

on firsthand information, paradoxically the rigid application of this rule also makes the book somewhat less reliable than one might wish.

The lacunae seem offset, however, by numerous and exciting revelations, only a few of which can be mentioned here. A spectacular one is the discovery that Domenico Ghirlandaio was a miniaturist as well as a painter (a miniature in the Biblioteca Vaticana bears his signature). Significant also is the discovery of documents that make it possible to distinguish the hand of Gherardo di Giovanni di Miniato from that of his brother Monte, of Bartolomeo d'Antonio Varnucci from that of his brother Giovanni, and of Giovanni di Giuliano Boccardi from that of his son Francesco and of Matteo da Terranova. Of interest, too, is the identification of a woman miniaturist, Donna Angela di Antonio de' Rabatti, of whom one work is documented by signature.

The abundance of new information, the reexamination and reassessment of earlier attributions in the light of recent discoveries, the rigorous distinction maintained between documented fact and interpretation, and the variety of scholarly apparatuses make this book a most valuable research tool for the specialist concerned with Florentine miniature painting. It will also be an indispensable foundation for any future attempt to write a history of Florentine manuscript illumination.

There are some typographical errors, only two of which may cause confusion. On page 255, "Tav. 38" (in the margin) should read "Tav. 37," and on pages 257 and 258, "Tav. 37" should read "Tav. 38."

DARIO A. COVI  
University of Louisville

GIULIANO BRIGANTI, *Pietro da Cortona o della pittura barocca*, Florence, Sansoni, 1962. Pp. 357; 289 figs., 16 color pls. L. 18.000.

This book by Giuliano Briganti is a kind of conflation of two related studies: one on the nature of Baroque style in painting, and one on the paintings of Pietro da Cortona. Together they make a truly distinguished volume, and one of the most significant contributions to the study of Seicento painting published in recent years. It must be said at the start that it is not always an easy book to read, for the author tends to advance his investigation along several densely worded fronts at once. However, it is full of ideas and insights, often witty and trenchant in its characterizations, and constantly stimulating and thought-provoking.

Part I is a discussion of the meaning of "baroque."

1. I, Nos. 1, 3, pp. 19-24, 6-14; II, No. 13, pp. 8-17. A slightly revised version of these essays has appeared in English in *Encyclopedia of World Art*, London, 1960, II, cols. 257-267.

2. *Vita del Cav. Pietro Berrettini da Cortona*, Cortona.

3. One minor addition to marginalia may be offered here. The *Battle of Alexander and Darius* at Versailles (Cat. No. 65), surely not by Cortona, is apparently the picture cited by Piganiol de la Force as by "Bourguignon," i.e., Jacques Courtois (*Nouvelle description du château . . . de Versailles*,

Actually, this is a reprinting, with added footnotes, of three now famous articles that appeared in *Paragone* in 1950 and 1951.<sup>1</sup> Part II is a study of Cortona's pictorial style, its antecedents, and its relation to its time. Part III contains a chronology of Cortona's life; a chronologically ordered catalogue raisonné of the artist's surviving work; a list of lost or destroyed paintings, and of misattributions; an "outline" for a catalogue of the drawings; and, finally, an extensive bibliography. A huge body of illustrations and several indices make the book easy and pleasurable to use.

Part III, containing some two hundred pages of catalogues, is now the standard reference for Pietro da Cortona as a painter. The quality and significance of Briganti's accomplishment can be fully appreciated only if one remembers that until now the one general study of this great artist was Fabbrini's unsatisfactory book of 1896.<sup>2</sup> For the most part the catalogue entries provide the student with all essential information and occasionally, when a work demands it (e.g., the Barberini ceiling or the Pitti decorations), the entry grows into a little essay, and this quite sensibly frees the text from the burden of heavy documentation. By now *Seicentisti* will have begun to fill the margins of the catalogue sections with additions and amendments;<sup>3</sup> in fact, important new materials have already been added and corrections made to the catalogues in some excellent reviews of the book.<sup>4</sup> However, it is just the thoroughness and accuracy of the author's researches that enable us to make sensible use of new information and to recognize errors or omissions. The importance of the catalogues can hardly be overestimated, but it should not make one neglect the text. I shall devote this review to a discussion of the latter, partly because the chief questions raised by the catalogues have already been dealt with by other writers, but mainly because I think the text contains Briganti's most immediately challenging and stimulating contributions.

Part I of the text, an essay that was first published more than a decade ago, is a classic discussion, illumined by good sense, and it merited reprinting. Furthermore, the rest of the book is predicated on this essay and is obviously the fruit of ideas that the author formulated in the context of this initial inquiry into the interpretation of the Baroque. Thus, the pages in Part II devoted to subjects like "la nozione veneziana del Cortona," or "la Natura-Spettacolo" are elaborations of the brief sketches of neo-Venetianism and of the relation of man to nature that appear in Part I. Together, Parts I and II represent a carefully structured argument about the Baroque.

The author begins with a study of the "strange word 'baroque'":<sup>5</sup> first in its general or metaphorical

Paris, 1724, pp. 185-186).

4. K. Noehles in *Kunstchronik*, XVI, 1963, pp. 95-106; W. Vitzthum in *Burlington Magazine*, CV, 1963, pp. 213-217, and in *Master Drawings*, I, 1963, pp. 49-51.

5. The most recent contributions to this subject are O. Kurz, "Barocco: storia di una parola," *Lettere italiane*, XII, 1960, pp. 414-444; *idem*, "Barocco: storia di un concetto," *Barocco Europeo e Barocco Veneziano* (ed. V. Branca), Venice, 1962, pp. 15-33; B. Migliorini, "Etimologia e storia del termine

sense, where it has always been "extremely imprecise and adaptable to the most varied objects" (p. 18); and then in its "abbottonatissima, lucide uniforme accademica" (p. 19)—that is, Baroque as a critical and historical concept. The author explains that the idea, most fully elaborated by D'Ors, of Baroque as a universal and recurring "type of vision" (analogous to and sometimes identical with Romanticism) has contributed little to historical insight, and he points out that Croce's concept of Baroque as a kind of "non-style" or "mode of the ugly" can only lead to a critical dead end. It is in the tradition of German and Austrian scholarship that the concept of the Baroque has had its greatest success and seems to have been most fruitful.

At this point the essay, which nowhere quite maintains a tone of dispassionate inquiry, becomes an especially sharp polemic. The author provides only a schematic outline of the historical background of *Stilgeschichte* and *Geistesgeschichte* while sharply attacking their methods of treating the Baroque. The former, with its Wölfflinian visual schemes, makes the Baroque a "chapter in an imaginary history of art without artists," or else it classifies artists "like dry flowers between an herbalist's blotting papers." Furthermore, it attempts to unify "under the banner of the Baroque, all artistic manifestations from the end of the Renaissance to the beginning of the neoclassical reaction" (p. 24). The danger of *Geistesgeschichte* is seen in its tendency to discover connections "not between the prevalent tendencies and the various artists of the age, but between some of the former (Jesuitism, the Counter Reformation, etc.) and the abstraction of a general style." This amounts to the creation of "a hypothetical collective subconscious which ultimately seems to presuppose the history of styles" (p. 25). The author makes a plea for a "history of art that is a history of artists, a history of living, thinking, working individuals." He rejects the notion of a "basic sentiment" or "vital sense of the age," and insists that such an idea is disproved by the "unbridgeable distance that separates . . . a Campanella from a Marino, a Caravaggio from a Pietro da Cortona." For Briganti the task of the historian of the seventeenth century is not to correlate disparate stylistic phenomena, but to make distinctions: "Distinguere, allora, e ancora distinguere" (p. 25).

The tone of these pages may seem unnecessarily heated today, when few scholars (excepting perhaps those stricken with what Briganti calls "pigrizia culturale") will disagree with the author's main argu-

ments. Nonetheless, it is certain that Briganti's polemic, now as ten years ago, has the merit of reminding us to inquire into our methodological presuppositions. For instance, in condemning the tendency to use the term "Baroque" for all seventeenth century art, Briganti explains that the belief in a unified Baroque period did not proceed from the observation of any stylistic or spiritual community between Caravaggio, Carracci, and Cortona, but from a pre-existing, and certainly questionable, theory of historical evolution.<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately, his discussion is highly condensed, and readers who are not familiar with the background material may find it difficult to follow.

The last pages of Part I appeared in *Paragone* under the title, "Milleseicentotrenta, ovvero il Barocco." Here the author argues that while our present conception of the Baroque has come to be riddled with ambiguity, contradiction, and methodological error, the word "baroque" had a "very precise" meaning when it was first applied to the visual arts in the second half of the eighteenth century. Baroque, for Quatremère de Quincy and Milizia, described a style that made a radical departure from the aesthetic norms established by antiquity and by Raphael, a style that had as its (evil) geniuses Bernini, Borromini, and Pietro da Cortona.<sup>7</sup> Only this narrow concept of the Baroque, Briganti insists, refers to something real and concrete. By extending the term "Baroque" to include other seventeenth and eighteenth century artistic modes we obscure the true Baroque and make it impossible to understand. The author's thesis is that the Baroque style is a unique artistic phenomenon created and propagated by the generation that matured about 1630, and the precise expression of a specific cultural content—the "spirit" of the moment in Rome. Baroque style is to be understood as the "style of 1630."

Part II, the heart of the book, represents the author's demonstration of his thesis. It provides, by way of explanation, a rich, panoramic view of painting and artistic culture in Rome from about 1615 to about 1665. In these pages the reader is treated to illuminating discussions that range from such specialized problems as the style of Tuscan artists working in Rome in the first decades of the century to such fundamental historical questions as the meaning of classical and archeological culture for Roman Seicento society. (The latter is an analysis that cannot be too highly praised.) However, the main argument for the author's thesis is, of course, the analysis of the paintings of Pietro da Cortona, one of the creators and leading practitioners

'barocco,' *Manierismo, Barocco, Rococò* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), Rome, 1962, pp. 39-49.

6. This is most obviously illustrated by the development of Wölfflin's work. In his *Renaissance und Barock* of 1888 he was concerned with the problem of the transition of Renaissance to Baroque style primarily in Italian architecture. In his *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* of 1915 he attempted to show how all the arts everywhere in Europe obeyed the same laws of stylistic development, and to form an idea of "was man als Zeitstil bezeichnen muss" (4th ed., Munich, 1920, p. 9).

Kurz (*Barocco Europeo* . . . , p. 30) has emphasized the

fact that historians of the second half of the 19th century who studied the Baroque were almost exclusively concerned with the problem of the genesis of the style. Some of the material relevant to this question is discussed by Briganti on pp. 23-24 and in n. 22.

7. One should not exaggerate the precision of 18th century usage. De Brosse used "baroque" as a synonym for "gothic," and Cavaliere d'Arpino and Caravaggio were, for Winckelmann and Bettinelli respectively, the painters whose art corresponded to the decadent taste of Bernini and Borromini (see Briganti's nn. 2 and 13).

of the Baroque style. Briganti shows that Cortona's pictorial means were largely based on the work of Lanfranco and Guercino, and on the appreciation of Venetian color in Rome in the 1620's. Most important, he argues convincingly that the content of Cortona's paintings was essentially the expression of the new militancy of the Catholic Church, the absolutist tendencies of the Barberini, and the "classical" artifice of the intellectual and social life of the upper classes.

These brilliant and erudite pages tell us much about art and culture in Seventeenth-century Rome, but I do not think they demonstrate the validity of the author's formula, "1630, i.e., the Baroque." There are, to my mind, two serious objections to it. First, the art of the generation of 1630 in Rome was really not stylistically coherent; second, some artists working before 1630 practiced styles that seem remarkably like Cortona's.

The author writes that the artists who reached maturity toward 1630—Borromini, Bernini, Cortona, Sacchi, Duquesnoy, and also Poussin (p. 28)—created "the various modes of the Baroque" and "assimilated and gave their personal inflection to the spirit [of the time]" (p. 34). Now to a certain extent one is justified in speaking of "generation styles." Members of a generation in a given place are likely to share cultural experiences, attitudes, etc., and their works will reveal something of this community. In terms of generation style there is a connection between Cortona, Sacchi, and Poussin. However, I cannot agree that this connection is strong enough to imply the existence of a "spirit" or "basic sentiment" of 1630, and to suggest that the multiform visual modes of the time can all be placed under the rubric "Baroque style." Indeed, the author himself is forced to interpret Pieter van Laer and Michelangelo Cerquozzi, who were creating the *bambocciata* around 1630, as the belated representatives of an earlier generation's "naturalism" (p. 54). Moreover, Poussin is ultimately explained as an "isolated case," as a classicist "outside the Baroque movement" (pp. 91-92, 101). However, granting these major exceptions, the author insists that the art of the generation of 1630 was otherwise Baroque, and he includes Andrea Sacchi, as a classicist "within the Baroque movement" (p. 92), which creates, I think, the greatest difficulty for his thesis. Despite the profound visual differences between Sacchi's work and Cortona's, which Briganti analyzes in detail, he argues, nevertheless, that Sacchi must be considered Baroque (albeit Classicistic-Baroque) because he shared the "nutrimenti spirituali" of his generation (p. 89). This can only mean that the forms of a work of art and the manner in which it is composed and painted have little to do with whether it is Baroque or not. It is the "spirit" that counts. It is clear then that Briganti's Baroque, after all, is not Milizia's Baroque, which referred to a manner, a mode of representation, and from which an artist like Sacchi was definitely excluded. For the author, not only are Cortona and Sacchi, and Luca Giordano and Baciccia and Tiepolo Baroque, but so also are Carlo Maratta and his following (pp. 89-90). One wonders whether Batoni is also to be considered Baroque. Thus a great many disparate visual phenomena

begin to assemble under Briganti's banner of the Baroque, and the only criterion for acceptance or rejection is their "spiritual content." However, it seems to me that the cultural factors Briganti isolates as crucial for Cortona's work are no more than that. Not all of them are relevant for Poussin or, I think, Sacchi and Maratta (and probably not for Tiepolo either), and they are certainly insufficient to explain these artists. I think that to see them as the explanation for the art of a whole generation and its following is, in effect, to do what the author himself warned against: discovering connections between *some* of the tendencies of an age and the abstraction of a general style.

The author's identification of the Baroque with "1630" complicates another major problem: the relation of Rubens to the Baroque style. While Ludovico Carracci and Lanfranco might possibly be relegated to an early or proto-Baroque moment, Rubens "always spoke the new Baroque language without accent or any archaism" (p. 31). This, the author grants, is true even of Rubens' Italian works (1600-1608). Considering Briganti's repeated insistence that the climate of 1630 was very different from that of 1600 or 1610, is it logical to conclude that "without any doubt the spirit that animates all Rubens' work is already the spirit of 1630" (*ibid.*)? Now either the cultural conditions that gave rise to the Baroque style only crystallized around 1630 and therefore Rubens is not Baroque (or is only proto-Baroque) during his Italian period, or else these conditions already existed and could nourish the visual arts before 1610 and therefore the Baroque style is not identical with the style of 1630. A third possibility is that specific and limited cultural conditions, despite their relevance in particular instances, may have less to do with the creation of major modes of pictorial expression than Briganti supposes.

It seems to me that if we consider the Baroque, as Milizia did, to be merely a manner or mode of representation, then we can make more meaningful connections and distinctions. The Baroque style is best understood, I think, as a set of pictorial formulae rooted in the grand tradition of Italian Cinquecento art. Essentially it was the heritage of the Venetians and of Correggio that was made into a new expressive tool by Ludovico Carracci, Lanfranco and others. Rubens, and then Cortona, elaborated on it and expanded its possibilities (and it is this point in the style that Milizia declared exaggerated and corrupt and, in effect, christened "baroque"). Thus a chain of connections can be traced from artist to artist in the development of Baroque forms. Around 1600 these forms were used to express some prevalent tendencies of the time, and around 1630, when new ideas and attitudes crystallized, some of them—perhaps the most significant—could be, and were expressed in the Baroque style. Some of the same ideas were expressed in other styles by Poussin and Sacchi. This explains the community of generation. But Poussin and Sacchi saw things—no less real—in the age that Cortona and his followers did not, and these things could not be expressed in a Baroque style. If we must have a name for the styles of Poussin and Sacchi, of Domenichino and of Maratta,

perhaps we can use the terminology of Milizia and call them the "sublime" or "beautiful" or "expressive" styles.<sup>8</sup> But it would be better to preserve distinctions and not call them "Baroque"; and it would be better to maintain clarity and not call them "Classicistic-Baroque."

I am afraid that my criticisms of Briganti's conception of the Baroque may have obscured my admiration for this major effort to resolve one of the central issues of art history. Only a writer with the author's erudition and breadth of vision could have attempted it. If we cannot accept all of his conclusions, this seems less important than the fact that he has given us a picture so wide in scope and so sharp in detail that the essential problems we must deal with stand out boldly.

The supreme accomplishment of the book is its analysis of Pietro da Cortona's version of the Baroque style. With a few reservations this can be said to be absolutely convincing, and presented with exemplary clarity and economy.<sup>9</sup> In the text relatively few, but characteristic, paintings from each period are considered in detail. In the discussion of Cortona's work of the early 1620's paintings like the Capitoline *Sacrifice of Polyxena* and the Mahon collection *Oath of Semiramis* serve to illustrate the new pictorial and presentational devices that the artist was creating. Briganti demonstrates that these pictures, in their stress on scenographic effects and on heroic, melodramatic moments, distinguish themselves from works of the previous generation; they emerge as clear reflections of the rigid social relationships of the time, of the manners, the conventions, "the pretensions of the dominant social class to dignity and grandeur" (p. 63).

In this connection Briganti also points out that the ideals of this social minority explain "the radical rejection of realistic and everyday forms in art" (p. 60)—that is to say, the ultimate rejection in Rome of the Caravaggesque tradition. This is certainly true, but I think one should emphasize the fact that these social ideals coincided with the authority of Italy's grand artistic tradition. For despite its brilliant success, the Caravaggesque style had acknowledged faults in the mind of the Italian artist and critic who was aware and respectful of his heritage, while the claims of the antique, of Raphael, Michelangelo, Correggio, and Titian could not be ignored. Essentially, this *aesthetic* motivation for rejecting Caravaggism could affect artists directly, regardless of their connections with the social milieu. Indeed, Briganti perhaps overestimates the ability of a social class to recognize immediately its own best aesthetic interests. After all, in the 1620's Casiano del Pozzo, Marcello Sacchetti, and the Barberini

8. The usual terms today are "classic" or "classical," which have something to recommend them if they are understood to describe a pictorial mode that adheres closely to the ideals of the "classic" art of Raphael. However, the tendency to confuse "classical" with "classicizing" and "antiquizing," and to extend the term so that it includes the so-called classical phase of Rembrandt's art, etc., makes one wonder if it is really more satisfactory than Milizia's terminology.

9. In one particular, economy is carried much too far. Nowhere in the text does the author make adequate reference to

patronized Vouet and Valentin as well as Cortona. In the context of Briganti's discussion these are minor objections, but I bring them up here because, while I agree with the author's main arguments, I feel that ultimately he "overidentifies" the style of Cortona and his contemporaries with a social class.

In a sense, the author's conclusion is that Cortona's generation in Rome sold out to a declining ruling class (p. 112), that it abandoned the "more difficult paths of free research" (i.e., Caravaggism) to create representational modes that could "illustrate the vain dreams of [the ruling class'] fantasy" (p. 55). He insists, therefore, in the final sentence of the text, that "a judgment on the work of Cortona and Bernini must be balanced by a judgment on the society and the culture whose interpreters they were" (p. 113). To my mind the author is here confusing historical and moral judgments with aesthetic judgments. "Bourgeois Holland" may have had, as Briganti says, a "freer, more modern culture" than did seventeenth century Rome, but in what sense was it also "higher" (p. 113)? Whatever our opinion of the "Establishment" of the Seicento, I think we must admit that in Bernini it had an artistic representative who equaled the very best that could be claimed by the good burghers of Holland. Certainly Cortona's decorations in the Barberini and Pitti Palaces are propagandistic and encomiastic, but today it doesn't matter whether or not we admire the families and ideals they celebrate; for the artist was able to transform the "vain dreams" of his patrons into a "high" poetry that still captivates and that carries the spectator away on the wings of artistic illusion. The historian can analyze the relation of art to society; if he insists on judging one by the quality of the other, then it is surely more meaningful to judge a society by the art that it fosters than an art by the society it serves.

The ceiling fresco of the Gran Salone in the Barberini Palace in Rome was Cortona's main achievement in the 1630's, and the decorations in the Pitti Palace in Florence dominated his activity in the 1640's. The author's discussion of these monuments is careful and sensitive, and is enhanced by his feeling for the poetic content of a historical situation. The latter enables him, for instance, to dispose of one vexatious problem in a single, telling sentence. The significance of Cortona's visit to Venice in 1637 and, especially, its possible influence on the design and color of the Barberini ceiling is a question that might have led to pages of inconclusive discussion. Briganti, who earlier explains Cortona's crucial experience with Venetian color in the 1620's (pp. 65-66), simply and correctly dis-

the literature he cites. The following is a typical example. On p. 31, speaking of neo-Venetianism in Rome around 1630, he credits "Longhi nel lontano 1916." No footnote. The reader who doesn't happen to know that the reference is to Roberto Longhi, "Gentileschi, padre e figlia," *L'arte*, XIX, 1916, will find no help in the bibliography, for there is no entry under "1916." Citations from inadequately indexed 17th century books are given without page references, and even without book titles.

misses the idea that the 1637 trip was in any way fundamental for the Barberini fresco: “. . . fu un soggiorno brevissimo: due settimane se non meno di un piovoso novembre, con le chiese buie e una gran furia nel cuore di tornarsene a casa” (p. 87).

The author emphasizes the relation of Cortona's Barberini fresco to Annibale Carracci's ceiling decoration in the Galleria Farnese, although he points out that despite clear reflections of the earlier work in the design, Cortona's ceiling nevertheless represents a different world of form and content.<sup>10</sup> Cortona evidently had Annibale's scheme in mind when he was first composing the fresco. In this connection one is surprised that a drawing in Munich, twice published as a preliminary study for the Barberini Ceiling,<sup>11</sup> is nowhere mentioned by the author. The drawing represents a florid but direct elaboration of the Farnese Gallery scheme and is closely related to the Barberini design. Obviously Briganti doesn't consider the drawing authentic, but since it is the only known drawing that might represent an early stage of the Barberini scheme, it seems peculiar that it should be totally ignored. Personally, I am inclined to accept it as Cortona's, and even if it is really a study for the ceiling of the Villa del Pigneto (ca. 1630), as Noehles has now tentatively suggested,<sup>12</sup> its importance would not be greatly lessened. Indeed, the designs of the Pigneto and Castel Fusano ceilings are, in a sense, preparatory stages in the development of the Barberini scheme. In any event, I do not think one can responsibly reject Posse's attribution of the Munich drawing without making a reasonable counterproposal about its authorship and purpose.

Actually, Briganti has not been much concerned with the genesis of the design of the Barberini fresco, and his discussion does not, therefore, supersede Posse's fundamental study of the ceiling.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore it seems to me that the author has not sufficiently appreciated the uniqueness of one aspect of Cortona's invention. The use of an open architectural framework to establish and define an interior and exterior space, and the creation of an illusion of forms moving freely between them was a novelty in Roman ceiling design. It was the means by which Cortona produced the effect of an explosive extension of the spectator space and of irresistible movement. Now this interpenetration of spaces is a device that does not appear in any of the earlier ceiling designs in which Cortona was involved, and, in its principles, it differs from the artist's early easel paintings, where Briganti shows that “the action is enclosed in a carefully defined space, which is alien to the spectator” (p. 63). Equally important, after the Barberini fresco the artist never used this device again. In other words, this aspect of the ceiling is something of an isolated phenomenon in Cortona's

work, and it does not seem possible to explain it satisfactorily in terms of the internal stylistic development of his art. The facts suggest instead that some special circumstance affected Cortona when he was designing the fresco.

Considering the clear reflection of the Farnese Gallery in Cortona's finished fresco, and considering also the close relation of his earlier ceiling designs to the same monument, it does not seem unlikely that the original plan for the Gran Salone looked very much like Annibale's masterpiece. Indeed, the Farnese Gallery scheme offered the logical solution for the Barberini vault, where a multiplicity of independent narrative scenes were also to be painted on a coved vault. The Munich drawing, of course, represents just such an “Annibalesque” design, with *quadri riportati* surrounded by the delimiting frames of painted architecture and of sculptural and “living” ornaments. Now Cortona's ceiling, representing Divine Providence, was conceived as a kind of pendant to Sacchi's ceiling of Divine Wisdom in the Barberini Palace. In 1633, when Cortona was just beginning his work, Sacchi completed his fresco. Sacchi's ceiling, although it is considerably smaller than Cortona's, creates the illusion of a vast, open, and unified space. If my guess about the original nature of Cortona's design is correct, then, I think, he would have found it constricted, overly detailed, and somehow small by comparison with the grand spaciousness of Sacchi's fresco. The competition from Sacchi called for revisions in his design, and one can easily imagine his procedure: reducing the bulk of the painted architecture; eliminating the delimiting frames; carrying clouds and figures across one compartment into the next. The result was a splendidly open and unified design, but bought at the cost of narrative and structural clarity, a “defect” that was severely criticized by Sacchi and his circle. In his next ceilings, in the Pitti Palace, Cortona abandoned the device of spatial interpenetration, but found another solution, one that he evidently considered more satisfactory and that is perhaps closer to his early designs than to the Barberini vault. In the Pitti the real stucco frames divide the ceilings into compartments and maintain an absolute separation between the individual units. However, the rooms are now dominated by the main “*quadri*,” which open out in painted views of the exterior space. This solution has the advantage of providing great, unified, illusionistic spaces while maintaining clear divisions between the many elements of the design. Thus the Barberini ceiling would appear to be a special, and not entirely characteristic, product of Cortona's Baroque style. This does not, however, in any way invalidate Briganti's conclusion that with this fresco Cortona “reached the high point of his artistic career” (p. 88).

10. On the iconography an important addition to Briganti's discussion is W. Vitzthum, “A Comment on the Iconography of Pietro da Cortona's Barberini Ceiling,” *Burlington Magazine*, CIII, 1961, pp. 427-433.

11. H. Posse, “Das Deckenfresco des Pietro da Cortona im

Palazzo Barberini und die Deckenmalerei in Rom,” *Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, XL, 1919, p. 168, fig. 26; K. Noehles, “Zur ‘Mostra di Pietro da Cortona’ in Rom,” *Kunstchronik*, X, 1957, p. 101, fig. 3.

12. *Kunstchronik*, XVI, 1963, pp. 99-100.

13. *Op.cit.*

The author did not conceive of this book as a conventional monograph and, because he was primarily concerned with the development of the Baroque style around 1630, he quite understandably treats Cortona's late work with some brevity. Indeed, in Part II fifty-five pages are devoted to the period from 1612 to 1639 while only twenty-one pages are given to the period from 1640 to 1669. Considering the author's intentions and admitting that the factual material necessary for an understanding of Cortona's last three decades of activity is found in the catalogue sections, it seems a little unfair to criticize him for this. Still one cannot help wishing that he had attempted a more thorough interpretative study of the artist's later work since the book will obviously serve us for a long time as the standard monograph on Cortona's painting.

Cortona's work, beginning with the Palazzo Pitti ceilings and culminating with the Palazzo Pamphili fresco, opened the way for a new development in Italian decoration. It would be wrong to see this merely as a continuation of the artist's earlier style. In the 1640's Cortona shifted his pictorial emphasis from the activity of mass to the activity of volume, from ponderous forms to light, swiftly moving figures, and he created luminous, airy spaces in ceilings that lead directly to Luca Giordano and ultimately to Tiepolo.

It is quite natural that one should concentrate on Cortona's monumental secular decorations, for he made his most spectacular and enduring artistic contributions in this field. Yet the old artist could be, on occasion, a religious painter of considerable power. Briganti calls attention to such splendid and moving works as the *Annunciation* in San Francesco, Cortona, and the *Procession of S. Carlo* in San Carlo ai Catinari, Rome; but these works deserve further study.

I have emphasized those aspects of this book that do not seem to me entirely convincing or that seem to call for more discussion. For the rest, a brief summary cannot do justice to this important book; I can only recommend it and report my pleasure in reading it, and also in looking at it. For the publisher has produced a handsome volume worthy of its contents. The black and white illustrations are mostly very good and the color plates, while not of uniform quality, make a real addition to our understanding of Cortona's art.

DONALD POSNER  
New York University

MAURICE SÉRULLAZ, *Les peintures murales de Delacroix*, Paris, Les Editions du Temps, 1963. Pp. 613; 125 figs., 16 color plates. NF 110.

This book presents good photographs and extensive documents on a major aspect of Delacroix's work that is still not well known, the mural paintings which he executed in Paris between 1833 and 1861. Although many students and artists have come to know the three murals in the church of Saint-Sulpice and the *Apollo* ceiling in the Louvre, few have had opportunity to gain entrance to the Palais Bourbon and the Palais du

Luxembourg (seats of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate), where Delacroix painted three extensive projects from 1833 to 1847. Most of these murals are placed high and illuminated by windows that sometimes dazzle the observer rather than lighting the paintings. The generous number of details in the plates of this book will be welcomed by those who already know the murals as well as by those who have not seen them. The spontaneity of brushwork revealed by close-up photographs should disprove the generalization that Delacroix's large paintings are remote from the intimate and personal qualities of his small easel paintings. This generalization has undoubtedly been based on the Saint-Sulpice murals (1849-1861) which are in many respects rigid, and which present a marked contrast with the loose form of the late easel paintings. But the earlier murals in the government buildings are closer in form to the easel paintings.

Although Walter Friedlaender, in his *David to Delacroix*, suggested the importance of a study of the murals to shed light on Delacroix's development as an artist, no sustained studies have appeared beyond several brief scholarly articles and a host of appreciations. This is the first book devoted exclusively to the murals, and its author has attempted to make it a basic work. In several respects he has succeeded; it is unlikely that a better and more thorough collection of photographs will ever be forthcoming, and equally unlikely that there ever will be gathered in a single volume so much documentation on all of the murals. But beyond photographs and documents there is little analysis or interpretation of either style or content. Of the nearly two hundred text pages all but twenty to thirty consist of documents quoted in full or part.

M. Sérullaz's intention to include all the documents relevant to Delacroix's murals necessitated the reprinting of material already published by Moreau-Nélaton and Escholier, and of letters and notes readily available in André Joubin's editions of the *Correspondance* and the *Journal*. To this material he adds critical reviews from newspapers accessible only in Paris, and unpublished official letters and reports from the national archives. All of these sources are presented with meticulous accuracy, but usually without comment. Documents, published and unpublished, are arranged chronologically within the chapter, each chapter being devoted to one of the projects, beginning with the three small frescoes at Valmont, Delacroix's only works in that medium. At the end of each chapter are two pages, more or less, of suggestions of specific stylistic sources for the murals; the introductory chapter (eleven pages) covers the same theme of Delacroix's roots in the past (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, Italian and French painting), quoting extensively from his own writings. The text is, therefore, predominantly a presentation of sources and must be judged from this point of view.

Footnotes are restricted to marginal references giving sources for quotations. The bibliography is chronologically arranged, including reviews and studies on the murals since their completion; it is strongest on