

mitgeführt wurde⁸. Und mit WENDY STEDMAN SHEARD hätte man nicht nur auf die Bedeutung der *Imagines* der beiden Philostrat verweisen können, in denen sich ein Bild des verwundeten Philoctetes fand⁹. In der *editio princeps* dieses Werkes, 1503 bei Aldus Manutius in Venedig, wurden zudem die Statuenbeschreibungen des Kallistratos abgedruckt. Vor allem die Ekphrasis einer Medea nach dem Kindermord benennt künstlerische Kriterien, wie sie auch für die jetzt Mosca zugeschriebenen Reliefs mit ihren ähnlichen Seelenkonflikten und Leidenschaften zutreffen.

Resümierend ließe sich eine Abschlußfloskel des frühen 16. Jahrhundert zum paragonalen Vorrang der Skulptur – „Aus diesen Erläuterungen mögt ihr das große *ingenium* der Bildhauerkunst erkennen“¹⁰ – abwandeln: Aus diesen Erläuterungen mag man das *ingenium* der besprochenen Autoren erkennen.

ULRICH PFISTERER

Kunstgeschichtliches Seminar
Universität Hamburg

- 8 PLUTARCH: Leben des Antonius 86, 3; vgl. CASSIUS DIO: Römische Geschichte 51, 21; dazu LEONARD BARKAN: The Beholder's Tale: Ancient Sculpture, Renaissance Narrative, in: *Representations* 44, 1993, S. 133-166, v.a. S. 154 f.; SILVIA URBINI: Il mito di Cleopatra. Motivi ed esiti della sua rinnovata fortuna fra Rinascimento e Barocco, in: *Xenia antiqua* 2, 1993, 181-222.
- 9 WENDY STEDMAN SHEARD: Antonio Lombardo's Reliefs for Alfonso d'Este's *Studio di Marmi*: Their Significance and Impact on Titian, in: *Titian 500*; hrsg. von JOSEPH MANCA; Washington 1993, S. 315-357; vgl. für Philoctetes auch die *Anthologia Graeca*, XVI, 111-113.
- 10 AMBROGIO LEONE: De Nobilitate Rerum Dialogus; Venedig 1525, cap. xli: „per haec explicatum magnum ingenium sculptoris artis accipiatis (...)“; dazu CLIFFORD M. BROWN / SALLY HICKSON: Caradosso Foppa (ca. 1452-1526/27), in: *Arte Lombarda* 119, 1997, S. 9-39.

Marcia B. Hall: After Raphael. Painting in Central Italy in the Sixteenth Century; Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press 1999; 349 S., 188 Abb. und 32 Farbtafeln; ISBN 0-521-48245-3; £ 45.-

„The innovations in Central Italian Painting through the century's course were many and significant and they resulted in a diversity of styles, but all are marked by their descent from the ideal created in its first two decades“¹. FREEDBERG stated already in 1970 the chronological axiom that Hall took as the lead for her recent book on sixteenth-century painting. In the art of High Renaissance painters Freedberg recognised a striving for equilibrium and harmony, that redirected artistic energy towards an expression of the cultural ideal in visible form. He maintained that, when this equilibrium was disturbed, the classical ideal in time led to counter-reactions such as Mannerism. The concept of organic growth of the High Renaissance-style did unavoidably include its inevitable decline.

Marcia B. Hall, with the eclectic view of the late twentieth century in mind, argues in her book for an altogether different structure underlying the sixteenth century. Instead

1 SIDNEY J. FREEDBERG: *Painting in Italy. 1500-1600 (Pelican History of Art)*; Harmondsworth 1970, p.1.

of finding the central issue in classical style and its presumed opponents, she accepts that various artists had a wide range of interests. Following Vasari's description of the period, Marcia B. Hall does not observe a break after 1520, but a continuous development. Instead of identifying this as a stylistic concept, she lifts continuity to a more conceptual level. Classical culture still provided the basis for this adaptation: like rhetoric, painting also required a style suited to the occasion and the subject in which it functioned. Thus, Raphael did not develop one 'individual' style during his Roman years which can be labelled High Renaissance, but opted for different solutions when working for different patrons. In the first chapter, the author thus describes the differences in concept and style between the decorations of the Vatican Loggia, the Villa Farnesina, the Sistine Tapestries and the Sala di Costantino. The decisions made by the patrons (Julius II, Agostino Chigi, Leo X and Clement VII) in each case required a different form.

Painters in the High Renaissance selected from the antique those examples that served them best in any given situation. This could either be inspired by reliefs like Trajan's column or antique sarcophagi, sculpture in the round, or by antique paintings from the „grotte“ which had just then been discovered. Raphael defined this method of working for the rest of the century, and his leadership of a large workshop provided him the means to explore these possibilities. Painters like Perino del Vaga, Giovanni da Udine, Giulio Romano and others all were experts on a different field, and executed parts of a given commission. When Raphael died in 1520, his workshop was split up, except for Giulio Romano and some other participants, who on the request of Clement VII finished the Sala di Costantino. Other painters, like Perino, had by then moved to other Italian courts. When in 1527 Rome was sacked, the dispersion of this conceptual interpretation of classical art had already begun. The „eclectic“ use of antique visual sources became the lead for painters until the 1560's.

At the same time, the range of examples was widened by the evolving market of prints. Especially Florentine artists came under the influence of northern examples through this new medium. It is assumed, that thematic correspondence was the reason for this favourable reception of northern art. Contrary to Rome, where classical subjects were commonly found in private houses, in Florence patrons seem to have preferred religious themes in their private dwellings. Roman patrons were, according to Hall, far less conservative than their Florentine colleagues; the exodus of progressive Florentine painters to Rome, where most of them were employed by patrons of Florentine origin, is another explanation for this situation. The dispersal of Raphael's workshop altered this. After 1522, classical culture in its Roman guise became introduced in Florence by Perino del Vaga, but tradition seems to have been strong. The only painter influenced by this new option was Rosso Fiorentino, who decided to leave for Rome almost immediately, and afterwards left for France. There, another option for decoration was developed: innovative combinations of painting and stucco, almost in the round. This style would become important in central Italy after Primaticcio's return to Rome as supplier of antique statues for the French king. By then, the 'Roman' style had been exported by Giulio Romano to Mantua, by Parmigianino to Parma and Bologna, and by Perino del Vaga to Genoa. And finally, prints offered

a new means of artistic dispersion, which freed the exchange of ideas from the boundaries of time and place. By each of these artists an aspect of Raphael's work was taken as the lead to develop decorative schemes. In all of these, the combination of various materials, real or feigned, enlivened or even negated the surface of the wall through painterly illusionism.

In the meantime, the Sack had not disrupted the Roman tradition of the High Renaissance. Marcia B. Hall interprets the pontificate of Paul III Farnese as a revival of the art of first decades of the sixteenth century. Clement's commission to Michelangelo for the Last Judgement in the Sistine Chapel, and this artist's influence on the Roman scene, even during his absence in Florence, through his pupil Sebastiano del Piombo, are signs of this continuity. The preference of the Medici-pope for Sebastiano secured him, even when the severe style of Michelangelo gave way to the more gracious one of Raphael, a regular amount of commissions. The accession of Paul III Farnese to Peter's throne in 1534 did not change this situation. A new direction only occurred when Florentine artists came to Rome, and decorated the Oratory of San Giovanni Decollato. The fresco of the „Preaching of the Baptist“, executed by Jacopino del Conte according to a design by Perino del Vaga, marked a new stylistic concept of grace, with decorative additions and visual citations; in short, mannerist tendencies. Vasari took over this new direction in his Sala dei Cento Giorni, where the subtle illusionism of Raphael's Sala di Costantino was deliberately ignored, and its unifying scheme was substituted for a fragmented decorative system. This not only occurs on the compositional level, but concurrently also with regard to contents. No longer a division was made between allegorical, symbolic and historical levels; their boundaries had become floating. In the decoration of the salone of Palazzo Ricci-Sacchetti by Salviati, this was used to create an ironic interplay of the different levels; and in the decoration of the Sala dei Fasti Farnesiani in the Palazzo Farnese, the painter merged the genres of history and allegory by means of witty compositional devices. Rhetorical principles became ever more overtly visualised, but at the same time were becoming blurred by intellectual devices.

In 1555 the Counter-Reformation channelled this sea of opportunities into a narrow road. Counter-maniera was the answer of the painters to this demand, but even in this period, certain traditions prevailed. The post-Tridentine style had its roots – according to Hall – in the 1510's in the circle of Vittoria Colonna and (again) Michelangelo. His decoration of the Cappella Paolina in the Vatican was the first answer in the new situation. Other artists continued to work in a late mannerist style, until Paul IV rigorously constrained this tendency, at least in the case of religious painting. Other painters took up Michelangesque examples: Taddeo Zuccari followed Sebastiano del Piombo in his concentration on the subject, but he also looked toward the relief-like style of Polidoro da Caravaggio for its narrative clarity.

Even the decoration of private palaces became affected by these new demands of the post-Tridentine era, as can be seen in the Palazzo Farnese in Caprarola. The subject of its frescoed decoration, begun in the 1561 by Taddeo Zuccari, changed from mythological to biblical during the pontificate of Pius V. This happened, according to

Marcia B. Hall, in response to the scrutiny of other cardinals and papal authorities. Extreme positions, such as taken by Carlo Borromeo, in which every aesthetic motif for art was rejected, remained without much influence on the development of painting. The Jesuit position of using art for the education of laity and priests, found a much more fertile soil in the counter-reformation and thus influenced the direction of art in the decades up to 1600.

Florence however did not follow the lead being set out at that time in Rome. Due to political changes – the creation of the Duchy of Tuscany in 1531 and the elevation of Cosimo to Grand Duke in 1569 – and the central position of one artist in that constellation, Giorgio Vasari, the Florentine art-scene was during little inclined the middle years of the century to follow the changes occurring in the Papal city. After an initial introduction of the relief-like style in Florence in the 1530s, as fitting to this new form of government, the Florentine mannerists seemed to act rather independently from the roman developments. Reason for this seems to have been the impact of Michelangelo's genius on his near contemporaries, but after his death younger artists left his example behind. The Studiolo of Francesco I in Palazzo Vecchio does not indicate an uncritical reverence for his genius. When the Council of Trent concluded, the Medici were the first secular rulers to take over the recommendations. This was done primarily for political reasons – through this act of orthodoxy Francesco I de' Medici showed their loyalty to the pope, whose approbation was needed for the title of Grand Duke. The Florentine painters were thus required to acknowledge the counter-Reformation style immediately, and so Roman influence was forced upon them. Most clearly this can be seen in the commission to Federico Zuccari for the fresco of the cupola of the Cathedral. Zuccari was called in when Vasari, who had started the project in 1574, died after two years of work. The subject of the fresco, the Last Judgment, must have called to mind to all spectators Michelangelo's example in the Sistine Chapel. The reception of the Florentine work was hardly positive; only the Florentine painters who had studied in Rome could appreciate the result. In secular commissions, however, Duke Francesco chose for traditional Florentine late mannerism, as can be seen in the Villa Medici in Poggio a Caiano. Raphael's lesson of style and rhetoric had been learnt at last in Florence, almost half a century after he left for Rome, but its application served far more overt political goals.

The book concludes with the coming of the Baroque age in papal Rome, where a renewed reversion to Raphael's example can be seen. This time, its reason laid in more practical demands. While Rome was prepared in great haste for the Jubilee of 1575, the papacy of Sixtus V left little room to painters to develop individual styles. Great workshops were supervised by Giovanni Guerra and Cesare Nebbia, to finish decorative projects in time. The three principal objects, the Scala Santa, the Lateran Palace and the Salone Sistino of the Vatican Library all show different styles of decoration and narrative composition. The times of Julius and Raphael, where according to rhetoric each object required appropriate decoration, was revived in these enormous undertakings. But where in the former period a sensory impact on the beholder was the goal, the latter culture was focused on spiritual impact. Correggio was

one of the examples that provided these painters the means to develop a new style, the Baroque. In Florence, Lodovico Cigoli was inspired by the Parmesan painter, as was Federico Barocci in Rome. When Annibale Carracci painted the Galleria Farnese, he again took the Sala di Costantino as point of departure, but now ended up with something altogether different from his predecessors. Intellectual rhetoric of the Raphael-workshop was transformed into a vivid emotional impression.

The central thought expressed in this book is the origin of all sixteenth-century styles in the two major painters, Raphael and Michelangelo, transformed and adapted by successive artists under the influence of changing circumstances of patronage. Marcia B. Hall intersperses this primary stylistic line of her book with many other subsidiary arguments, consisting of remarks on colour, the workshop practice and the emerging printing-business. The structure of the text suffers through the amount of information offered to the reader. It seems however, that the author did not want to offer a clear line of reasoning. Under the heading 'The view of the late twentieth century' she argues that stylistic development in the Cinquecento was not linear, but directed by diverging interests of patrons and painters. Post-modern culture allows the idea that more than one style was functional to the painters of that century. Crucial to this period was not, as some earlier writers stated, the imitation of the antique visual arts, but its culture in general, which included the rhetoric and politics. Marcia B. Hall in this book tried to do justice to all these aspects, and their constantly changing influence on the visual arts.

The consequence of this choice is that many subsidiary lines are being followed at length, with little stress on their importance for the central argument. Geographical boundaries of this study, as signalled in the title, are often exceeded, when the work of Primaticcio and Rosso in Fontainebleau, that of Giulio Romano in Mantua, Parmigianino in Bologna and Parma, and the decorations of Perino in Genua are being discussed extensively. This material was included for its impact on the development of painting in Rome and Florence, but a more concise discussion of these objects would help to keep track of the general line of the argument. In some cases, straightforward superfluous information is offered, in the case of Flemish painters in Rome at mid-century, or the sojourn of El Greco there in the 1570's. In both instances even Marcia B. Hall must conclude that there is no trace of mutual influence between the Roman scene and these foreigners. And the argument of style and civilisation fades almost completely when iconography is discussed at length. The relation between iconography and style – setting aside a general remark on decorum – is nowhere questioned intensively.

Moreover, the explanation of stylistic choices as determined by patrons alternates throughout the book with traditional explanations of style as independent painterly concept, developed by means of artistic exchange. The necessity for this alternation lies in the difficulty to construct a line of development on account of the patrons, who all had their different motifs. The author's decision to investigate the conditions in Fontainebleau, Genua and Mantua deviates even more from the central focus, for the political and cultural circumstances diverge widely from those in Rome

and Florence. A single reference to the Roman emperor and his influence on all these courts is, considering the announced centrality of this kind of argument, not enough to be convincing. It becomes openly blurred, when Marcia B. Hall compares two patrons as in the case of late-sixteenth century popes: „The pattern of patronage defined by Sixtus was carried forward by Pope Clement VIII [...]“ (p. 257). It remains unclear what kind of definition is referred to in this context, or for that matter, in general. And the patron seems to dissolve into thin air, when she states in relation to his religious works „that like Rosso, Giulio Romano did not experience religious emotion deeply. His inclination is to turn it into theater“ (p. 71). After a chapter on the patron prescribing much of the contents and style of works of art in great detail, one wonders why Giulio Romano was exempt from this rule.

In the denomination of the chapters, this lack of an overall structure is most clearly reflected. Where the first chapter discusses the High Renaissance, in particular Raphael and his workshop, and thus has a stylistic focus, the second treats the decade of the 1520's – and thus argues along chronological lines. The third chapter shifts focus again, to the diaspora of the Roman style, i.e. style and geography. Chapters four, five and six go into the Roman restoration after the Sack, the Counter-reformation and the Florentine revival in the 1560's; in short, circumstantial influences on artistic style. The concluding chapter takes a chronological focus within a limited area: the last decade of the sixteenth century in Rome. Its accumulation of detail, with the inclusion of many secondary lines, excludes this book as introduction to the sixteenth century for the average student. On the other hand, the outset of an extensive discussion of all important works and artists in the Cinquecento obscures the scientific argument of the interrelation between stylistic, chronological and cultural developments. This book thus neither replaces a book like Freedberg's *Painting in Italy*, nor the classic study of SHEARMAN on the cultural background of Mannerism². Admittedly, it contains many interesting thoughts – of which the influence of Raphael's decorative concept of the Sala di Costantino on Salviati, Romano, Carracci and others is by far the most interesting – and suggestions. However, stricter editing would have made the book accessible to a far larger audience.

ARNOLD WITTE

Vakgroep Culturele Studies
Universiteit van Amsterdam

2 JOHN SHEARMAN: *Mannerism*; Harmondsworth 1977 (first edition).