

Dafür wird die x-te Wiederholung längst bekannter Ansichten behutsam vermieden und man sieht in diesem Band wohlthuenderweise **nicht** den Finger Gottes aus Michelangelos „Erschaffung Adams“. Sehr begrüßenswert ist auch die Publikation von Details, die so bisher nicht gesehen wurde, z. B. wird nicht die Gruppe des Heliodor aus der gleichnamigen Stanza Raffaels wiedergegeben, sondern die auf einen Sims gekletterten Knaben, die den Hohepriester beim Gebet beobachten; nicht der Engel, der Petrus befreit, erscheint im Detail, vielmehr die Wächter in ihren schimmernden Rüstungen. Bemerkenswert ist auch, daß nicht nur Details von den brillant restaurierten Bildern veröffentlicht werden, sondern auch von stark verschmutzten Fresken, z. B. in der Cappella Paolina.

Formal ist das Buch gerade für ein breiteres Publikum sehr ansprechend, daher hätten Auszüge aus lateinischen Dokumenten und Bibelverse übersetzt werden sollen. Die Übersetzungen aus dem Italienischen stammen von Dr. Ulrike Bauer-Eberhardt, Dr. Susanne Evers, Dr. Susanna Murmann und Dr. Ruth Wolff. Diese Titelhüberei ist ebenso altertümlich wie überflüssig und hebt die Übersetzerinnen akademisch über die Verfasser sowie den Herausgeber prof. (!) Carlo Pietrangeli. Den Doctores sind kleine Ungenauigkeiten unterlaufen: S. Pietro sollte beispielsweise nicht mit „Petersdom“ übersetzt werden, „aiuti“ nicht mit „Gehilfen“, der Name des Apologeten Laktanz bzw. Lactantius wurde nicht erkannt, so blieb das italienische Lattanzio, auch ist der Titel von Matteo da Lecces Fresko in der Sixtina mit „Handel um den Körper des Moses“ seltsam übersetzt, da Engel und Teufel offenkundig um den Leichnam des Propheten kämpfen.

Mit Pietrangelis *Gemälde des Vatikan* liegt die bisher umfassendste Präsentation des Gesamtbestandes vor, vor allem aufgrund der Abbildungen wird er auch in wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken von großem Nutzen sein.

SABINE POESCHEL

*Institut für Kunstgeschichte
Universität Stuttgart*

Angela Negro: Il giardino dipinto del Cardinal Borghese. Paolo Bril e Guido Reni nel Palazzo Rospigliosi Pallavicini a Roma, Rom: Nuova Argos, 1996; 119 + XLII S. Abb.; ISBN 88-85897-53-3, Lit.80.000

The abundance of restorations in Italy in the past, and many more to come, makes the publication of its documentation an almost impossible task. However, in the exemplary case of the restoration undertaken by the Soprintendenza dei Beni Culturali in the Loggia del Giardino of Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi, a proper book has been written by Angela Negro. Its scope is wider than mere documentation, as Negro not only describes the work done by the restoration-team, but also makes observations on the working procedure of the artists, and undertakes a new attribution the design and part of the decoration. The result points art historians at the value of direct observation of the artwork itself. When Negro discusses the iconography,

however, this seemingly logical development neglects the cultural *ambiente* of the patron. A new reading of the fresco is proposed at the end of this review.

The present Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi in Rome was built by Cardinal Scipione Borghese, nephew of Pope Paul V (1605-1612). With the election of Camillo Borghese to the Papacy, Scipione rose to a high position in the Papal state, in internal and international affairs¹. For that reason he needed quarters within close distance of the papal residences, and, as a prince in seventeenth-century Rome, above all a garden to receive high delegates. From 1610 onwards, the plan for a garden of delight and official receptions seems to have taken form on the Quirinal Hill. Between 1611 and 1616, a conglomeration of smaller grounds was restructured into four parts: a formal garden with the Casino dell'Aurora, a second with the Loggia delle Muse, a third private garden, and a palace. Scipione Borghese never saw his project finished, though, as he lost interest when the more sumptuous Villa Borghese was begun. In 1616 garden and palace were sold to Giovanni Altemps, who initiated a series of interventions on the building and its decoration, changing its original appearance, until it reached its present state around 1700. At the time of the sale part of the decoration had already been finished, including the Loggia dell'Aurora and the subject of the present book, the Loggia del Giardino.

The first acquisition of ground was the small casino of Patriarch Fabio Biondo, in 1610. Directly a crucial requirement for a grand garden, an abundant water supply, was taken care of. In the next two years the rest of the property was bought by Scipione, including the 'torrione' of the Zitelle del Refugio, a womens' community, and the monastery of the Eremiti di San Gerolamo. Both of these were financially doted by the cardinal, to urge them to leave their properties. Scipione was obviously in a hurry to see his plans realised. An early plan for the palazzo included remains of the Baths of Constantine, and consisted of an enormous courtyard. It was never realised, and the cardinal - avid collector of Roman statues - decided to have the antique ruins demolished by 1613. By then, construction was well under way, as workmen were hired already in 1611. Immediately the decoration was taken in hand: the Loggia di Psiche was painted by Lodovico Cigoli, the Loggia delle Muse was frescoed by Agostino Tassi, and Guido Reni executed his famous Aurora. The Casino Biondo was simply included in the newly constructed palazzo, and its loggia also painted by Reni, in 1612. The inaccessibility of the space prohibited reception of this work in the history of art; nor do archival sources shed much light on the project, because of the enormous amount of work being done in such a brief period. Only the sales report, drawn up in 1616, gives an idea of the high estimation of the gardens and buildings, without, however, answering any questions regarding chronology or attribution.

Angela Negro focusses on the material aspects of the frescoes to solve these questions. The Loggia del Giardino has a decorated ceiling, in the form of a pergola: a wooden structure covered with vine. Openings are occupied by animals, mostly

¹ See G. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, vol. VI, Venezia 1840, pp. 220-1; DBI 12, Roma 1970, pp. 620-4; and V. Reinhard, *Kardinal Scipione Borghese (1605-1633): Vermögen, Finanzen und sozialer Aufstieg eines Papstnipoten*, Tübingen 1984.

birds: an eagle, an owl, a peacock, the extinct 'corvus sylvaticus', but also a cat, and monkeys. In the pendentives, pairs of putti are depicted in various positions, holding animals on a string, playing or fighting. The lunettes on the back and side walls have been decorated with landscapes. The front originally consisted of an open loggia, closed probably in 1704 when the palace was sold to the Rospigliosi family. On these newly constructed lunettes landscapes were painted to fit the rest. The original lunettes were executed by Paul Bril, who is mentioned several times in the documents. According to the accounts, scaffolding was built in June 1611, and Bril was paid for work done in the loggia by the end of that month. Payments continued until July 1612, made only to Bril. This leaves open the question of who worked in his shop, and who was responsible for the design of the ceiling. Howard Hibbard² ascribed the design to Tassi, and its execution to Bril and Reni. Guido's collaboration has no documentary evidence, and few contemporary descriptions mention his work in the loggia. Mancini praised Bril, as did Giovanni Baglione, for taking up Italian influences; Reni was credited by neither. First mention of Reni's putti was made by Scanelli in 1657; at the same time they were engraved, with reference to Reni as inventor. The question thus remains, why Reni was excluded from the accounts. Negro argues that payments made to Reni as official painter to the pope explain the exclusion of his name from the sources on the Loggia. In just this period, he was employed on other projects for the Borghese. Negro also proposes Bril as the designer of the Loggia del Giardino. He had experience in the genre collaborating with his brother Matthijs in the late 1570's in the Loggia of Gregorio XIII. She mentions Carel Van Mander, who informs us that Bril's father was a painter of fruit-still-lives and grottesques, to make the sons' role as designer plausible. But a part of the pergola and three stylistically deviating landscape-lunettes were not executed by him. Traditionally ascribed to either Bril or Tassi, Negro attributes these on stylistic grounds to Pietro Paolo Bonzi, called Gobbo dei Carracci. Her argument is supported by Baglione, who mentions Bonzi's activities as landscape and stilllife painter. The workshop of the Loggia del Giardino was thus headed by Bril, assisted by Bonzi, with Reni executing the putti.

The exact range of their tasks has been examined by Negro during restoration, and the chronology of painting reveals some interesting details. First of all, Bril and Reni made a proof, consisting of one pendentive with a pair of putti and two adjoining parts of the pergola. Obviously this was meant to give an idea of the effect of the total decoration, to be judged by the patron. Scipione did not save expenses by hiring the most famous painters of that time, and wanted to be sure of the effect. From then on, the ceiling was painted by Bril and Bonzi. Negro assumes that Reni did not work with them contemporaneously. In fact, overlaps between the *giornate* reveal that the putti were painted afterwards, when the rest was finished. The landscapes were painted independently.

² See H. Hibbard, 'Scipione Borghese's Garden Palace on the Quirinal' in: *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 23, 1964, pp. 163-92; and J. Hess, *Agostino Tassi. Der Lehrer des Claude Lorraine*, München 1935, p. 17.

In the final chapter, Negro starts her iconographical interpretation by describing all the species of animals, birds and flowers. The meaning of these is traced through the popular work on allegory by Andrea Alciati, and are seen as referring to neoplatonic love. Two details in particular point at this connection: the monkeys, restrained by putti by means of leads, and the putti contending for a dove. The struggle between celestial and profane love also pervades the bird-scenes; according to Alciati all these have negative meanings, and need to be restrained by the positive force of celestial love. Also the flowers underline this opposition. The theme of love was treated abundantly in Equicola's *Libro di Natura e d'Amore*, which appeared in 1525, and, citing Panofsky, had a widespread reception in the sixteenth century through Vincenzo Cartari's *Immagini degli Dei*. The central idea of the ceiling, according to Negro, is that Scipione Borghese is here depicted in the guise of the eagle, as the dominating force constraining earthly desires. In her view, this coincides with the image that he had constructed of himself in the official parts of the garden, as in the Casino dell'Aurora, where the symbolic image of the sun referred to the patron. Poems comparing Scipione with Apollo, and connections of the location itself with the cult of Apollo through the Temple of Serapis (then considered to be the Temple of Apollo) seem to support her interpretation. According to Negro the popularity of the book by Equicola guarantees the reception of these ideas even in the circle of Scipione Borghese, more praised for his good taste than his prolific learning.

Negro's discussion starts with the visible aspects of the fresco, and connects these to a specific treatise on the basis of its influence on Alciati's *Emblemata* and the popularity of these themes in painting. She ignores however three important issues connected with the main question: the patron, the cultural *ambiente* and the spatial setting. These can shed another light on the iconography, and lead to another conclusion.

Regarding the first, the image of Scipione Borghese as 'a princely patron', a hedonist, has been unquestionably accepted by Negro. But material exists, from which emerges a cardinal, described as a cultured and diplomatic man³, who profited from education in philosophy at the Collegio Romano and law at the university of Perugia⁴. He had a large private library⁵. Housed in the Villa Borghese - and thus possibly located in the Palazzo on the Quirinal Hill before 1615 - it contained a large number of books and manuscripts⁶. Its inventory indicates that Scipione in fact owned books on love, for example *Gli Asolani* by Pietro Bembo, *Institutione morale* by Piccolomini, and works by Aristotle, Plato, Augustine, Petrarca and Tasso on related subjects⁷. Secondly, there existed a lively discussion on the morality and philosophy of

³ See Ludwig von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, Bd. 12, Freiburg i.B. 1927, pp. 42-8.

⁴ See DBI 12, Roma 1970, pp. 620-4. The authority of Scipione in questions of Grace shows his learning, but Paul V gave scarce opportunities to Scipione to employ his knowledge.

⁵ See V. von Flemming, *Arma Armoris. Sprachbild und Bildsprache der Liebe*, Mainz 1996, p. 179 f.

⁶ See V. von Flemming, "'ozio con dignità'? Die Villenbibliothek von Kardinal Scipione Borghese" in: *Römische Quartalschrift* 85, 1990, pp. 182-224, especially p.187, where the presence of books on moral philosophy is noted. There exists an inventory of printed books in the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Borgh. Ms. 382, and of manuscripts, Cod. Borgh. Ms. 379. See A. Maier, *Codicis Burghesiani Bibliotheca Vaticana*, Città del Vaticano 1952, p. 430.

⁷ See Cod. Borgh. Ms. 382 (wie Anm. 6).

love in the late Quattrocento and early Seicento. On the subject more than 80 books were published in the Cinquecento alone, with many diverging interpretations⁸. Around 1600, this discussion had not - as is commonly supposed with Panofsky in mind - arrived at a neoplatonic model. Rather, multiple interpretations were possible at this time, comprising one accepting love as a natural passion⁹. In the context of this fresco and its patron, it also should be noted that the discussion had acquired importance within the church from the Council of Trent onwards. Here it was connected to questions around Grace provided by the sacrament of marriage. Instead of refuting love as a negative passion destructing human morals, it was accepted as central force within marital sacrament. This underlined the importance of ecclesiastical law in solving problems between husbands and wives. The inventory of Scipione's library also shows, that the major part contained books on legal subjects, and more specifically, church law. With his legal education on the one hand, and philosophy on the other, Scipione Borghese undoubtedly was well informed about the discussion in ecclesiastical, and literary circles on love and marriage. Considering his important position at this time as *penitenziere maggiore*¹¹, as well as being a patron of writers, he will even have played a role in it.

Thirdly, the concept of space and its use are lacking in Negro's interpretation. Although the building-history is traced in the first chapter, the latter part of the book does not return to the spatial context of the Casino Biondo. Even though there are few indications as to how this part of the palazzo functioned, it can be argued that it was used as *studiolo*. According to the estimates of the palace made before the sale to Altemps, part of the collection, comprising small antique sculptures, was displayed in the Casino Biondo and probably in the gardens as well¹². The combination of library, antique-collection, loggia and *giardino segreto* was traditional in the concept of *studiolo*¹³. This part of the palace was dedicated to study and reflection, and access was only open to a limited circle of *letterati*. The location of the Loggia del Giardino suggests the choice of a more intricate iconography, aimed at this more learned society. The proof that was made by Bril and Reni moreover shows that the project had a special meaning for Scipione, as he wanted to judge on the effect before completion. Role and position of the patron were presented less obviously, compared to the other loggia's in the Giardino, where official iconography of a well-known type was applied. Instead of looking for direct self-representation, references to Scipione were secondary, in the eagle which does not occupy the centre of the decoration but rather stays aside.

⁸ See G. Zonta (ed.), *Trattati d'amore del Cinquecento*, Bari 1912; and P. Lorenzetti, *La bellezza e l'amore nei trattati del Cinquecento*, Pisa 1922, pp. 81-4.

⁹ See Flemming (wie Anm. 5), p. 163.

¹⁰ For the discussion on marital sacrament see *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, vol. VI, Paris 1957, p. 752-3; *Ehe und Sakrament in der Kirche des Herrn*, H. Jedin u. K. Reinhardt (eds.), Berlin 1971, und H. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, vol. IV/2, Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1975, pp. 96-121.

¹¹ For the position of *penitenziere maggiore*, see G. Moroni (wie Anm. 1), vol. LII, Venezia 1851, pp. 61-69; LThK2, vol.8, p. 610; and *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*, vol. VI, Paris 1957 p. 1328.

¹² See K. Kalveram, *Die Antikensammlung des Kardinals Scipione Borghese*, Worms 1995, p. 46.

¹³ See Wolfgang Liebenwein, *Studiolo. Die Entstehung eines Raumtyps und seine Entwicklung bis um 1600*, Berlin 1977, p. 66, 112, 114 ff.

The frescoes in the Loggia del Giardino can thus be interpreted in quite another way. The couples of birds point at the value of love as a central emotion in marriage, and the fighting putti then stand not for earthly love being thrown down by heavenly love, but the struggle to focus passion within the sacrament of marriage. The playing putti represent the marriage in which this struggle has reached a happy conclusion, whereas others do not get there, and apply for help from the side of the church - and thus the church law. The flowers, interpreted by Negro as vices and virtues connected with earthly and heavenly love, point at the positive and negative ways in which the passion of love could be directed. If we accept the depiction of Scipione in the guise of the eagle, also his position slightly off-centre becomes clear. The eagle is not the constraining force of all earthly desires, but rather representative of ecclesiastical law. In this sense, he forms part of society and nature, and only acts as *primus inter pares* in ecclesiastical and legal questions on marriage. Help of the church can be used in attaining heavenly harmony within human relations. In this light even the landscapes - not considered iconographically by Negro - contain a meaning. Apart from the discussion on the interpretation of painted landscape, the fact that they form part of the decoration, conceived at the same time, calls for attention¹⁴. The inclusion of landscape is traditional in the context of studioli, as it is in loggia's, referring in many cases to the seasons¹⁵. But in the Loggia del Giardino, the depiction of nature points at the celestial harmony visible in the creation of God. This harmony should also reign within marriage, and this can be attained by abiding to the sacrament of marriage given by the church. The eagle thus does not reign, but control; as did Scipione Borghese as *penitenziere maggiore*.

In the new reading proposed here, some arguments of Negro's interpretation have been excluded. Elements as the monkeys with birds on a string, and the couple of fighting putti are traditionally connected with neoplatonism. It may have been possible, and even was meant, to give multiple interpretations of love. As the theme had been reflected upon in various ways in treatises, it was depicted here on different levels. Again, in this can be connected to Scipione Borghese as *penitenziere maggiore*, deciding upon varieties of love in relationships, as described in philosophical works. Negro's book has shown how much worth the patron lay on its execution, and how the painters solved the problem of adapting the idea to the reality. That it simply depicted a one-level iconography however, presenting Scipione as ruler of the universe, would be underestimating the patron, and the frescoes themselves too.

ARNOLD WITTE
 Culturele Studies
 Universiteit van Amsterdam

¹⁴ The author is writing a dissertation on the iconography of painted landscape in Rome around 1600.

¹⁵ For example Armenini in his *De' veri precetti della pittura*, Venezia 1678 remarks on the appropriateness of landscapes in studioli.