

an American collection and now in the municipal museum in Sens is compared to panels in Baltimore, but the reference seems to be to an Infancy window that has proved to be fake (p.189); the correct accession number is 46.42). Finally, some transatlantic publications were apparently unavailable to the authors: V.C. Raguin, 'The Thirteenth-Century Glazing Program of Saint-Fargeau (Yonne)', in *Selected Papers from the XIth International Colloquium of the Corpus vitrearum, New York, June 1982* (Corpus Vitrearum USA, Occasional Papers I), ed. M.H. Caviness and T. Husband, New York [1985], pp.70-81 (p.203); and M.H. Caviness, 'Suger's Glass at Saint-Denis: The State of Research', in *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis: A Symposium*, ed. P.L. Gerson, New York [1986], pp.267-68, Figs.14-15, for the twelfth-century fragments in Sens Cathedral (p.176).

MADELINE H. CAVINESS  
Tufts University, Medford, Mass.

**Gli Amori degli Dei. Nuove indagini sulla Galleria Farnese.** By G. Briganti, A. Chastel and R. Zapperi. 243 pp. + 62 col. pls. + 101 b. & w. ills. (Edizioni dell'Elefante, Rome, 1987), L.It.120,000.

'The greatest men, those of the first and most leading taste, will not scruple adorning their private closets with nudities, though in compliance with vulgar prejudices, they may not think them decent decorations of the staircase or salon'. This is an opening remark in John Cleland's *Fanny Hill* (1750): it is therefore all the more bewildering that in 1598-1601 Odoardo Farnese, a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, had Annibale Carracci decorate the vault of the gallery in his palace in Rome with the loves of the pagan gods, generously exhibiting their most hidden graces. That he would do so in spite of the recent Catholic condemnation of lustful profane paintings sanctioned by Cardinal Paleotti – later echoed by Possevino, Mancini, Ottonelli, Rosignoli and others in their own writings – is pretty obvious, just as Annibale's competition with Michelangelo's 'stufia' in the Sistine chapel is apparent. It is less obvious, however, that Cardinal Farnese would act in open defiance of Pope Clement VIII Aldobrandini's policy on moral matters, for reasons clearly outlined by Giuliano Briganti in his essay (pp.38-39).

Briganti's essay is perhaps the most important new contribution to Farnese Gallery studies in the text of this book, apart from the new chronology suggested for the decoration of the room and the identification of the *giornate* in the ceiling, as sketched out in a map by Carlo Giantomassi at the end of the volume. Apparently these marginal, albeit important, additions to our knowledge of the Gallery owe something to the extensive knowledge of contemporary archival information of Roberto Zapperi, who contributes an *Annales*-style essay on 'the perception of the human body at the time of the Farnese Gallery'. On the other hand André Chastel's introduction provides a very el-

egant and clear account of the state of research on these frescoes, so that this book can be useful and enjoyable to the general reader as much as to the accomplished scholar. Both can look with equal pleasure at the rich apparatus of coloured and black and white photographs shot by Giuseppe Schiavinotto. As Briganti himself points out, they are the most innovative contribution in this book, for they focus exclusively on details. Even John Rupert Martin's standard monograph (1965) was illustrated with a set of some seventy black and white photographs offering only comprehensive views of the gallery decoration and of each episode in the ceiling and walls. The careful visual investigation now carried out by Schiavinotto's camera through a series of close-ups provides a wealth of information on technical matters which can be greatly appreciated by connoisseurs and is partly commented on by Briganti (pp.27-29).

The new photographs reveal the beauty of such little-known details as the masks and fruit festoons surrounding the major episodes and medallions, the animals (dogs, tigers, eagles, goats) enlivening the various stories, the landscape details and the Parmigianinesque putti in the *Diana and Endymion* episode. Perhaps not all the details are equally significant or relevant to scholarly purposes. Perhaps Fig.100 was included to offer a clear example of how to draw a foreshortened thigh: however because of its framing it rather draws our attention to an appropriate sample of what Counter Reformation prudery would condemn. On the other hand, it is perhaps regrettable that no written comment accompanies the visual analysis of the famous naked youth sitting next to the *Pan and Syrinx* medallion, a figure attributed to Ludovico by Malvasia (*Felsina Pittrice*, 1841, I, p.351 and Schiavinotto, Figs.36, 106 and 110). Martin rejected this attribution without being able to take a close look at the figure (1965, p.54 and Fig.51): still, Schiavinotto's photographs make some differences from the other decorative nudes conspicuous both in design and in brushwork, especially in the use and technique of highlights and shadows. Also his hair looks more distinctively Lombard. This is not to imply that Malvasia's attribution is correct: it simply means that it has some ground to stand on, especially since the overlapping of the plaster layers does not necessarily contradict it.<sup>1</sup> It relies on the same kind of evidence (stylistical, technical and 'psychological') used by Briganti for the head of a putto which he ascribes to an undocumented intervention of Annibale in Agostino's *Glaucus and Scylla* (pp.35-36). Malvasia may have been wrong, but he is neither a liar nor a forger: he is a connoisseur and a good writer.

GIOVANNA PERINI

<sup>1</sup>According to the map of the *giornate*, the nude is later than the terminus and the medallion, but earlier than both the lower part of the medallion's frame with a mask and of the festoon with a mask under the nearest episode portraying *Hercules and Iole*: this festoon however is later than all the frescoes around it. This sequence in execution is not unique in that there is only one similar case on the west side of the vault.

**Netherlandish fifteenth and sixteenth-century paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland.** By Christian Vogelaar. 109 pp. + 92 b. & w. ills. (National Gallery of Ireland, 1987), £IR.30. ISBN 0-903162-37-7.

**Netherlandish Paintings in Soviet Museums.** By Nikolai Nikulin. 359 pp. + numerous col. pls. (Phaidon, Oxford, and Aurora, Leningrad, 1987), £29.95. ISBN 0-7148-2441-0.

Christiaan Vogelaar's volume on early Netherlandish painting is another in the series of substantive, scholarly catalogues of the collections of the National Gallery of Ireland. The physical format of the book is quite attractive. Entries are arranged alphabetically by artist, preceded by a brief biography. In addition, the numerous helpful indices allow one quick access to the chronological development of the collection, the subjects of the pictures, and their previous owners. The reproductions of the paintings range from good to adequate and are augmented by details of inscriptions, seals, and coats-of-arms as well as by judiciously chosen comparative illustrations.

The National Gallery of Ireland has a good but not outstanding collection of early Netherlandish painting. Major artists such as Rogier van der Weyden, Jan van Scorel, or Hieronymus Bosch are here represented by workshop pieces. The collection is strongest in sixteenth-century pictures and includes several facets of Antwerp mannerism. There are several outstanding, important, and fascinating paintings here, and I would call particular attention to Gerard David, *Christ bidding farewell to the Virgin* (Cat.13), Adriaen Thomasz. Key, *Portrait of a Man* (Cat.576), or Pieter Pourbus, *The golden calf* (Cat.189).

In general, Vogelaar is to be commended for having produced a clearly written, comprehensive catalogue. An inspection of the changes of attribution (p.97) made since 1981 may be taken both as a tribute to the diligence of Vogelaar's research and to the evolving nature of the scholarship of early Netherlandish painting. Nevertheless, I found that certain entries were not totally successful.

*Landscape with Judith and Holofernes* (Cat. 1176): admittedly Herri met de Bles is a difficult artist and we must look forward to Walter S. Gibson's forthcoming study of sixteenth-century landscape painting for further precision in regard to Bles's *œuvre*. However, Vogelaar's over-general characterisation of the artist's style and lack of specific supporting arguments, coupled with a rather murky reproduction, did not cast any real light on the relationship of the Dublin panel to other works attributed to Herri met de Bles.

Pieter Pourbus, *The golden calf* (Cat.189): one of the most interesting aspects of the entry on this important picture was Vogelaar's statement that the cross-hatched underdrawing, indicating shadows, was meant to be seen through the thin paint. This is a fascinating issue deserving of further study since in certain of their paintings both Hieronymus Bosch and Gerard David