steten mitsamt Postament und Basis je 40 Dukaten. Wahrscheinlich war Baratta der Autor der Serie; von ihm stammen jedenfalls die beiden Stücke, die sich bisher identifizieren lassen, „Pace" im Sommergarten" (*Abb. 3b*) und „Guerra" in Zarskoe Selo". Dagegen kosteten die im Jahre 1722 nach St. Petersburg überführten zwölf Büsten römischer Kaiser pro Stück nur 7 Dukaten, da sie nicht aus Marmor, sondern aus „acqua impietrita" gefertigt waren (vier Büsten davon stehen in der Ermitage).

Ragusinski und seine Auftraggeber mögen bedauert haben, daß für kleinformatige Kabinettstücke aus Marmor und Bronze abweichende Preismaßstäbe galten. Als Beispiel sei die 72 cm hohe Marmorgruppe „Kampf der Lapithen und Kentauren" genannt, die Ragusinski 1722 nach St. Petersburg schickte, wo sie in der Ermitage erhalten ist (*Abb. 1*; Androssov 1981, S. 51). Wie ich feststellen konnte, ist sie das Werk des seinerzeit sehr renommierten Francesco Bertos. Nach Ragusinskis Liste kostete die vierfigurige Gruppe 50 Dukaten, also mehr als eine Statue von einem Meter Höhe.

Sergey O. Androssov

ASPECTS OF DOMENICO TIEPOLO'S EARLY CAREER

(with six illustrations)

Giovanni Domenico Tiepolo (1727-1804) became an artist in the 1740s, one of the most fruitful periods in his father's career. His artistic formation was surely accelerated because of the pressure of work in the studio, and the presence of other students of Tiepolo, while this busy atmosphere must also have influenced his attempts at etching – an independent, self-contained activity. Owing to the relative lack of documentary evidence for the period, scholars have different opinions on the precise chronology of the work which engaged Giambattista in these years, the type of training Domenico would have received, his experiments with etching in relation to his father's, and the extent of his collaboration with Giambattista as an apprentice, questions I intend to look at briefly here. (Compare for instance the accounts of Domenico's formation given in Byam Shaw 1962 ch. II and IV; Mariuz ch. I; Knox ch. IV and V, and Levey 1986 ch. 6; for disputes on the dating of the early etchings see Succi 1988 pp. 24-30.)

Between 1743 and 1749, Domenico grew up: he moved from making drawings after paintings for Francesco Algarotti to publishing his etchings of the *Via Crucis* (R. 39-54), based on his first wholly independent works of 1747-48. Giambattista must have encouraged Domenico to work for Algarotti for much the same reasons as he had, early in his own career, made drawings after 16th-century Venetian paintings for the engraver – the importance of studying the great Venetian masters, making a reputation, and earning some money. Furthermore, making copies of paintings was traditionally an important element in any artist's training. But it seems to have been Domenico's own choice to

begin publishing etchings after his father's work around 1744: Giambattista had little need of publicity then. The move from copying pictures on a smaller scale in tightly-worked drawings to reproducing paintings as etchings for the collector was surely a crucial one in Domenico's development. Finally, the publication of his etchings after his own paintings in 1749 was a proud announcement of his full status as his father's equal: this perception of himself was based on his growth to maturity as an artist from mid1743-47. Before looking at Domenico's formation, however, the sequence of the major work occupying Giambattista in that period must be recalled, with the reminder that, *contra* Knox (Introduction and ch. III), the decoration of the Palazzo Labia (P. 187) could not date from 1744 but must have taken place towards the end of this period, in 1746-47. Thus, Tiepolo painted in fresco the Cappella Sagredo (P. 149), and the ceilings at the Palazzo Pisani Moretta and Villa Cordellina (P. 143, 147) in spring and summer 1743, with numerous commissions for Algarotti following in late 1743-44 (P. 146, 153, 154, 155 and more); amongst other commitments in 1744 were the completion of the Villa Cordellina decoration and the preparation for the enormous Scalzi ceiling (P. 151A-C) in consultation with the quadraturist Gerolamo Mengozzi Colonna. Important engagements in 1744-45 included the decoration of two rooms, one with fresco, at the Palazzo Barbarigo (P. 160), the completion of three altarpieces for SS. Massimo e Osvaldo at Padua (P. 163-65), and the painting of the large *Martyrdom of St. John* (P. 150) for the Duomo at Bergamo. Tiepolo painted the Scalzi ceiling in April-September 1745. The Palazzo Labia decoration could not have been begun until the following spring. Two major Venetian commissions, the Gesuati altarpiece (P. 130) and the central canvas for the ceiling of the Scuola dei Carmine (P. 144), had to be postponed until 1748 as a result of this pressure of work (Levey 1986 pp. 151-60; Pignatti p. 79).

Francesco Algarotti met Tiepolo soon after his arrival in Venice in May 1743; his growing friendship with the family and his encouragement of the young Domenico is reflected in his commissioning of drawn copies of 16th-century Venetian paintings from him in the summer of 1743, although he did not have total confidence in Domenico's juvenile efforts (Levey 1963 p. 128). On 9 January 1744 he wrote enthusiastically of his admiration and respect for Tiepolo, and spoke warmly of Domenico's prospects (but there is no suggestion that he had proved himself yet): the son showed every sign of following in his father's footsteps, and if his progress proved equal to his willingness to learn then this would greatly encourage his affectionate father (Posse p. 64). Clearly Domenico was at an early stage of his training. He was certainly copying his father's drawings as part of this process: thus a vigorous red chalk drawing by Giambattista in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, (Knox M662) for the foreshortened head of a soldier at the left of the *Continence of Scipio* fresco of early 1744 at the Villa Cordellina was carefully copied in a drawing formerly in the Wendland Collection (Knox M663), apparently by Domenico, around the time of Algarotti's letter.

Finished pen and wash drawings by the master were also studied by Domenico – as in his copy in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (Bean and Griswold no. 242) of Tiepolo's *The Angels appearing to Abraham,* now in the Museo Civico Bassano. Copying his father's drawings was one way for Domenico to absorb the highly evolved language Giambattista had developed; making drawings after paintings was another. Etching was a further mode of study, and a means of transforming copies into independent works. Domenico may have been struck by the success of Pietro Monaco's *Raccolta di cinquantacinque storie sacre..,* a collection of engravings after religious works, including drawings and paintings by Giambattista, which appeared in 1743. He would have noted the growing demand for prints after Piazzetta: in 1742, Marco Pitteri had engraved a series of heads of saints while Giovanni Cattini published in 1743 the *Icones ad vivum expressae,* a set of 15 engravings of finished drawings by Piazzetta (Succi 1983 pp. 256-59, 305-11, 130-32 with further references). Apart from professional engravers publicizing the work of well-known artists, there was a strong Venetian tradition of the artiste-graveur. Carlevarijs (1703), Marco Ricci (1730), Canaletto (from c. 1741), and Marieschi (1741) had published etchings of real and imaginary landscape and vedute; Fontebasso, inspired by Tiepolo and Ricci, published eight fanciful compositions in 1744 (Succi 1983 pp. 112-29, 328-43, 94-110, 235-53 with further references). Giambattista's *Vari Capricci* appeared in 1743 (Santifaller 1972, but see Robison 1974 p. 290 for continued questioning of this dating). He was also working on the *Scherzi* in the 1740s, while the impact of his prints on Piranesi's *Grotteschi,* etched in 1747-48, is evident. Domenico surely knew Piranesi, who was in Venice for a brief visit in the spring of 1744, returning for a longer sojourn in 1745-47 (Robison 1986 pp. 9-10). More importantly, Algarotti experimented with etching in February 1744, with Giambattista's help, in what must have been very enjoyable sessions in the studio (Santifaller 1977). Surely Domenico was also learning at the same time: rather than etch fanciful heads and decorative detail with Algarotti he turned to religious subjects, thus avoiding invidious comparisons.

Domenico may have begun with a small etching after a lost finished drawing by Giambattista, a *St. Jerome* (R. 1), which displays all the uncertainties, heavy re-workings and corrections of a beginner (Robison 1974 p. 297 *contra* Rizzi's ascription to Giambattista). A little later he worked from two further pen and wash drawings of his father's, producing similarly small-scale *Flight into Egypt* scenes (R. 65, 66). His first etchings of his father's paintings are the six plates after the grisaille frescoes in the Capella Sagredo at S. Francesco della Vigna of 1743 (R. 115-120): these could be studied in situ, and being monochrome were good examples for the inexperienced etcher to copy. The two roundels came first, with Domenico having some difficulty in responding to the painted surface: his etching technique was not yet appropriate for this purpose. The *S. Gerolamo Emiliani* (R. 55) which would have been Domenico's first independent etching (Robison 1974 p. 297; also Knox 1976 no. 40, but his dating is too early) is similarly experimental in technique, with a variety of kinds of cross-hatching, scribbled lines, dots and dashes.

I would argue that Domenico moved in late 1744-45 to the more demanding task of reproducing the sfumato effects and gorgeous colouring of Tiepolo's oil-paintings. A close look at his etchings after Giambattista's *Tasso* scenes (R. 128, 129, 146) reveals that they are immature, tentative works (as in the undifferentiated treatment of cloud and drapery in *Rinaldo and Armida*, the treatment of Armida's profile which is very close to that of the profiles in the etchings after the Cappella Sagredo roundels, and the fussy, uncertain handling of R. 128 in particular). A comparison with Domenico's superb etchings, documented to late 1757, after the Villa Valmarana frescoes (see G. Marini's discussion in Vicenza 1990 pp. 64-68) confirms their early date. Knox 1978 argued for a revised dating of Tiepolo's eight pictures of scenes from the *Gerusalemme Liberata,* P. 221A-D and 220A-D, to c1742 (followed by Barcham 1992, p. 82, who dated them c1742-45). A decade later, Lorenzo etched two more of the series, P. 221B and 220C (R. 225, 226), perhaps choosing his subjects with his brother's youthful efforts in mind.

Domenico next reproduced four of the shaped canvases at the Scuola dei Carmine of 1740-42: these etchings (R. 99-102) are clearly early works by contrast with his marvellous rendering in 1749 of the later main scene *(Abb. 6)*. A late dating has been proposed for these etchings (Succi 1988, cat. 171-74), amongst others, based on the argument that they do not appear in the Mariette Collection at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and no proofs are known prior to the numbered proofs from the first edition of Domenico's catalogue, therefore they must date from the mid1770s. However, Succi does not dispute a dating in the 1740s for the two *Flight into Egypt* etchings (Succi 1988 cat. 6) mentioned above, despite the fact that the same arguments equally apply. Domenico seems to have had ambiguous feelings about some of his early etchings – for instance, the *St. Peter Regalati* (R. 97, for which Succi 1988 cat. 26 accepts a dating of 1747-48) does not appear in any of the editions of his catalogue – so that other arguments besides the evidence of publication must be used for their dating.

Domenico attempted in his etchings after the Carmine subsidiary scenes to formulate a disciplined graphic language in the handling of contrasting tones and shadows (an attempt already practised on a small scale in his independent image of *St. Vincent Ferrer* R. 114). This regular, controlled language was further developed in the stronger, more assured pair of prints after the ovals for the Palazzo Barbaro, *Tarquin and Lucretia* and *Gifts borne to Juno* (R. 103-4), which could date from c1746, but there are still some uncertainties particularly in the conveying of a range of tones and textures, and in the overlapping of shadowed forms. The etching after the *St. Patrick* altarpiece (R. 106; *Abb. 5a*) displays the same problems (for instance, in the silhouette of the acolyte on the right) although it is vigorous and confident. Domenico was now working on a larger scale, and clearly saw this plate as a watershed. The respectful and affectionate tone of the dedication to Algarotti, and the reference to the latter's advice to Giambattista on the design of the altarpiece, to whom in turn Domenico offers the print, cannot but recall Algarotti's praise and

encouragement of Domenico three years previously. Surely the etching and dedication (later to be dropped) were made around the time of Algarotti's departure from Venice in early 1746, as a testimony of Domenico's gratitude and an example of his progress in etching.

Domenico was a fast learner, and his greater maturity is already visible in his independent etching, *St. Peter Regalati* of 1747-48. Two important reproductive prints made in 1748-50 – those of the Gesuati and the *St. James* altarpieces (R. 125 and 132) – show him as a highly accomplished printmaker, the equal of any professional with his coolly controlled yet distinctive graphic language. The *St. James* (P. 241), which was painted in the winter of 1749 for dispatch to the Spanish embassy in London after display in Venice, may, in Domenico's view, have required a particularly disciplined approach as an accurate record of a magnificent and virtuoso work which would soon be inaccessible. He simultaneously explored a more individual technique in some other reproductive prints, such as the etching after the ceiling of the Palazzo Barbaro (R. 113) – surely etched later than the ovals above – which is very close to Domenico's masterpiece of reproduction of these years, the *Virgin and Child appearing to Simon Stock* (R. 98; *Abb. 6*). Here, the regularity of the *St. James* or Gesuati etchings is electrified so that a deliberate tremulous effect appropriate to the visionary is achieved. Meanwhile, Domenico's etchings of 1748-49 after his own paintings at S. Polo have a very different character: he was not tied to the aim of pure reproduction (although obviously he had a practical purpose in mind) but could graphically re-interpret his own works as he saw fit. The etchings are again experimental in many ways, with some more assured than others.

Transforming his copies of drawings and then paintings into etchings would also have set Domenico apart from other copyists, emphasizing his special affinity with the master and in a sense establishing his role as Tiepolo's successor. When Domenico took up etching in early 1744, a fellow copyist and student of Tiepolo was Francesco Lorenzi (1723-87). Zannandreis records that Lorenzi, after a broad humanist education in his native Verona, turned to painting and spent three years with Matteo Brida before moving to Venice to study under Tiepolo. He remained there until 1750, copying Titian, Veronese, Solimena and above all Tiepolo, while he also worked on life drawing under Piazzetta (Mongan). Towards the end of this period he began to exhibit paintings and gained some commissions. Although Zannandreis does not specify when Lorenzi joined the Tiepolo studio, he clearly had a long sojourn in Venice, probably from the early 1740s. His signed copy in the Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg, no. 7933, (Knox 1970 fig. 4, in pen and wash over black chalk, not in red chalk as stated there) of Tiepolo's finished drawing, *The Madonna and Child with Sts. Sebastian and Peter of Alcantara* now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (Bean and Griswold no. 189), may date from the start of this period. So too must a full-sized copy in the Art Institute, Chicago, with some variations, of the second oil-sketch (P. 121b. 1) for the central scene of the *Institution of the Rosary* in the church of the Gesuati, a

substantial canvas which must have been available in the workshop for study (Knox 1970 no. 29; Barcham 1989 pp. 124-25). A group of pen and ink drawings in the Castelvecchio Museum, Verona, shows Lorenzi copying details of figures and parts of compositions, including the Camerino altarpiece (P. 129) and the Palazzo Labia ceiling. An unpublished sketchbook by Lorenzi in the Cleveland Museum of Art (John L. Severance Fund, 52.223) includes copies and derivations from Tiepolo, and I believe it dates from the mid-1740s. The drawings are in black or red chalk with white, on blue or buff paper, the pages approx. 317 : 228mm. The folios are numbered 1-51 in ink, and a long inscription by Lorenzi on p. 1 dated 1760 describes the kind of style he had evolved by then. Lorenzi continued to copy Tiepolo long after his apprenticeship, for amongst the drawings at Castelvecchio are copies of figures from the Villa Valmarana (Vicenza 1990 pp. 60-64).

Franz Martin Kuen (1719-71) joined the studio a little later, keenly studying Tiepolo paintings and drawings from 1746-mid 1747, and the recent catalogue by Mathias Kunze devoted to Kuen's relations with Tiepolo is an invaluable contribution to Tiepolo studies. The range of his copies shows that, like Lorenzi, Kuen not only drew from great public works – making quick notations and careful figure studies – but also copied oil-sketches and finished drawings. Occasionally he and Lorenzi drew from the same original; so close were their interests that Kuen often resembles Lorenzi in his style of pen and ink drawing. For instance, Kunze A23 and Lorenzi's drawing in the Castelvecchio Museum, Verona (Inv. 12618/78) are very similar pen, ink and wash copies of a wreathed hero figure in the clouds with a flag, lion and club: a warrior with the attributes of Hercules. The lost prototype possibly derived from the small ceiling sketch in Cleveland (P. 271) or the ex-Palazzo Barbaro ceiling in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (P. 190A). Kuen also copied a composition by Balestra, Kunze A40, of which there are two copies in Verona, one probably by Lorenzi (Inv. 13131/599). Some pen and wash drawings of ceiling figures, Kunze A24-27, probably derive from lost Tiepolo prototypes, but they could even be copies of drawings by Lorenzi.

Another artist in the orbit of Tiepolo from 1747-50 was Georg Anton Urlaub (1713-59), from Würzburg, who had already spent two years studying in Bologna. Urlaub too took up the working practices of his fellow students, copying paintings and drawings by Tiepolo and making nude studies in the manner of Piazzetta. (Knott; Knox pp. 150-161 under Section E; E5 and E8 are also by Urlaub, however).

There was clearly some fruitful interchange between Lorenzi, Kuen and Domenico in 1745-47. Thus, Kuen's detailed copies of the principal area of *The Last Judgement* (P. 66, now Cassa di Risparmio, Venice, 150 : 200cm) with Christ in glory and angelic hosts below (Kunze A6), and the lower left area with an angel rescuing a young soul and a skeleton shakily gesturing beneath (Kunze A16), give a *terminus ante quem* for the painting and testify to Giambattista's authorship. Knox (pp. 35-36) argued that P. 66 was a modello by Domenico and

may have been intended for the apse of S. Polo. Pedrocco's researches make this highly unlikely, however. As Knox excluded the possibility that Domenico made detail copies of oil-sketches, he concluded that Domenico's drawings were preparatory studies. The figure types in the painting (particularly the angels) suggest a dating in the early 1730s: if it is an oil-sketch for a lost or unexecuted fresco, then the canvas may well have been available in the studio for copying. Kuen was copying other oil-sketches – on the recto of Kunze A16 is a drawing after the Dulwich modello (P. 147a) for the Villa Cordellina ceiling, where (as with the verso) the relationship of two graceful airborne figures is explored. The main composition of *The Last Judgement* impressed Kuen, and his detailed studies were to be re-used in a fresco of 1750. Domenico (perhaps struck by Kuen's interest) made some confident studies after details of the painting, surely at the same time. The vigorous *Trumpeting Angels* drawing in Boston (Knox M129) clearly shows on the lower part of the leg of the right hand angel the overlapping wing of a putto visible in the painting, side by side with indications of the wing and the open book held by an adjoining angel, while the *Skeleton* in Stuttgart (Knox M342) has diagonally opposite, at the top right, part of the trumpet blown by an angel exactly as in the oil. A number of copies of these and other details are among the drawings attributed to Urlaub, and in the second sketchbook, at the Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg, which Knox has identified as copies by Lorenzo Tiepolo. (Knox E19, 20, 21, 23, 31, 34 (this is in fact a copy of the angel and young soul, not a woman and child as stated by Knox), and G13, 60). Some studies in the unpublished Cleveland sketchbook suggest that Lorenzi may also have been interested in the *Last Judgement*, although these are not conclusive. On p. 24 a drawing of the lower half of a foreshortened putto corresponds with a detail at the top right of the painting while some of the arm studies in the sketchbook seem to correspond.

One project which involved Kuen, Lorenzi and arguably Domenico was that of the San Salvatore-related composition of *Sts. Augustine, Louis of France, Magno, and John the Evangelist* known in an oil-sketch at the York City Art Gallery (York 1961 no. 839, and 1974 pp. 8-9) and a drawing in the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich (Knox M207; *Abb. 5b*). Kuen made a rapid sketch (Kunze A34) of the San Salvatore altarpiece of 1737-38, a piece of evidence first used by Levey (1971 p. 219) to show that the oil-sketch now in the National Gallery, London (no. 1193), is the modello for this altarpiece. Barcham 1989 (pp. 194-202) gave a full account of the iconography of the painting, which was destroyed after 1765. Although Kuen's very summary drawing omits many details, the characterization of the architectural background demonstrates that it was made from the altarpiece and not from the modello. Kuen also made a pen and wash drawing of the right hand group (Kunze A35) which seems to be a copy of a finished drawing. The York and Munich compositions, which have been thought to record Tiepolo's first ideas for the San Salvatore commission, can in fact be dated later, to c1746. Again, Levey (1971, p. 220, n. 8 and pp. 217, n. 12) drew attention not only to Algarotti's interest in

collecting Tiepolo oil-sketches but also to his ownership of an oil-sketch of *Sts. Maximus and Oswald* (probably that in the National Gallery, no. 1192) and of the York painting, both of which are later variations upon existing altarpieces. The *Sts. Maximus and Oswald* oil-sketch is datable to c1745: thus Algarotti, having seen Tiepolo at work on the altarpiece in 1744-45, could have requested a small oil-sketch incorporating the master's alternative ideas. As Barcham (1989, pp. 209-13) persuasively argues, the Paduan altarpiece and the associated oil-sketches display various affinities with the works related to the San Salvatore altarpiece. These affinities must have caught Algarotti's eye, since (presumably after admiring Tiepolo's *Sts. Maximus and Oswald* sketch) he went on to request a similar painting showing a re-arrangement of the cast of male saints represented at San Salvatore. (Around the same time Giambattista discussed with Algarotti, as the dedication on Domenico's etching records, the *St. Patrick* altarpiece for S. Giovanni di Verdara, Padua [P. 175], yet another depiction of an elderly bishop saint.) In this case, the York painting is a studio work, although some areas are of high quality. I would suggest that, as a compliment to Domenico which would be appreciated by Algarotti, Tiepolo allowed his son to execute this picture, under very close supervision, hence the rather flat and dry effect of the work.

A pen drawing in the Hermitage (no. 14268) must have been part of the preparation for the York picture: it is classed as the work of a pupil, corrected by Tiepolo, by Salmina. A little oil-sketch in the Pushkin Museum, Moscow (P. 145a. 1), probably yet another variation on the Sts. Maximus and Oswald theme (where the elderly bishop saint is closer to St. Patrick than to St. Maximus), bears the inscription on the verso *Regalo fatto dal padre a Gian Dom.o Tiepolo,* which Lavrova describes as authentic. Giambattista may have rapidly painted this for Domenico as part of a lesson in relation to the Algarotti project. Meanwhile, Francesco Lorenzi was interested in Tiepolo's variant San Salvatore composition, and made a number of careful studies of details: that of *An Acolyte holding a Gospel Book* (Knox M230, repr.; Knox 1970, no. 27 as Lorenzi), which has an unrelated arm study on the verso, is very close in style to the chalk drawings in the Cleveland sketchbook, while other studies of details are surely also by Lorenzi (Knox J9, J16, M528 [repr.]; J7, 8, 10, 27 [not repr.]).

The precisely-drawn black chalk copy in Munich *(Abb. 5b)* has often been described as a preparatory drawing for a print: it is derived from the Algarotti painting, but there are modifications to the architectural setting, and (unless the drawing has been cut down) a slightly closer and narrower view of the composition is taken. A variation on this drawing (mentioned by Barcham 1989 p. 195, n. 71) was published by Aikema (fig. 12a, pencil 496 : 349mm) as by Giambattista. This is closer in size to the York painting (59 : 36.5cm), but there are further variations in the architecture, as if those of the Munich drawing had been seen and developed. The drawing is by a different, possibly later hand: it is crisper and sharper, with greater attention to the decorative detail, while there are some subtle changes to the features with the result that, for example, the St. John

is no longer a Tiepolo type. The measurements of the Munich drawing (500 : 270 mm) are closer to the plate size of, for instance, Domenico's *St. Patrick* etching (514 : 251 mm; *Abb. 5a*) than to the size of the York painting. Domenico is surely the likely candidate as the author of the drawing, for in its tightly worked hatching and close attention to texture it is very similar to the *St. Peter Regalati* drawing in the Hermitage (Knox M152), a rather more assured and confident preparatory drawing of a year or two later followed precisely in Domenico's etching. Kuen's interest in the San Salvatore altarpiece may have been sparked off by the activities of Domenico and Lorenzi: in fact, he went on to make a black chalk drawing of the figure of St. Louis from the York picture (Kunze A36). However, Kuen's figure looks rather more like the figure in the Munich drawing than that in the painting, especially in some details of hair and drapery: possibly he had both models before his eyes.

Domenico and Lorenzi had much in common: four years separated them in age, but Lorenzi was enjoying a second apprenticeship, parallel with Domenico's. Both were struck by Tiepolo's preparations for, and painting of, the Palazzo Labia frescoes. This is not the place to discuss the attribution of the chalk drawings connected with the decoration, of which some are creative sketches and working drawings by Giambattista, some are copies or elaborations of such drawings by Domenico, but many are direct copies of the frescoes by Domenico. However, I would suggest that the Francesco Lorenzi sketchbook in a private collection, published by Knox (Section J) with the cautious attribution of all the Tiepolo-inspired drawings therein to Domenico, is possibly entirely by Lorenzi. I argued above that the group of drawings in that sketchbook related to San Salvatore are by him, datable to 1746. Of the 50 or so drawings connected with the Palazzo Labia, at least 30 are copies of various details related to the wall with the *Meeting of Antony and Cleopatra,* and only five are directly connected with the *Banquet* on the opposite wall and then only with the subsidiary scenes. Knox reproduces one drawing from the sketchbook, J89, the *Head of Anthony* as a copy by Domenico of a working drawing by Giambattista in the Hermitage, Knox A25. A comparison of the two reproductions shows that J89 is not a direct copy of the Hermitage drawing (the detail of the lion on the helmet alone is a giveaway) but is taken from the fresco itself. The meticulous shading of J89 with a sharpened stick of chalk is absolutely typical of Lorenzi. By comparison with A25, this is an inferior drawing – the head is too rounded, the face has been a little prettified, and the shape of the helmet is not quite right. The Hermitage drawing (perhaps the highest quality of the group there) is extremely close in spirit to the head in the fresco, conveying exactly the fall of light on the temple, nose and chin, and the highlights on the jewelled band of the helmet. Whether this is a working drawing by Giambattista – much more detailed and careful in execution than two earlier striking head studies of 1743-44, also working drawings (Knox M343, ex Woodner collection, and M662 Ashmolean Museum) – or a copy of the fresco by Domenico is difficult to establish. I would share the views of Morassi, Byam Shaw (1971), Pignatti (pp.

79-84) and others that Domenico made numerous accomplished copies of details from Giambattista's frescoes to build up his own artistic vocabulary, or with etchings in mind. Lorenzi's sketchbook in my view includes a record of a study period at the Palazzo Labia concentrating on the *Meeting* wall and on the unfinished *Banquet* wall, perhaps in the spring of 1747, a study period which may have been spent with Domenico when both copied many of the same details, amounting to the greater portion of the *Meeting* fresco. Indeed, a few copies from the Palazzo Labia frescoes by Urlaub identified by Knox (E85, 86, M156, 216, 283) focus on the same areas as the Lorenzi drawings – details of the *Meeting* and the secondary scenes on the *Banquet* wall – suggesting that he too might have been present at these study sessions. At the same time, Domenico was planning his *Via Crucis*: the verso of one of the Hermitage drawings (Knox A40), a study of a man's head from the *Meeting* fresco, contains a preparatory study for Station II. Lorenzi paid Domenico the compliment of making characteristic studies (Knox J56, 57, 64, 65) after the picturesque soldier and the stiff drapery of St. Veronica in Station VI, which are in keeping with Lorenzi's interest in costumes, jewellery, heads and gestures in the sketchbook as a whole.

Domenico's development as a painter has only been mentioned thus far in relation to the *St. Augustine and saints* for Algarotti, painted under close supervision in 1745-46. After that, the way was open for Domenico to contribute further: yet he does not seem to have collaborated in the painting of the Palazzo Labia (Levey 1986, p. 138). Giambattista may have judged that he was not yet ready to work in fresco, or on a large scale – much more was needed in the way of studying the Tiepolo style through drawing first. It seems likely that a group of small paintings of scenes from the Passion of Christ of similar dimensions – *The Last Supper, The Agony in the Garden, The Crowning with Thorns, The Crucifixion* and *The Ascension* (P. 179 and 181-84) – were to some extent delegated to Domenico, probably in 1746-47, who would have worked from his father's designs, imitating his manner as closely as possible. The *Agony in the Garden* appears to be a work of collaboration (Barcham 1992, p. 98; but see Haskell and Levey, p. 423), while the *Crucifixion* and *Ascension* may be entirely by Domenico. (Sometimes included in this group are Domenico's *Deposition* [P. 273] in the National Gallery, London [no. 5589] of c1750-60, and the Rotterdam *Crucifixion* [P. 180] which also seems later.) This project would have provided a perfect preparation for Domenico's subsequent exploration of the theme of the Via Crucis. At S. Polo he was working under his own name, however, and although his vocabulary was identifiably Tiepolesque, his approach to the subjects and manner of painting were entirely his own (Pedrocco p. 113). By contrast, in the summer of 1748, Domenico painted the large *St. Francis of Paola curing a possessed man (Abb. 7)* as one of a group of ten canvases for S. Francesco di Paola in Castello: his picture was one of the last to be commissioned, and he would have been aware that some senior artists and other Tiepolo followers or associates were involved in the project. The commission may even have come to him because his father was too busy. Privato established

that amongst the artists involved in the commission of 1745-48 were Gasparo Diziani and Nicola Grassi, also Vincenzo Canal (d. 1748), an old friend of Tiepolo's and the biographer of their teacher, Gregorio Lazzarini, and Giovanni Francesco Soliman (1716-84) a disciple of Tiepolo. Domenico looked back to his father's *St. Patrick* and *Martyrdom of St. John (Abb. 8)* compositions for inspiration.

Like the *St. John,* the *St. Francis of Paola* was part of a series of narrative paintings, and difficult to view at close range – the Bergamo series hangs in the apse of the Duomo, distant from the congregation, while the S. Francesco series is ranged high around the nave of the church – so that strong, forceful statements were required. The theme of exorcism in the *St. Patrick* (Whistler p. 32) made it a blueprint for Domenico's composition, with the position of the saint reversed. Levey (1986 pp. 136-37) and Barcham (1992, p. 9) have argued for Domenico's early collaboration in both the Bergamo and the *St. Patrick* altarpiece: however if one accepts the chronology suggested above, then it is hard to imagine his involvement in two large and important commissions painted in early 1745 and late 1745-46 respectively. The Bergamo painting was commissioned on 31 July 1743, and installed by 21 September 1745 (Zava Bocazzi), but was surely completed before Tiepolo began painting the Scalzi ceiling in April 1745. As Levey pointed out (1986, pp. 113-14), Giambattista included in the Bergamo modello (P. 150a) an angel with a palm who had originally appeared in the first oil-sketch for the Scalzi ceiling of 1743 (P. 151a) but was omitted in the second one (P. 151a. 1). Thus the Bergamo modello would date from late 1744: it is a very small (40 : 22cm) but breathtakingly assured sketch, which is complete in almost every detail with respect to the final painting. The latter was to have somewhat different proportions (600 : 250cm) so that Giambattista had to expand considerably the area of sky, moving the angel upwards, and peopling the arcade with agitated spectators, while he also had to expand slightly the width of the composition, allowing for more secondary figures. The angel's palm was now further removed from the saint's gesturing hands, and this somewhat empty area (in between the violence of the main action and the reaction of the distant audience) was filled by the new element of a shouting man. This strong note of emotional release is balanced by the impassive oriental figure to the left, and by the reactions of the group on the right – the modestly dressed woman who turns away, shielding her frightened boy (envisaged in the modello), and the anguished oriental who looks directly out of the painting, commanding the spectator's attention. Viewed as a whole, this grandiose scene of saintly martyrdom and Divine reward, with its subtext of human brutality and human emotion, is typical of Giambattista's religious art where clarity and immediacy prevail, and a strong vein of realism can be found. Yet Tiepolo is a master of both realism and idealization in religious drama, and he combines striking human elements with the symbolic use of architecture in denoting sacred events, so that the significance of the painting as a whole moves between a number of different registers. Giambattista's realism provides a direct source of inspiration for Domenico, who prefers to strike one loud and memorable note rather than

emulate the careful balance of tone sought by his father. Thus in the *St. Francis of Paola* the emotional state of the possessed man, his hair standing on end and body thrashing, dominates the picture, reducing the saint to an ineffectual spectator, even though it appears that the miracle of exorcism has already taken place. The shouting man is a direct descendant of the Bergamo figure, but he resembles even more closely, in reverse, the agonized head of one of the souls in Purgatory in the lower right corner of the *Virgin and Child appearing to Simon Stock* which Tiepolo was finally painting for the Scuola dei Carmine for delivery in 1749. This suffering figure had been envisaged in the modello for the ceiling, now in the Musée du Louvre, presumably dating from c. 1740 when the commission was agreed after detailed discussions. A similar open-mouthed anguished type recurs in Domenico's S. Polo pictures, notably in the expression of the saint in *The Stoning of St. Stephen*, but also in that of a spectator in Station VIII of the Via Crucis.

Whether the original invention of the figure is Domenico's is debatable: this argument is possibly supported by a chalk drawing in the National Museum, Warsaw (Knox M495) *(Abb. 9)* of a shouting head which is by Domenico. However, the drawing is rather weak, and is clearly based on the painting not only because of the vertical line indicating the column on the right, but mainly because it follows the system of shadowing on the face in the painting very carefully (this is particularly noticeable in the area of the mouth and base of the nose). It is apparently not an exact copy because the young man here wears a headdress. In the painting, however, a coral-coloured piece of fabric is mysteriously visible just at the back of the man's head – could this be the residue of a headdress Giambattista had first blocked in, before assessing the overall impact of the painting and giving further definition to this motif by adding a shock of hair? I would argue that Domenico was impressed by this head in particular, making a rapid copy immediately, and that he went on to adapt it in his own work (perhaps thereby stimulating his father to re-model the detail of the soul in Purgatory in the Carmine ceiling).

Domenico's predilection for pungent realism and for making a strong emotional impact on the viewer, seen in the *St. Francis of Paola* and in the group of paintings at S. Polo with saints as protagonists, finds its ideal objective correlative in the subject of the Via Crucis. This new cult, promoted since the 1730s by the Franciscan Leonardo da Porto Maurizio, provided a rigorously controlled spiritual journey in fourteen set pieces. The Via Crucis commanded the participant's attention from beginning to end with a combination of images and prescribed meditation, in which attention was focussed on tangible pain, with the devotee encouraged to relate Christ's suffering to his own sinful life. For all their occasional awkwardness and clumsiness, Domenico's paintings are highly original and effective visualizations of the Passion in terms of a modern and popular mode of devotion, which had not previously been depicted in Venice. They establish him as a religious artist of great distinction, just as a decade later his frescoes at the Villa Valmarana were to proclaim his individuality in secular themes.

Catherine Whistler

Abbreviations used in the text:

P. A. Palluchini *L'Opera completa di Giambattista Tiepolo* Milan 1968.

R. A. Rizzi *The Etchings of the Tiepolos* London 1971.

Knox G. Knox *Giambattista and Domenico Tiepolo. A Study and Catalogue Raisonné of the Chalk Drawings* Oxford 1980.

Kunze M. Kunze *Vorbild Tiepolo – Die Zeichnungen des Franz Martin Kuen aus dem Museum Weißenhorn* (exhibition catalogue 1992-93) Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg, Städtische Kunstsammlungen Augsburg, Kulturzentrum Zehntscheuer, Rottenburg a. N. and Museum Weißenhorn.

Bibliography

Aikema, B. reviewing Barcham 1989, *Kunstchronik* 44, 1991, pp. 661-64

Barcham, W. *The Religious Paintings of Giambattista Tiepolo* Oxford 1989

Barcham, W. *Tiepolo* London 1992

Bean, J. and Griswold, W. *18th century Italian Drawings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* New York 1990

Byam Shaw, J. *The Drawings of Domenico Tiepolo* London 1962

Byam Shaw, J. 'Tiepolo Celebrations: Three Catalogues' *Master Drawings* 1971, pp. 264-76

Haskell, F. and Levey, M., review of the Munich exhibition, *Burlington Magazine* C, 1958, pp. 422-27

Knott, N. *Georg Anton Urlaub* (Mainfränkische Studien Band 19) Würzburg 1978

Knox, G. *Tiepolo A Bicentenary Exhibition* Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge 1970

Knox, G. *The Etchings of the Tiepolos* Ottawa 1976

Knox, G. 'The Tasso Cycles of Giambattista Tiepolo and Gianantonio Guardi' *Museum Studies* 9, 1978, pp. 49-95

Lavrova, O. 'Le tele di Giambattista Tiepolo nel Museo Statale di Belle Arti A. S. Pushkin' in *Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi sul Tiepolo* Udine 1970, pp. 126-27

Levey, M. 'Domenico Tiepolo: his Earliest Activity and a Monograph' *Burlington Magazine* CV, 1963, pp. 128-29

Levey, M. *The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Italian Schools* London 1971

Levey, M. *Giambattista Tiepolo. His Life and Art* New Haven and London 1986

Mariuz, A. *Giandomenico Tiepolo* Venice 1971

Mongan, A. 'Some drawings by Francesco Lorenzi' *Studi in onore di Antonio Morassi* Venice 1971, pp. 347-52

Morassi, A. 'Sui disegni del Tiepolo' *Arte Veneta* XXIV, 1970, pp. 294-304

Pedrocco, F. 'L'Oratorio del Crocefisso nella Chiesa di San Polo' *Arte Veneta* XLIII, 1989-90, pp. 108-15

Pignatti, T. 'Tiepolo a Palazzo Labia' in *Palazzo Labia di Venezia* Turin 1982

Posse, H. 'Die Briefe des Grafen Francesco Algarotti' *Jahrbuch der Preußischen Kunstsammlungen* 52, Supplement, Berlin 1931, pp. 35ff.

Privato, R. 'Il ciclo pittorico settecentesco della chiesa di S. Francesco di Paola' *Venezia Arti* 5, 1991, pp. 148-53

Robison, A. reviewing Rizzi, *Art Bulletin* LVI, 1974, pp. 295-98

Robison, A. *Piranesi. Early Architectural Fantasies. A Catalogue Raisonné of the Etchings.* Chicago 1986

Salmina, L. 'Deux dessins de G. B. Tiepolo' *Bulletin du Musée de l'Ermitage* XVI, 1959, pp. 36-40

Santifaller, M. 'Alcuni "griffonages" su stagno di Francesco Algarotti e la grafica di Giambattista Tiepolo' *Arte Veneta* XXXI, 1977, pp. 135-44

Santifaller, M. 'Carl Heinrich von Heinecken e le acqueforti di Giambattista Tiepolo a Dresden' *Arte Veneta* XXVI, 1972, pp. 145-53

Succi, D. *Da Carlevarijs ai Tiepolo* Venice 1983
Succi, D. *Tiepolo. Virtuosismo e ironia* Turin 1988
Vicenza 1990 *I Tiepolo ed il Settecento vicentino* (exhibition catalogue, ed. F. Rigon, M. E. Avagnina, F. Barbieri, L. Puppi, and R. Schiavo)
Whistler, C. 'Tiepolo's St. Patrick altarpiece' *Irish Arts Review* 2, 1985, pp. 32-35
York 1961 *Catalogue of Paintings Vol. I City of York Art Gallery* (no authors named) and *Supplement* (J. Ingamells) 1974
Zannandreis, D. *Le Vite dei Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti Veronesi* ed. G. Biadego, Verona 1891, pp. 426-32
Zava Bocazzi, F. 'La documentazione archivistica delle tele settecentesche del coro del Duomo di Bergamo' *Arte Veneta* XXX, 1976, pp. 232-240

DIE VENEZIANISCHE MALEREI DES 18. JAHRHUNDERTS NACHLESE ZU EINEM MÜNCHNER SAMMLUNGSKATALOG

Venezianische Gemälde des 18. Jahrhunderts, bearbeitet von ROLF KULTZEN und MATTHIAS REUSS. Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Bd. X, 2. München, Hirmer 1991. 190 Seiten, 113 Abb. auf Tafeln. DM 128,-.

(mit zwei Figuren und drei Abbildungen)

Mit dem Begriff „Ankaufspolitik" werden auch heute vielfach noch die unterschiedlichsten Motivationen beim Zustandekommen einer Kunstsammlung umschrieben. Am ehesten trifft dies in des Wortes eigentlicher Bedeutung auf die Kunstbestrebungen an den barocken Fürstenhöfen zu. Der hier noch weitgehend vorherrschende „politische" Aspekt des Kunstankaufs hat sich im 19. Jahrhundert mit dem Enstehen der öffentlichen Museen wesentlich zu Gunsten eher „kunsthistorisch-pädagogischer" Gesichtspunkte verlagert. Auch die Entstehungsgeschichte der Sammlung venezianischer Malerei des 18. Jahrhunderts in den Bayerischen Staatsgemäldesammlungen, deren vollständiger Katalog nun vorliegt, läßt dies deutlich werden.

Mit dem Aufkommen des Klassizismus, in welchem die Klassikdoktrin der französischen Akademie gewissermaßen wiederauflebte, war auch die venezianische Malerei des 18. Jahrhunderts mehr oder minder aus dem Blick geraten. Erst mit den Augen der Impressionisten konnten diese farbenfroh gestimmten Werke in neuem Licht gesehen werden. Ihre Wiederentdeckung geht Hand in Hand mit einer erneuten Wertschätzung der Maler des französischen Rokoko durch die Brüder Goncourt (vgl. E. Hüttinger, in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2.12.1967). Daß sich mit deren Anerkennung zugleich die Rehabilitierung jener italienischen Kunstrichtung vollzog, welche noch zu Zeiten Ludwigs XIV. gleichsam als ein ästhetischer Gegenpol zur klassischen französischen Barockmalerei die Aufmerksamkeit vieler Sammler auf sich gelenkt hatte, ist nicht nur eine Ironie des Schicksals. Die besondere Bedeutung vor allem der venezianischen Künstler, die entweder selbst oder mit ihren Werken fast überall zugegen waren, zeigt sich in der enormen Wirkung auch auf die neue Generation von französi-