacred archaeology.

An important intersection point between the poetical and archeological preoccupations of the Barberini letenati is the collection of Francesco Gualdi, himself a papal cannone closely associated with the court of Urban VIII. Pieces of Gualdi’s collection are used to document translations of classical texts made under the auspices of Francesco Barberini. The

Figure 3. Gianlorenzo Bernini, Apollo and Daphne, Villa Borghese, Rome. © ICCD, Rome.
public image of Urban VIII is largely constructed by the same authors who sing the praise of Francesco Gualdi’s collection. The writer Antonio Querenghio (1546–1633), held in the highest esteem by Urban VIII, devotes a poem to the museum. Another letterato, Ignazio Bracci, who in one work uses the Barberini papacy to explain the etymology of the word ‘papa’, publishes several pieces of Gualdi’s collection on single folios. On a folio dedicated to Urban VIII the Jesuit Alessandro Donati compares a medal from Gualdi’s collection with other archeological material to establish the medal’s iconography, ‘l’Adorazione dei Magi’, which in turn serves as the subject-matter for a poetical exhortation for peace. The same interest in the testimonial value of the artefact underpins Donati’s Roma vetus et recentioris, first published in 1639, a historical description of Rome. This guidebook culminates in the new buildings erected by the Barberini offering early descriptions of the baldachin and palazzo Barberini alle Quattro fontane, and gives Gualdi’s museum pride of place.

Exactly the same interests manifest themselves in Gualdi’s museum, one of the earliest collections of Christian antiquities. According to Tempesta and Franzoni, in the museo antiquities become a ‘testimonium’ and ‘trophæum’, living and actual signs of history, establishing visual proof of the historical continuity that leads to the triumph of the Roman Church. Meanwhile Gualdi’s own activities closely mirror the historical preoccupations of the Barberini. When in 1640 Gualdi exhibits the city of Rimini (the exact addressee is unknown) not to destroy an ancient Roman bridge, he uses the patronage of Urban VIII, and the Cardinals Francesco and Antonio Barberini, as an eminently good example of his good attitude towards the past.

Strikingly, Gualdi selects his examples not only from antiquities, such as the tomb of Cecilia Metella, or even early Christian objects, sometimes venerated as relics, such as the Lateran triclinium, the cella of Gregory the Great on the Celio and the room of Saint Catherine transferred to Santa Maria sopra Minerva by Antonio Barberini in 1638. He also refers to modern interventions, such as Urban’s tomb and fresco decorations for Mathilda of Canossa, an exemplum of a secular ruler who devoted herself to the defence of the Church, or Urban’s tomb in Santa Maria Maggiore for Antonio Nigriti, the Congolose ambassador to Paul V, a testimony to the worldwide expansion of the Catholic faith. Thus Gualdi justifies the conservation of past artefacts because they are valuable testimonies of important events and virtuous persons, just like contemporary tombs and monuments. This same belief in the testimonial value of ancient artefacts seems to underlie a gesture that remains unique in the Roman Seicento. Gualdi permanently displays pieces of his collection in public places. In 1630 he installs in the portico of SS. Apostoli the paleochristian sarcophagus that provides the image to identify the iconography of the medal published by Donati. In the same year an inscription dedicated to Antonio Barberini heralds the installation of another paleochristian sarcophagus in S. Maria Maggiore, and in 1646 a sarcophagus decorated with biblical scenes is placed in the portico of the Pantheon. The inscription adorning this monument espouses the violent anti-iconoclastic message voiced earlier in Paolo Giuseppe Merone’s elegy on the sarcophagus in Santa Maria Maggiore, praised as inconvertible evidence for the rites of the early Christian Church. These sarcophagi then are doubly revelatory images: they show the truth about the sacred past and, therefore, show the true practice of religion, inspiring the contemporary beholder to emulate the example they display.

CONCLUSION

The presence in Sforza Pallavicino’s papers of a poem on Raphael’s Saviour in the collection of Francesco Gualdi reveals the intimate relation between poetics, the visual arts, antiquities and sacred history in Rome, in 1610–30. In its implicit dismissal of maritian poetry the manuscript poem closely adheres to the literary tenets championed in the vicinity of the Barberini family and the papal court. In its exaltation of a Raphael shown amidst antiquities the poem also indicates Gualdi’s collection as a site where art, poetry and sacred history intertwine. Similar to Giovanni Ciampoli’s description of Truth, and linked to an ancient description of Apollo, Raphael’s Saviour emerges as a perfect example of sacred art. As one of the artefacts that Gualdi shows to the Roman public the painting belongs to the imagery sampled by the Barberini letterati to demonstrate that righteous imitative art expresses the teleology of history itself, since it reproduces the manifestation of the divine in creation. Gualdi’s collection and patronage then visibly demonstrate the argument of Ciampoli’s Poetica sacra: the progressive emergence of divine truth in images and artefacts parallels the emergence of true faith and its custos, the Roman Catholic Church, a process that culminates in the pontificate of Urban VIII.

The poem also mentions the mirabilia in Gualdi’s museum, and thus points towards another rather virulent debate during Urban’s pontificate, which involved the actors presented here and bears upon related issues. While Francesco Gualdi himself stood in close contact with the Accademia dei Lincei, Ciampoli and Pallavicino were actual members of this centre of scientific endeavour in Barberini Rome. A medal from Gualdi’s collection features in Apes Dianiae in monumentis veterum observatae (Rome, 1625), a poem by the Lincean Justus Riquius that fuses new scientific observations with the genre of classical panegyric to appease Urban VIII in favour of Galileo Galilei. The academy, an ardent supporter of Galileo, was deeply intertwined with the literary milieu of the Barberini, while pursuing its own agenda of research based on accurate observation of the natural world, a pursuit in which visual evidence obviously played a central role. These endeavours, in turn, reflected back into literary practices of the day, as much in Ciampoli’s ‘dramatic’ descriptions of the universe — notably absent from the Poetica sacra — as in Marino’s fascination with the telescope or his frenetic urge to enumerate and catalogue.
In this respect it is striking that while the manuscript poem implicitly connects Gualdi's museum with contemporary discussions on sacred poetry, and thus establishes an intimate link between poetics, the visual arts, antiquities and sacred history, the text only refers explicitly to the mirabilia in the museum, the giant's bone and the transformations of water and wood. While these references may be explained by the notoriety of these objects, they are also used to emphasize the superiority of the sacred painting over this kind of mirabilia. It is therefore possible that the poem's author is well aware of the not always smooth relationship between the sacred history as told by historical artefacts and the natural history that emerges from the gathering of empirical evidence. Remarkably, in his writings other than the Poetica sacra, Giovanni Ciampoli goes to great pains to distinguish and separate the realms of the writer, the theologian and the natural philosopher. Ultimately, the conflict between these disciplines comes to a rather violent manifestation in the controversy surrounding Galileo Galilei, an important factor in the closure of the Accademia dei Lincei after the death of its founder Federico Cesi in 1650. This controversy inaugurates a crackdown on Galileo's Roman friends, first among them Giovanni Ciampoli and Sforza Pallavicino. Even if the manuscript poem significantly predates these dramatic events, it already points towards the faultline along which the intellectual elite of Urban VIII's court will be divided.

NOTES
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1 - Biblioteca Casanatense, ms. 2121, ff. 448r–451r, see Appendix. The Casanatense contains a series of volumes with Pallavicino's papers, see Bibliografia romana. Notizie della vita e delle opere degli scrittori romani del secolo xi (Rome, 1880), pp. 196-200, which gives the old shelfmarks. On Pallavicino, see the literature infra, note 45.

2 - An inscription attributing the poem to Sforza Pallavicino has been crossed out and overwritten with a statement that Pallavicino is not the author. As will become clear, there is reason to believe that this correction is right.

3 - See for instance ms. cit., ff. 160r–160r: 'Alla Santità di N.ro Sig.re sopra la fortezza di castel S. Angelo ridotta dalla prima fabbrica à somma perfettione da S. Beat.ne', which must date from 1625–26; ff. 447v–447r, a poem on the death of Carlo Barberini, the brother of pope Urban VIII, in 1630, an event Pallavicino dwells upon in the letter published in Antonio De Luca, 'Lettere inedite di Sforza Pallavicino a Fabio Chigi', Rassegna della letteratura italiana, 38 (1974), pp. 31–42, letter of 5 March 1620; but also, f. 239r: 'Alla Santità di papa Paolo V, nell'apparire della Cometa', i.e. during the reign of Paul V (1605–21); and on f. 50r a poem by Agostino Favoriti in honour of Alexander VII (1655–67).

4 - See Appendix.

Guadì is mentioned as the patron of a chapel dedicated to Carlo Borromeo in Rimini, see Carlo Francesco Marchezzi, Pitture delle chiese di Rimini 1754, Ristampa anastatica ... In appendice, il manoscritto di Marcello Ornato sulle ‘Pitture nella città di Rimini’ (1777), a cura di Pier Giorgio Fasini, Bologna, 1972, pp. 105-6, 59/60: ‘qui [in Rimini] particolarmente sendogli più capelle, altari, pale o icone erette [to honour Carlo Borromeo], e fra le principali e per avventura di tutte l’altra prima, quella nella Cattedrale di Francesco Guadì, cavaliere di Santo Stefano da eccellentissimo maestro dipinta’. The ‘eccellentissimo maestro’ is possibly Cristoforo Roncalli, detto il Pomarancio.


10 – It is not improbable that the text is taken from an engraving of the painting, inscribed with Apuleius’ verses, see the comparable representations of gema published in Franzoni and Tempesta 1992, cat. 29 and 30.

11 – Giacomo C. Bascurà and Marcello Del Piazzo, with Luigi Borgia, Insigne e simboli, Araldica pubblica e privata, medievale e moderna (Rome, 1982), p. 312.


13 – Stradiotti 1986, p. 34 argues that the painting originally belonged to the family that eventually buys the painting, the Barzi Mosca, because no other local family could claim to be a ‘casa antica’; according to Stradiotti, a predecessor of the Barzi could have been in contact with Raphael in Urbino. It should be noted, however, that Carlo Tonini. La cultura letteraria e scientifica in Rimini: Dal secolo XIV ai primi del secolo XIX (Rimini, 1884), vol. II, p. 132 refers to the Guadì as a ‘mobile e antica famiglia riminese’.

14 – There is little material available on the Guadì family. See Tonini 1884, pp. 132–6 and Franzoni and Tempesta 1992, p. 35, note 4. Information on a different branch of the Guadì family, with which Francesco Guadì entertained intensive contacts, can be found in the ‘Introduction’ to Puppi (ed.) [1970].

suffrances qu'il a essuyées pour racheter les hommes, est placée à sa gauche. Raphæl, toujours grand dans les moindres sujets, nous offre, dans cette simple figure, le sublimé de l'art, du côté de la pensée et de l'esecution. In his introduction, p. 393, Delaroché praises the engravings Landon has used to reproduce the Giustiniani painting as a new and promising method to communicate works of art to a larger audience.


23 – Piaunochò, vol. I, p. 93, liber primus, epigr. CLXVII, Salvatoris Vultus, Raphæli opus mundem Princ. Insc.; vol. II, p. 97: 'Traduzione', in which Basile Bonatsa follows the identification of the Raphael with the epigram proposed by Salerno, 1957, as noted in 16. This identification is also accepted by Danesi Quarantina 1997, as in note 15.


On the iconography of the Ecce Homo, see Lexikon, vol. I, k. 355–61. Landon's catalogue gives a number of engravings of portraits of a bleeding Christ, all of which clearly show the drops of blood; see Landon 1812, nrs 33, 47, 61, 64–73, 78, 79, 93, 94, 95, 101. It is therefore highly unlikely that the engraving of the Raphael would have omitted any traces of blood, moreover a feature that does not fit into the Salvator Mundi iconography.

25 – See Salerno 1997, nrs 30, 52 (both of which are described in Silos), 129, 169, 178, 188, 187, 250.

26 – Piaunochò, as in note 24: 'Ipse sui pictor, minio haec velamina fixit/Ipse vero, externae nil valueris manus', in the translation of Bonatsa: 'Lui stesso si è dipinto. Lui stesso ha rappresentato queste spoglie'.


28 – Giovanni Battista Marino, La Galleria, a cura di Marzio Pieri, (Padova, 1979) [henceforth: Galleria], vol. I, Piture – Historie, p. 67, [33]. The reference is made in Danesi Quarantina 1997, as in note 15. It should be noted that the catalogue of artworks described by iconic poetry in Marianne Albrecht-Bott, Die bildende Kunst in der italienischen Lyrik der Renaissance und des Barocks: Studie zur Beschreibung von Portraits und anderen Bildern unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von G.B. Marinos Galleria [Mainzer romanistische Arbeiten, Bd. 41] (Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 221–2, does not consider the subject of Marino's and Silos's poem to be identical. However, it is safe to say that this catalogue is rather a list of the subjects mentioned by the poems than a thorough attempt to retrace the objects involved.

29 – Daniela Danesi Quarantina does not mention that Marino's poem first appeared in the 'sacred' section of the first volume of the Rime (1602), where the painting is said to belong to the collection of Matteo di Capua Prince of Conca (1568–1607), one of Marino's earliest benefactors and a collector of renown, see Galleria, vol. II, pp. 40–1. Per una immagine d'Ecce homo, di mano di Raffaello di Urbino, ch'è nella Galleria del Principe Grande Ammiraglio, Albrecht-Bott (1976), p. 198 gives a not entirely reliable concordance between the Rime and the Galleria, On Matteo di Capua, see DBI, 39, pp. 718–20. Marino frequented di Capua's court from 1592, became his secretary in 1596 and was ousted in 1599, after second arrest in Napels, see ibid., p. 791b. This sheds some light on the provenance of the Raphael. After Marino's ignominious departure from Napels in 1600, di Capua died amidst giuorist debts, leading to the progressive sale of the family's possessions, Ottavio Gentile, an agent for the Gonzaga, was probably not the only prospective buyer who visited the family palace in early 1608 in the lookout for paintings; see Antonio Bertolotti, Artisti in relazione ai Gonzaga Duchi di Mantova nei secoli XVI e XVII (Bologna, [1707]), p. 15. Angelo Borzelli, La Galleria dei Cavalier Marino (Naples, 1923), pp. 5–6, note 1, states that he has looked in vain for a complete inventory of di Capua's paintings allegedly drawn up in 1608 by Gentile. It should be noted that no painting fitting Marino's poem appears in the Gonzaga inventory of 12 March 1627, as published in Alessandro Luzio, La Galleria degli Gonzaga venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627–28 (Milan, 1913), pp. 89–116. In 1636, the di Capua family palace was sold; see Antonio Colombo, 'Il palazzo dei principi di Conca alla strada di S. Maria di Constantinopolis', Napoli Nobilissima. Rivista di Topografia ed Arte Napoletana, IX (1900), pp. 187–9; summariert in Gerhard Lahrodt, Benoni in città. Residenz e comportamenti dell'aristocrazia napoletana 1520–1734 (Naples, 1970), pp. 177–8, who, on p. 57, n. 60, misquotes the year of Colombo's publication. If the identification proposed here is correct, the di Capua Raphael was sold to Guaidi somewhere after 1607, to reach the Giustiniani collection before 1621. Even if Guaidi's museum only hit the guidebooks in the late 1620s, he had already obtained an esteemed position long before, as cameriere di Lco XI, Paul V, Gregory XV and Urban VIII, i.e., from 1605 onwards. The fact that this painting must have left Guaidi's collection by 1621 could also explain why it is never mentioned in eulogies of the museum, all of which are of a later date. The possession of a Raphael would hardly have gone unnoticed. In 1650 Francesco's relative Girolamo Guaidi bemoans the fact that he is unable to obtain a good Raphael for his own museum: 'Di questo rarissimo spirito poco mi trovo havere, perché lo opere maggiori furono per gran principe e con fatica fatte e la maggior parte a fresco', see Puppi (ed.) (1790), p. 22. If the Raphael was in Guaidi's possession between 1607 and 1621, then Sforza Pallavicino, born in 1607, would almost certainly not be the author of the poem, however precarious he was.


32 – It is unlikely that the Brescia Christ Blessing could be the Raphael from the Di Capua collection mentioned in Marino's Rime. As mentioned in note 12, according to the eighteenth-century dealer the Christ Blessing never left the family that commissioned it from Raphael. If this is true, it cannot have been in the possession of the di Capua, since that family lost its collection and became extinct in the seventeenth century.


35 – See, for instance, Rime di Gio. Battista Marino (Venice, 1606), Parte prima, p. 201, where 'E questa, oime, del tuo celeste figlio'.


49 - This issue is developed at length in Maarten Delbecque, 'Evidence as art, art as evidence. Bernini, Pallavicino and the paradoxes of Zero', in Estetica borocco, acts of the international conference, Rome, 6-9 March 2002, forthcoming.

50 - Sforza Pallavicino, Del Beni libri quattro del P. Sforza Pallavicino della Compagnia di Giosè (Rome, 1844), in Opere del Cardinale Sforza Pallavicino (Milan, 1844) [henceforth Opere], vol. II, p. 526b: 'E pur le figure dipinte, banché per dipinti sien ravvisate, pungono acutamente l'afetto. Il dimostrano con buona e con rea operazione e le diverse taigne che spesso traggan dagli occhi alle persone spirituali e ben formati ritratti del tormentato Redentore, ...

51 - During the 1630s Pallavicino works on an ambitious poetical description of the Catholic feasts, the Festi sacri. He interrupted and allegedly destroyed the work when he entered the Jesuit order in 1637, see Irene Affo, Memorie Della Vita e degli Studii di Sforza Cardinale Pallavicino (Parma, 1794), p. 4. A part of the Festi were published in Francesco Bagioni, Scritti di poete italiani Nuon mai per l'addetto stampate de 'più nobili autori del secolo (Venecia, 1686), pp. 160-335

Ne t'assolve il dire, che tu sei mosso a ciò [i.e., lascivious poetry] da onesta vaghezza per la sola eccellenza dell'arte: manca forse l'arte e più nobile e più ingenua in materia eroica, morali e sante?
Perché potendo tu ritrarre più bella la face dalla purezza della cera, la cerchi dell'inmortalità del sevo? Sopra quest'argomento, per quanto appartiene a l'altro, hanno scritto egregiamente in prosa due uomini del mio Ordine, Famiano Strada con tre delle sue prolozioni, e Vincenzo Guinigi con una sua alluvione, e in verso si un biennissimo principe Urbano VIII, che alzò l'incinta bandiera contro a'corrottori di Parnaso nella prima eletta posta in fronte delle sue poesie; si un mio familiarissimo amico Giovanni Ciampoli suo seguace e familiare, nella poetica sacra. This passage is read as an anti-marxist statement in Franco Croce, La critica dei barocchi moderati (Milan, 1955), p. 76.

53 - On this aspect of Guinigi's and Strada's work, see Marc Furamoli, 'Gêcône Pofitâc Reumânon, La tradizione poetica del Collegio Román e le principes inspiratorie del mécénat des Barberini', Milanges de l'École Française à Rome, Moyen Age, Temps Moderns, XL (1998), pp. 797-835.


56 - A good biography of Ciampoli can be found in DBL, XXV, pp. 147-52. A contemporary perspective is offered by Alessandro Pozzobonelli, Vita di Giovanni Ciampoli, in Giovanni Ciampoli, Lettere di Monsignor Giovanni Ciampoli segretario de brev del Gran Popolo a Urbano VIII. Con aggiunta in questa ultima impressione di molte altre lettere del medesimo, e d'una sua Canzone non più stampata, insieme con la Vita dell'autore, descritta dal Sigor Alessandro Pozzobonelli (Venice, 1676), pp. 221-41. The most extensive bibliography of Ciampoli's work is Mario Costanzo, Critica e Poetica del primo Seicento, vol. I (Rome, 1969).

57 - Valuable additions in Bellini (1997), passim; and Idem, 'Federico Borromini, Giovanni Ciampoli e l'accademia del Lincei', Studia Borromaeana, 13 (1999), pp. 203-34; esp. p. 227; note 2; Ciampoli's disgrace is generally seen as a punishment for his involvement with Galileo Galilei; see Pietro Redondi, Galileo Heroe (Princeton, 1987) [see also infra]. Even if this undoubtedly played a role, the exact circumstances of Ciampoli's fall are far from clear, see the assessment in Ezio Raimondi, Letteratura Barocca, Studi sul Seicento italiano (ristampa aggiornata) (Florence, 1982), pp. 331-3.

58 - Pallavicino's editions of Ciampoli's poetry are listed in Affò (1794), pp. 51-3; Costanzo (1956) pp. 5-10; and DBL, XXV, p. 151b, where the Venetian edition of 1648 is omitted. Pallavicino's editions of Ciampoli's writings have now extensively been dealt with in Federica Favino, 'Sforza Pallavicino editore e 'Galileista ad un modo', Giornale critico della filosofia italiana, s. 6, 20 (2000), pp. 288-96, who reaccesses earlier literature on Pallavicino's editorial interventions, most importantly Ezio Raimondi (1966), pp. 114-18.


60 - The text must have been written between 22 March 1625 and 22 April 1629, since it mentions the canonization of Elizabeth of Portugal on the earlier date, but not Andrea Corsini's reception in the heavenly hierarchy, even though Ciampoli was actively involved in this celebration; see Frederick Hammond, Music and Spectacle in Baroque Rome: Barberini patronage under Urban VIII (New Haven/London, 1994), pp. 76 and 264, nr. XIX.

61 - Marziano Guglielmietti and Mariarosa Masocco, 'Lettere e prosa incide (o parzialmente edito) di Giovanni Ciampoli', Studi Sienteschi, 19 (1978), pp. 131-237; 136-41; Marzio Pieri, Per Marino (Padua, 1976), pp. 128-29; Bellini (1997), as in note 55. Ciampoli's role in the establishment of the Poeta Saca is also celebrated in Sforza Pallavicino's introduction to Ciampoli (1648), p. [6]: 'Et aggiunandosi [al Ciampoli] agli spiriti del nativo suo genio g'incitamenti, e gli esempi del gran Cardinal Maffio Barberino, adorato poscia dal Mondo col nome d'Urbano Ottavo, machiò egli à pro de mortali una nuova lega non pur fra le Muse, e la Verità, ma fra le Muse, e la Picta', quoted in Affò (1794), p. 8, who leaves out the phrase 'egli à pro de mortali'. Affò continues: 'Sentendosi quindi Sforza eccitato a poetare, ed avendo già le sue pure lumi d'iscritturì di buoni secoli per ciò che appartiene alla stile; per l'innocenza de' suoi costumi, e la pietà che gli fu sempre compagnia, s'invaghì d'imitar Ciampoli nella scelta de'soggetti o sacri, o morali'. Comparable statements can be found in Leone Allacci, Apes Urbaneane ise de Vrus Illustres (Rome, 1633), pp. 155-7 o Lorenzo Crasso, Elogi di Uomini Letterati (Venice, 1666), pp. 371-87.


63 - Ciampoli (1648), Dedication a cardinal Girolamo Colonna, p. [6].

64 - Poetica sacra, p. 290: 'L'ottio schiavando, ci si prenda piaceare / Tal'hor negli arborelli / Scolpire hinni novelli: / Spesso in concave rupi Echo l'udiria / D'angeliche preghiere / Con devota armonia / A
celebrar GIESV sfidar gli angeli; / Né d'industrie pennelli; / Fui per dipinto suo la gloria ignota / Alla gosta risona'.
65 - Peteca sacra, p. 255-2: D'ellerà imcoronate / Fecero al guardo / mio leggadri intesi; / Da Pierre efliciate. / Del difetto à vedersi! / Il Vero e' l'Alfo ivi apparian vestiti / Con aremi diversi! The / ambiguity whether Devotion actually sees the statues or only bears a description is resolved at the end of the passage, see infra, note 70.
67 - Peteca sacra, pp. 253-2: 'Presso alla bella image / Apre / gioconde scene / Un Teatro ben vago'. 'Il colonnac alabastre' have 'Non men semplici il cuore, che bianco il petto', They open their 'ai nevose, / Sprizzando in arie perle / Di stille ruggiadìose'.
68 - Peteca sacra, pp. 252-3: 'Ove con altre tempe è colorita / La bugia cuor mentita. / Mà che mentita il cuor? Mentita il volto, / Mentita il corpo tutto; / Perquè a qui guardi si celo horror si brutto / Ella lo tiene inviol / Dalle spalle alle piante / In un drappo cangiante / Mostruoso à vedersi. / Oh quanti aspetti varij ivi rimirir! / Hor par ciel di zaffiri / Hor prato di smeraldi, / Sembra hor campo di diade à di più caldi, / Tal hor ceneri, e fiamme ivi vescoperis, / Altre volte argentata imita l'onde; / E spesso in un confonde / Mille apparenze di color diversi, / Qual pompia ivi non mente? / Della faccia i diffusi ivi nasconde / Maschera furandente; / Mà fuor che larve, e vesti / Null'altro in lei vedresti; / Che sol ne i lisci, e nel gli ammanati è vaga / Quella sì falsa maga', ibid.; 'E con industria vana / Studio in fingersi un luomo Scimmiona Africana. / Gentueri, e Geriusi / Enciadi, e Chimere'.
69 - Peteca sacra, p. 253: 'Io non sapea levarmi / Con faccia hor lieta, hor trista / Dalla curiosa vistà / De' figurati marmi. / Godeva nel mio diletto / Il Santo Eroce del solitario tetto'.
70 - The description concludes, p. 254: 'Mà pittura men bella / non fu per l'ama mia la sua favella'.
71 - Peteca sacra, p. 253: 'Sembra hor campo di diade ... Altre volte argentata imita l'onde, ... Mille apparenze di color diversi' [emphasis added].
72 - Peteca sacra, pp. 255-6: 'Nel basso mondo, / e sù nel Ciel supremo: / Ad ogni nostro oggetto / Di Verità prodotta il nome ino / medito, / Non ti stupir; nessuna lingua ti nega. / Verace all'hor trà / noi si chiana un detto / Quando del cuore interno / Nuonte lielo ocauti sensi ivi spagna: / E Verità s'apppili anco ogni effetto, / Ment'ei parla con l'opere, / E gli arcani di DOIO nel mondo scopre' '... Non vedili tâ, che Verità vi regna, / e con vedi ti accecent / Al guardo de' viventi / Del Num degenrate / che gloria insegnare' / 'Mà che? non sol / nello stellato impero / Ella si fì palese; / Manifestando il vero; / In terra anco disecces; / Né si scura caverna / Addiâr mai potrai / Ov'ella Alba di DOIO non sparga raia'.
73 - Peteca sacra, pp. 264-5: 'Dentro al globo rotondo / Ove lo / spirito humano formai pensieri, / con simulare veri / Splendente le stelle, / e si compendia il mondo. / Sai che se sogni, o pensi; / Trovi si chiaro lo sol, tan'altro un monte / Dentro la propria fronte, / Quanto apparir lo fanno / Della terra, e del ciel gli spazi immensi. / Per natura sempri'hanno / Arte da DOIO coi stupendo e vari / hà dentro d'ogn'oggetto / La veritiera imagine si fá, / E nel vasto / Intelletto. / Che d'infiniti mondi anco è capace, / Estra sol di sensibi apparenza / Simulacro verace, / Il falso, che fu sempre / orbo d'essenza, / Di sua sembianza finito / Introdur non vi può larva dipinta. / Così del mondo ogni corpore mole / E Veritate in ater / Così dell'ama ogni fantasma intatto / È sera effige, che del / Vero è quale / Scuti hor come si sole / Produrre l'Alfo entro alla / fronte humana / Con forza di parole. / Quella plebe infinìa / D'immaginè animate / Con meraviglia strana / Là dentro ha moto, / e vita: / I membri suoi sconette / In cento parti, e cento, / E ne sà fabbricar larve insante. / Poi, se vuol, gli rinnette / Nel primo sembiante in un momento, / Hora in esse produr quei mostrì ignoti / Può faccondia eloquente. / Che tra i nemici sovente / Con variati / Forma senz'arte il vento'. This metaphor has a longstanding tradition, see most recently Giacomo Berra, 'Immagini casuali e / natura antropomorpha nell'immaginario artistico rinascimentale: / Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz, 43/2-3 (1999), pp. 335-419: 370-6.
75 - Peteca sacra, pp. 318-20, cf. pp. 319-20: 'Non hà mortale / ingegno ochi linxei / Di si fina acutezza, / Che attenenbati dal / corpore velo: / Possan di Dio mirar là sovra il / Cielo / l'invisibile bellezza, / Dunque è sepolto entro al silenìo eterno / Dei secoli infiniti / Stans quel sacri arcani, / O di frugi non suoi sian revistiti. / Se nel Teatro interno / Introdur gli orrai de i petti humani. / Solo da quei colori, / Che in tavelagna unita unìa accoglie / Immortale fedele, / I lumi, e l'ombre toglie / Per figurar le tele: / E l'human Intelletto / Per dipinjeg di Dio gli eterni honorì, / E dal senso / mortali folcori splendedi / A mendicar costretto'.
76 - Peteca sacra, p. 272: [Poesia] 'Mà she in Parnaso insegna, / Che i prodigy non falsi IDDIO produce, / Sacro Oriente di novella luce / Hoggi s'apre a gl'Ingegni, / E con celeste suono / Di nuova Cetri / a Verita faci dono'. Devotion then proceeds by explaining how every mythological story can be substituted with a biblical one, which will arouse equal admiration. cf. p. 281, 'hor fio / 'I rieditori stupori / Al mondo espo dir, / Conven, che vada dove / Universalmente forza hoggi l'adori; / Ch'in luce addir le meraviglie nuove / & solo arte di Dio'. See also p. 316: 'Già non ti concide / Farsal gi福祉 annali all'immortal Fede'. Then, pp. 317-18, John's Apocalypsin is praised as a poetic masterpiece.
77 - Peteca sacra, p. 273: 'Mà chi le mani all'inventicon qui lega / E dò mai si nega, / Quando il Deus di Urbio storie colorì, / Che di frugi inventati / Ei non v'aggiunga incogniti stupori / Certo il pennel dell'Arno, / Orando in Vatican muri ammirati, / Con destra immittatrice / Non desjava in dorno, / Mentre il ver coloria / palma inventrice'.
78 - Peteca sacra, pp. 305-28.
79 - Fundamental to Giampoli's oeuvre, this idea serves elsewhere to justify the use of classical eloquence in the defence of the faith and the admission of 'newness' to clarify the truths of faith; see Giovanni Giampoli, Proe (Rome, 1649). The use of classical eloquence is justified in 'Discorso quatro: Delle lettere sacre e profane', esp. cha 4, 6, pp. 114-20, where it is compared to the spoliation of idolatrous temples and objects to honour God, cf. pp. 115-16: 'In una contingenza assai proportionale si trova in materia de lettere il Christianesimo presente. L'enolocqua risplende nell'Ildolatria, Gran disaventura del Mondo, che la dottrina dei / Platonì, e de gli Aristòiti; la faccondia di Demostene, e di Cicerone; / l'acceutà di Livio, e di Tacito siano vivande profanate con i riti sacrâgli! Non per questo si pensi il Demonio ò di affamare l'appetite de gl'ingegni, o di sconvertire la religione de gli affetti. Entriamo o pure con le spoglie d'Egitto in quella terra, dove scaturisce il latte della sapienza, & il mele della faccondia. Ne scacciamo gli Idoli, e la consacreremo à Dio. Vadano i carriaggi in
Tiro, & i navilj in Osir per portarc-li le verghe d’oro & i legnami di cedro. Sapremo co i tesorci delle nationi profane fabbricare il palazzo & il tempio in Jerusalea. Né sarà Idolatia l’adorare in quelle materie tradigurate la Deita verace, mentre il medesimo bronzo, che fa Giove in Campidoglio, si adora oggi con effigie trasformata per Pietro in Vaticano.17 The next chapter points out that also holy scripture used ancient verse, while, in turn, authors like Homer or Pindar offer models for the ‘Istoria monastica’ and the exaltation of martyrs. It concludes, p. 117: ‘Pare finalmente, che non si riveda per maestevole la letteratura, se non è Religiosa, e che riucisca meno gradibilie la religione, quando non fosse letteratura’. Chapter 6 demonstrates the same ‘truth’ with historical examples, such as the writings of Augustinus. ‘Discorso sesto, della novità’, pp. 111–121, actually forms part of the same argument (see the remark on p. 113), and explores whether ‘novità’ are permitted in ‘matrice sacra’. This pertains to the matters discussed here, since Ciampoli argues that also immutable things can be expressed in different forms (pp. 116–18), an argument based on an apology of metaphor, ch. 11, ‘Della metafora, e come in essa s’immetta la falsità’, pp. 149–51. The argument here is in essence the same as in the Poetica sacra: metaphor renders visible, and even if it does not correspond exactly to the object or concept it represents, and therefore contains falsity, it is a legitimate means to show sacred subject-matter. Ciampoli argues that idiology or heresy stems from the tendency to read metaphors literally: ‘In questa maniera la metafora sarebbe una Magia, che, superando le forze della natura, e le consuetudini dell’incommensurata, con imprroprietà di parolletto accattata sarebbe metamorfoosi repentino’. In the Bible, Ciampoli argues, ‘Visa forma la metafora, non vi si idolatra la proprietá’ (p. 150). The issue of idolatry appears very frequently in Ciampoli’s poetic oeuvre, see for instance Giovanni Ciampoli, Poetica Sacra (Venice, Zaccaria Contazzi e Fratelli, 1662), pp. 119–23: ‘Meditazione Sopra il Salmo 113. Contro all’Idolatria con occasione della Provvidenza Divina manifesta al popolo Ebreo nella partenza d’Egitto’. 80 – The familiarity between Ciampoli’s and Pallavicino’s aesthetics has been stressed by Costanzo (1970), p. 193; note 8 and pp. 138–57; and Mazzocchi (1997), pp. 37–58. As pointed out, supra, Pallavicino deals with these issues most thoroughly in his 1634 Del Bono, where he provides a solution to the fundamental weakness in Ciampoli’s argument: if art necessarily lies, it can never liberate itself entirely from the suspicions raised by iconoclasm. Pallavicino suggests that art is not true or false, but ‘utrare’, perceived in a realm where no judgement is made on the veracity of the object. On this issue, see the literature quoted in note 45 and Delbeke (forthcoming). 81 – This calls to mind the identification of Christ as Truth, most famously expressed in the gospel of John 14: 6: Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life; and Psalm 84 (85), 12. 82 – Poetica sacra, p. 313: ‘Con pompe così belle / L’umanva meraviglia / Inimia i rai delle dorate stelle, / E splendidis richizzia / Merta applauso, e corona / Se quel, che l’uomo annimira, / A Dio si dona’. This idea is further developed, and Devotion concludes on p. 317: ‘Sol per farn [le vere Idee della splendor divino] palese à nostre menti Piglio meravigliose / Di creata beatì pompe apparenti’. 83 – Poetica sacra, pp. 339–42: pp. 333–40, the coronation of Charles V; p. 341, the description of Saint Peter’s; pp. 342–7, the ceremonies under Urban VIII. 84 – Poetica sacra, p. 341: ‘Mà dove lascio voi, bronzi dorati, / Alle cie glorio vinto / L’antica palme sue cede Corinto: / E con due colonne in mar se già si vede / Ai vascelli spalmati / Porte i confini Alcide, / Qui del gran Tempio in maestrevol parte, / Quattro colonne con stupor ben rare, / Quasi termine all’Arte / Dal magnanimo Urbeo al Ciel s’alzaro’. Also partly quoted in Bellini (1997), p. 165–


89 – See supra, note 9.

90 – The original text goes as follows: ‘g. contra Apollinem — ridiculum dixit — adversus virtutibus culpabat, quod Apollo esset et coma intensus et genis gratas et corpore glabellus et arte multiescius et fortuna opulentus. Io iam primum, inquit, crimes eius praemus antiqui et promus antis anteuentui et propenduli, corpus totum gratissimum, membra nitida, lingua faticida, seu tute oratione seu versibus malis, uturique facundia acque sapientia [emphasis added], taken from Apollis, Apologiae. Florides, texte établi et traduit par Paul Valette, 2nd edn (Paris, 1605), pp. 126–9, where the following translation is given: ‘si cheveuere vierce du fer, ses joues fraiches, ses membres lisses, la varieté de ses talents, l’opulence de sa condition. Et d’abord, disait-il, ses cheveux disposé en boudes et ses accrochement retombent sur son front et flottent sur ses tempes; son corps est la grace meme; ses membres sont eblouisants; sa langue fatidique vaticine, a votre gre, soit en prose, soit en vers, avec une egle eloquence.’

91 – A thorough study of Borbomi’s book is long overdue. Brief remarks can be found in Philippe Sénéchal, ‘Restaurations et remplois de sculptures antiques’, Revue de l’Art 79 (1988), pp. 47–51; L’Arca dii Benini [cat., Ariccia, Palazzo Chiapi, 10 October – 31 December 1998] (Rome, 1998), p. 173. Borbom treats sculpture mainly as a legitimate means to celebrate glory and virtue through the establishment of an artificial and eternal likeness, which imitates God’s creative prowess. The last chapter of his book, however, in what Sénéchal termed an ideologically inspired ’piaucette’, celebrates rulers who refuse to have their statue erected, because they attach greater value to the effigy their subjects carry in their heart. The most eminent example is Alexander VII’s refusal to allow the Popolo Romano to erect a statue on the Capitol hill in honour of his efficient measures to counteract the plague that ravished central Italy in 1656; see Borbom (1661), pp. 338–44. Rather predictably, this refusal becomes a major theme in the panegyric devoted to Alexander; see Sforza Pallavicino, Dei Vita di Alessandro VII. Libri cinque. Opera inedita del P. Sforza Pallavicino della compagna di Gesù (Prato, 1839–1840), vol. II, pp. 167–9; Alcieri (1654), I, p. 429; Ariccia (1998), nr. 22; Gian Lorenzo Bernini. Regista del Barocco (Milan, 1999), nrs 172–5. Borbom concludes this chapter, and his book, with
a passage that extols Christ as the most perfect sculpture ever made, the only effigy worthy to be held in front of one’s eyes at all time and to be emulated by all, in words that do not stray far from the ideals espoused by Giamboni. Io fra tanto, che fin’adesso impregni a favellare de’marmi effigii, tocco dal consiglio del Vangelo Profeta; metto d’avanti a gli occhi dell’intelletto di chi che sia, quella Pietra vivente, di cui favella la leggenda dello Spirito Santo in un’Ulterior Vergine di Maria, appunto, per parlar con Bernardino Siena, Tempiam in officina vostre statuendae operationis. Dirò dunque con Zasja, Attentio ad petram, unde eexis estis [Cap. 53]; accio che similemente considerazione, ognuno si studii per mezzo delle virtuose operazioni di rsassomigliare a quell’Immagine Divina; poiché allora saremo degnì ritirati di esser collocati nel Tempio dell’Eterna Gloria; che saremo conformes Imaginis fibi Dei, cui soli honor, & Imperium [Ad Rom. 8].

92 - Silos describes sculptures of the muses and Apollo under the heading ‘Musarum Chorus in Musaeo Francisci Guidali’, together with effigies of the poets Anacreon and Sappho, Pantheonica, I, pp. 263-6; the modern poets, ibid., I, pp. 281-2, see also Fraonzoni and Tempesta (1992), nrs 13-15. It should be noted that long before the publication of Silos’s work, in the 1690s, during the last years of Guidali’s life, the museum is dispersed and ends up in the Minim convent of Trinita dei Monti, where it is visited by Christina of Sweden in 1656, see Fraonzoni and Tempesta (1992), p. 5. Silos stayed in Rome between 1650 and 1656 in the Theatre convent of S. Andrea della Valle, then again from 1668 until his death in 1674, see Basile Bonsante in Pantheonica, vol. I, pp. 115-lx.

93 - Andrea Bolland, ‘Descrizio e Dieta dei vescovi, touch, and the poetics of Bernini’s Apollo and Daphne’, Art Bulletin, 82 (2000) pp. 309-30, p. 317. Urban’s verses are (in the translation provided by Bolland): ‘Whoever loving, pursues the joys of fleeting beauty fills his hands with leaves or seized bitter berries’. On p. 309 and footnotes Bolland gives an overview of the literature on the subject of the relation of Bernini’s Apollo and Daphne and contemporary literary debate. It should be noted that Bolland convincingly argues that Bernini’s statue comments upon the fundamental rift between the arts of vision, poetry and painting, and the art of touch, sculpture, a division superseded in ‘a particular poetic ideal’ expressed in Urban’s dyptic, creating ‘a linkage to an illustrious Tuscan tradition [patriarchial] that intertwined spirituality, poetry and the laurel’ (p. 322). In this respect, it is worth mentioning that Pallavicino dedicates Ciampoli’s Rome to cardinal Girolamo Colonna because his family supported ‘Petrarch’s Paramusus’.

94 - The parallel between Raphael’s Sessor and Gianlorenzo Bernini’s Apollo and Daphne also suggests an interesting aspect of the widespread identification of Bernini with Michelangelo. On this identification, see Cesare d’Onofrio, Roma vista da Roma (Rome, 1967), pp. 172-87; Catherine M. Soussloff, ‘Imaginazione di Bernini’, Sixteenth Century Journal, XX (1990), pp. 31-60. Against the background of the rather important body of criticism voiced against the later work of Michelangelo, Bernini was profiled as a new Michelangelo who had been able to cast aside the excesses of his Cinquecento model, a process that went hand in hand with a reappraisal of Michelangelo’s work; see Christof Thoenes, ‘Bernini architetto tra Palladio e Michelangelo’, in Gian Lorenzo Bernini architetto e l’architettura europea del Seicento, ed Gian Francesco Spagnesi and Maurizio Fagiolo (Rome, 1989), pp. 105-34; Delbeke (2002), pp. 33-53. In Cinquecento literature directed against Michelangelo, Raphael was used as the counter-example of the ‘rightful’ artist; see Tristan Wediglen, ‘Fedele Zuccaro between Michelangelo and Raphael’, in ideen (ed.), Fedele Zuccaro: Kunst zwischen Ideal und Reform (Basel, 2000), pp. 165-268: 196-201. It is this pattern that we see emerging here.


96 - The most famous example is the use of the bronze of the Pantheon for Urban’s artillery and the baldacchino. Alessandro Donati, Roma vetus ac recent (Rome, 1616 [1659]), pp. 283-4, deals at great length with this ‘restoration’ of the Pantheon; on Donati, see note 123. Other restorations or reconstructions of churches include Santa Agnese (1539-37), San Caio (1655), Santa Bibiana (1624-9), SS. Cosma e Damiano (1626-32), S. Theodoro (1643-44).


98 - Bellini 1999, Barbara Agosti, Collezioneismo e archeologia cristiana nel Seicento, Federico Borromini e il Medesino artistico tra Roma e Milano (Milan, 1999), pp. 9-36. It should be noted that Gualdi dedicated a chaplet to Federico’s uncle, Carlo; see note 8. During his stay in the eternal city, Borromeo stood in close contact with the Roman circles sketched here. In 1616 Ciampoli sends Borromeo an essay of his sacred poetry. Ciampoli’s Parnasso sacro portrays Borromeo as the new Moses, who is spurred to form an alliance with the David from Bologna, Maddo Barberini, later Urban VIII; see Guglielmini and Massoero (1979), p. 150-8. The Parnasso is published in Costanzo (1976), pp. 97-104. Bellini has detected a strong parallel between Borromeo’s treatise on sacred painting, De pictura sacra libri due published in 1624, and Ciampoli’s Poetica sacra; see Bellini (1999), esp. pp. 211-12.


100 - Antonio Querenghi writes a poem on Gualdi’s collection for Pomplio Totti’s Ritratto di Roma Antica (Rome, 1635); the poem is given by Cancelleri, ms. cit., pp. 1124-25; see also Fraonzoni and Tempesta (1992), p. 35, note 24 and p. 42, note 203; Gallo (1992), p. 326, note 16; Querenghi also had close contacts with Paolo Gualdi, a member of the Accademia degli Humorist; see Umberto Motta, Antonio Querenghi (1546-1603). Un letterato pavoconta nella Roma del tardo Rinascimento (Milan, 1957), p. 202-21.


102 - Alessandro Donati, Vetus sacrum numinum sub eorum pactis Italicoe Numine Romae repositum a Francesco Guidali ... Et ab eodem Bibliothecae Vaticanse dono datum (Rome, Ex typographia R. Camarre Apostolicæ, 1650), shown in Fraonzoni and Tempesta 1992, Dec. 1a, fig. 15, and Appendice I, without mention of the author. This sheet is probably listed in D&B, III, k. 133, nr. 15 as Carmen de veteri numintum, Rome.


108 - Francozzi and Tempesta (1992), Ded. 1 b. According to the same catalogue, Gualdi also installs three 'arac', dedicated to San Lodovico, San Francesco di Paola and the Virgin and Child, ibid., Cat. ded. 4 c, d, e, f.

109 - Ibid., p. 50; Franzoni and Tempesta (1992), Ded. 2 and 3. The inscription in Santa Maria Maggiore is also recorded in Evelyn, Diary, II, p. 245; on this sarcophagus, also Osborne and Claridge (1996), vol. 2, nr. 245.


Cancelleri, ms. cit., pp. 147-148 quotes by the same Merone the oration De Christianarum Antiquitatis Reliquis, quoas sacras imaginis proserenent habita in aridibus Itime Patriis Romani Peirs a Valis, published in Rome 'apud Haeredes Iac. Mascardi' in 1635, which describes 'un antica imagine dipinta in un Vetro Cimieriale'. Cancelleri, p. 148 also mentions that Gio. Battista Casali, De veneribus aegyptiorum in Italis (Rome, 1644), p. 83, praises 'una sua [Gualdi\'s] lucerna con l\'effigie di Giona ignudo, disceso all\'ombra delle fronti di una Zucca, per simbolo della Risurrezione di Gesu Cristo, bench\'e abbia male interpretata la figura del Profeta per quella di Venere e il Monogramma (chiro) per una Rota, su cui si volge la vita, ...'. It should be noted that also Cassali fervently attacks the 'heretics' who deny that the early Christian Church venerated images; see Franzoni and Tempesta (1992), p. 17; William Heckscher, 'Bernini\'s Elephant and Obelisk', Art Bulletin, 29 (1947), pp. 155-162; 178, note 4 mentions Cassali\'s defence of the erection of christianized obelisks.

111 - See Favino (2000). It has often wrongly been assumed that Gualdi was a member of the Lincei (see Marini [1984], vol. I, p. 493, who contradicts this), but he was closely connected to a lot of its members; see Franzoni and Tempesta (1992), p. 1 and notes 15-16.

112- David Freedberg, The Eye of the Lynx, Galileo, his friends, and the beginning of modern natural history (Chicago, 2001, p. 163). For the provenance of the medal, see Cancelleri, ms. cit., pp. 1129-30; also Franzoni and Tempesta (1992), nr. 44, who do not mention the publication.


115 - Appendix, lines 144-52. On the popularity of the mirabili, see note 6. In 1637 Francesco Stelluti publishes an unfinished manuscript by Federico Cesio on 'wood turned into stone', Trattato del legno fossile mineralmente scoperto (Rome, Vitale Mascardi), dedicated to Francesco Barberini, 'che per la novit\'e sarebbe stata una lezione gustoisissima, & curiosissima' (p. 11). The frontispiece is adorned with the impressa of the Accademia dei Lincei.


117 - On these events, see Redondi (1887), passim.
APPENDICE 1. BIBLIOTECA CASANATENSE, MS. 2121, FF. 448R—451R

1 Quando tra i ceppi avvins

De le membra terrene in antro osceno
forme celesti il Regnator Superno,
Cinc angustie fenestre ci vi distine,
Onde un riflesso impuro
Lor traluce almo del sole eterno:
E in ogni opra più vil, che’l senso
apprende.
Pose un vestigio interno
De la beltà, che nel suo volto splende.
Die Natura però troppo severa
A i sensi in luogo, e in tempo angusta
sfera.

12 Nè pur dentro a gli horror

Di folta notte asconde i sacri arcani
De l’incerto futuro a noi Mortali,
Mà del passato ancor gli ampi tesori
Ritolti à i sensi umani
Danno in preda a l’oblio gli ordin fatali
forse almeno del presente i campi
immensi
Scorrer con rapid’ali.
Ponno in un’Sol momento i nostri sensi?
Ciò è hora alberga in ogni Ciel remoto
forse al gran lume lor non resta ignoto?

13 Ah [che] nò, fiera natura
A l’infelice senso avara meta
Negli spattij del luogo hai tu prescritto
Circondi il Regnà a lui d’anguste mura
e l’pie de estrà gli victa
Da quei confini con tuo severo edito
Sol la mente far può per Mari, e Regni
Momentaneo tragitto
Nullo esigio al suo volo impone i segni.
Mà cieca ellè, mentre quaggiù e’n giace
Se del seno non splende a lei la face

34 Onde aita pieta

L’animo havrà trà questi horror
sepolti?
Dura legge natìa troppo gli ccela.
Di natura il vigore arte ingegnosa
Sua prisma emula ha tolto;
e l passato, e’l remoto à gli occhi suelà:
Per lei nobili pennello estinsì Eroi
Ravviva in vago tela

E fa veder il Tago à i Regni Eoi,
Quai sariam senza lei penne facende?
Spirto ella à i marmi, à i bronzi, à i legni
infonde

Quando in Lidia, già prodigioso anello
Asconde de’presenti ancor l’aspetto:
E a noi d’arti gentil magia verace
Con incanto più bello
Mostra ogni antico, ogni Ioniante oggetto.
Le celesti a i nostri sensi ascosè,
A l’umano intellettò,
Ch’opre co i sensi pur chi fu ch’espose?
Con mirabil penell condotta penna,
E con scalpello industre arte le accenna.

56 Però scoltor sublime

I simulaci tuoi, bencen spiranti
Ignudi d’ogni color più vago
Nè Fidia mai s’aspra battaglia esprime,
fà splendor d’oro i manti,
O sù l’herbe ondierggia vermiglio lago.
Chi non vide, Ivi bella i tuoi colorì
Ne cerca in van l’imago
D’ammirato scalpello entro i lavori.
Nè stranio fiore à gli occhi espor gli lice.
Alà ben l’arte d’Apelle è in ciò felice?

67 Spiega penna eloquente

Con diffimi forme i propri oggetti,
E varia’ al variar d’anni, e di Regni.
osciri hor sono alla Pelarga gente
Del prisco Omero i detti
Over l’indice no to a i Toschi ingegni.
Contempla occhio affannato a parte
Mille intricati segni
Per luce trar da le profonde carte:
Mà dove, o quando mai telà faconda
E chi i suoi sensi a un girar d’occhi
asconda?

78 Cedan la prima gloria

Nobil pittura a te le due sorelle;
Tu la sola a l’alma oppressa a pien
soccorri;
Mà, deh, nel fango di lasciva historia
Le tue sembianze belle
Macchiar, per Dio, Vergine illustre
abborri.
Se di lisci impudichi appanni il viso
Per gli occhi al cor te’n corri;

Che resta al fin da la tua peste ucciso.
Ridite a voi del faico antiche scene
Quanto avvevlenin l’alma effigie
oscene.

89 Da dotta man dipinto

Mira Garzòn incanto il falso Giove
Da fuoco impuro in pioggia d’or disfato;
E vero ardor da quel diluvio flinto
s’accende in lui, ch’e l muove
Ad imitar l’esempio ivi rittratto.
Quil sia stupor, se germigliarci in seno
Mille desiri hà fatto
Chi pone ancora al natio corso il freno?
Tu l’sai Clorinda, à cui bianca pittura
Tolve il color, che ti doveva Natura.

100 Sù misteri del Cielo

Dunque imprimi o bell’arte in te illustri;
Onde sien poscia a le nostre alme
impressi.
O come ardono i cuor d’empireo zelo,
Quando da marìi industri
Miràl divini oggetti al vivo espressi?
Frà mille opre più rare, una hor ne
ammira,
E di carmi le intessi
Mia Clio, fregio immortal con l’aurea
lira.
Gualdi, in tuo bel museo questa risiede
Ove altre meraviglie han chiara sede.

111 D’omnipotente Nume

effigiato è qui l’eterno figlio,
Dal Ciel diceso entro ad humana
spoglia;
Qual, mentre in terra ei fu supremo lume
spirò dal sacrìo ciglio,
Tal sembra qui, che ne le luci accoglia.
Par, se a gli occhi daì fè, che in tali
accenti
Ver noi le labbra scioglia:
Venite al Ciel, ch’io v’apro alme viventi;
Ecco ch’uomo, e mortal mi son fatt’io,
Per far l’uomo immortal per farlo un Dio.

122 D’elette Ninfe un Choro

Uni Pittor sovrano all’hor, ch’ei volse
effigiar la celebrata Achea.
E da varie beltà divise in loro.
Alto esempio ci raccolse,
Per ritrar pari al ver l’empia Ledea
Mà tu, ch’espesso hai sacro¹ Nume eterno
Onde havesti l’Idea?
Più che mortal bellezza io qui discerno.
Ei che le stelle, e’l sol pinse, i celesti
Color ti diede, e l’arte onde il pingesti
⁴⁴(48r) 133 Si nobil tela è prole
Di quel moderno Apelle, onde si pregia
L’alta Città, cui l’aurea² quercia impresa.
Fosti ben tu de la Pittura un sole

fù la tua destra egregia
De’tesori dell’arte ampia miniera.
Prodigio sembra un colorito sino
In provincia straniera,
che parto sia del tuo pennel divino.
E tua gloria immortal vie più lampeggia
Nel solio Vatican, come in sua Reggia.

144 Mà cento opre stupende
Che contro al muto⁶ oblio t’ergon trofco

Quest’una di beltà vince in battaglia.
Più ch’ossa di Giganti ella risplende
Nel mirabil museo.
Nè Gauldi, altro supore ivi l’agguaglia:
Legno in pietra converso, acqua in diamante,
Chi dirà che prevaglia
La tela al suo fattor fatta sembiente?
La veggio opre di Dio, qui dentro espresso.
Da divino Pittor veggio Dio stesso.

¹—Replaces an illegible word.
²—E oscuro.
³—Gl’indice.
⁴—Replaces an illegible word.
⁵—Replaces an illegible word.
⁶—Del maligno?