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Introduction

The paintings of Gaspard Dughet (1615-1675), an artist whose work evokes the countryside around Rome, profoundly affected the representation of landscape until the early twentieth century. Beginning with his immediate followers, from Crescenzio Onofri (c. 1632-1712), Jan Frans van Bloemen (1662-1749), and Andrea Locatelli (1695-1741) and continuing with Richard Wilson (1714-1782) and Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788), the stylistic influence of Dughet’s landscapes found expression even in the work of Paul Cézanne.¹ Despite his impact on the development of landscape painting, Dughet is recognized today as the brother-in-law of Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665) rather than for his contribution to the history of landscape painting. His paintings, unlike those of Poussin, are generally classified as works without subjects, embodying no higher intellectual pursuits.² This dissertation considers Dughet’s extensive oeuvre in the context of the development of pastoral literature and seventeenth-century antiquarian culture through a new study of his paintings for Roman noble families. Specifically, I locate his work within the expanding discourse on the rhetorical nature of seventeenth-century art, exploring questions on the meaning and interpretation of landscape imagery in seicento

¹ In his early study on landscape, Kenneth Clark, Landscape Into Art (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), 70, refers to Dughet as “one of the most underrated artists in the history of painting.” For the connection between Poussin and Cézanne, see the exhibition catalogue, Richard Verdi, Cézanne and Poussin: The Classical Vision of Landscape (London: Lund Humphries and the National Gallery of Scotland, 1990).

² Both Michael Kitson, Studies on Claude and Poussin (London: The Pindar Press, 2000), 287 and Marcel Roethlisberger, Gaspard Dughet: Rome 1615-1675 (New York: Richard L. Feigen & Co, 1975), 25, dismiss the artist as having no interest in portraying higher ideas, such as the passage of time, mortality, or the idealized Arcadia and instead only focusing on the physical representation of a naturalistic landscape. As Roethlisberger states, “there are no involved literary concepts at the base of his compositions.” He argues that instead, Dughet sought to represent the countryside of Rome, evoking the grandeur and beauty of the landscape around the city for his patrons, 22.
Rome. Through the examination of the paintings and frescoes commissioned by elite Roman families such as the Borghese, Barberini, Colonna, Massimi, and Pamphilj, this study proposes an innovative reading of how Dughet’s patrons viewed his art, proceeding beyond the earlier assessments of his paintings as purely decorative to a new understanding of his participation in Poussin’s intellectual circle.

Dughet was born in 1615 in Rome, the son of a French pastry chef and an Italian mother living near the Piazza di Spagna, but his parents insisted upon an education that would prepare him for a better career than his father’s. At the age of six, he entered grammar school, where he began the prescribed course of study, learning Latin and reading Classical texts. Thus, unlike his contemporary Claude Lorrain, Dughet had some familiarity with Latin and would not have relied entirely upon translations of famous passages from texts or help with reading treatises. After his sister’s marriage to Poussin, Dughet began his training in the older artist’s studio in 1631. His earliest biographers, Filippo Baldinucci and Lione Pascoli, record that Poussin swiftly recognized Dughet’s particular talent for representing nature and encouraged his apprentice to pursue a career as a landscape painter. Through Poussin, Dughet encountered scholars and antiquarians, including Cassiano dal Pozzo and Lucas Holstenius, who worked in the Barberini circle and whose collections and writings would significantly influence his understanding of the

---

3 Filippo Baldinucci, Notizie de’ professor del disegno da Cimabue in qua. Secolo V: dal 1610 al 1670 (Florence, 1728), 473, “L’indole spiritosa del fanciullo, fino al età di sei anni, diede a suoi genitori giusto moto di applicarlo allo studio della Grammatica, per quindi portarlo a quello dell’umane lettere” (The spirited nature of the child, up to the age of six, gave his parents just motive in applying it to the study of Grammar, so to get him to learn his letters).

4 Baldinucci, Notizie de’ professor del disegno and Pascoli, Vite de pittori, scultori ed architetti moderni Vol I (Rome, 1730), 57-63. These two biographies serve as the primary, and contemporary, sources for Dughet’s life. Baldinucci’s main source was the artist’s younger brother Jean (1619-1679), who also studied in Poussin’s studio and produced a number of engravings after paintings.
ancient world.

Dughet left Poussin’s household in 1635 and traveled around Italy, visiting Naples, Perugia, and Florence, where he is said to have come into contact with Pietro da Cortona while working at the Palazzo Pitti. He settled in Rome before 1647, when he received his first public commission for the decoration of the church of San Martino ai Monti in Rome. These frescoes launched Dughet’s career and established his reputation in Rome, positioning him to work continuously until his death in 1675. His works graced the homes of the most illustrious families in Rome, as well as those of major artists, such as Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Carlo Maratta, and Charles Le Brun. This connection to premier artists of the day occasioned fruitful collaborations not only with Maratta and Le Brun, but also with Guglielmo Cortese (or Guillaume Courtois, 1628-1679) and Pier Francesco Mola (1612-1666). He also painted canvases for the Spanish ambassadors in Rome and for King Philip IV. Despite Poussin’s connections with the French nobility who were his primary patrons, Dughet, who thought of himself as Roman, did not work for the French. The most influential patrons in Rome, particularly papal families,

---

5 Dughet’s travels are recorded by Baldinucci, *Notizie de' professor del disegno*, 474. If Dughet worked for the Medici family during his trip, the records and paintings are now lost.


7 Michael Kitson. “The 17th Century: Claude to Francisque Millet,” in *Claude to Corot: The Development of Landscape Painting in France*, ed. Alan Winterminte, (New York: Colnaghi, 1990), 11, states that the French court did not commission a single landscape from Poussin or Claude in the seventeenth century. By 1700, however, two paintings by Dughet had been acquired as well as landscapes by Poussin, Claude, the Carracci and Domenichino. Landscape was not a popular genre in France until the eighteenth century. For
embraced Dughet’s paintings, unlike the work of his brother-in-law, by then a famous history painter. Dughet was a prolific artist, producing over four hundred paintings, and his popularity and talent led to enormous success. He did, at times, adopt the surname Poussin (Pusino in Italian) and was more often referred to as Gaspard Poussin than as Dughet in both contemporary documents from inventories and census records, and in scholarship on the history of art up to the twentieth century. He took on only a few pupils, including Onofri and the nearly unknown Jacopo de Rooster.

more on Dughet’s nationality, see Ann Sutherland Harris, “Gaspard Dughet’s Drawings: Function and Fame,” Master Drawings 47, no. 3 (Autumn 2009): 268, in which she cites numerous documents in which the artist refers to himself as a Roman painter. Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, 137-48, also publishes a number of contracts as well as Dughet’s will and testament, where he is listed as “Pusino.”

8 Baldinucci, Notizie de’ professor del disegno, 475, estimates that Dughet’s estate was worth around 25,000 scudi at the time of his death, while Pascoli states that the artist rented four homes – two in Rome, one in Tivoli, and one in Frascati, where he could work in the countryside. Dughet earned far more than the average landscape painters in Rome, such as the bamboccianti, and just a little less per picture than Claude. Based on estimates, he likely received around 100 scudi per painting and up to as much as 300, compared to the 30 or so per painting that the bamboccianti and other Northern landscape specialists were paid. Poussin was paid, on average, around 130 scudi per painting for history subjects and Claude earned about the same for his landscapes. See Richard E. Spear, “Rome: Setting the Stage,” in Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters, ed. Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohm (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 33-113, particularly 97-104 for the economics of landscape painting. Most of Dughet’s earnings were from his easel pictures as he received little for his frescoes. The San Martino ai Monti paintings only earned him 10 scudi for the larger images and 3 for the smaller ones. Spear argues that he likely only agreed to paint frescoes to please his patrons and maintain a close relationship, 99. Interestingly, Spear notes that the despite the lesser fees paid for landscapes because of the hierarchy of genres, the paintings themselves did not cost less for artists to produce as green pigment was typically made by mixing expensive ultramarine blue with yellow lake or ochre and then black and green earth, 104. Baldinucci also states that Dughet could work quickly, producing a painting of five palmi (around forty inches) in a single day (“in un sol giorno poteva dar principio e fine al dipignere una tela di cinque palmi con varie figure”), 475.

9 For Dughet’s will, which is signed Gaspare Duché Pusino, see Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, 140-141. Baldinucci calls the artist Gasparo Poussin in his biography and he was known as Gaspard Poussin throughout Europe.

10 See both Baldinucci, Notizie de’ professor del disegno, 475, who mentions de Rooster and Onofri and Pascoli, Vite de pittori, scultori ed architetti moderni, 62, which states that Dughet had only one pupil, Onofri. Dughet was sharing an apartment with Rooster in 1675, which is recorded in his death certificate now in the Archivio di Stato in Rome, first published by Boisclair, “Documents inédits relatifs a Gaspard Dughet,” Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français (1973): 75-85. Dughet never married as, according to Baldinucci, he was devoted to entertainment and hunting (“il suo genio all’allegria del conversare con gli amici, e tanto il prurito della caccia”), 475.
A monograph, three smaller exhibitions, and a number of articles, most dating from more than twenty-five years ago, make up the current scholarship devoted solely to the artist.\(^\text{11}\) Compared to the scholarly works written on Claude, Poussin, or Salvator Rosa, Dughet is virtually neglected. Marie Nicole Boisclair has catalogued Dughet’s paintings, but her monograph, which includes a catalogue raisonné, addresses only stylistic development and chronology. The lack of scholarship contextualizing the artist, along with a complete catalogue of known paintings on which to base research, has allowed me to conduct more profound historical and critical analysis into perceptions of Dughet’s work in the seventeenth century. While there has been a great advance in the study of landscape painting in the past thirty or so years, with a number of important surveys on the development of the genre and the meaning of such images, Dughet’s works are still addressed only in terms of stylistic history with a brief discussion of patronage.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{11}\) The monograph is Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*. The earliest exhibition was Roethlisberger, *Gaspard Dughet: Rome 1615-1675*, which consisted of only a few paintings. Next was Anne French, *Gaspard Dughet Called Gaspar Poussin, 1615-75: A French Landscape Painter in 17th Century Rome and His Influence on British Art* (London: The Greater London Council, 1980), the most extensive exhibition devoted to the artist, which included paintings and drawings by Dughet and British artists who were influenced by his work. The final exhibition was Christian Klemm, *Gaspard Dughet und die Ideale Landschaft: Kataloge des Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf Handzeichnungen* (Düsseldorf: Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 1981), which presented drawings by Dughet in the Kunstmuseum as well as works by a number of his followers.

\(^{12}\) See for example Mark Roskill, *The Languages of Landscape* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), which addresses, through semiotics, the role of landscape itself in various cultures beginning with ancient Greece and how images of the landscape are read; the essays in *Landscape and Power*, ed. W.J.T. Mitchell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), which connect the rise of the genre with expanding empires in Western Europe, where each country develops its own national style; Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1995), which argues that all landscapes, whether real or painted, are a product of culture. Also see Boudewijn Bakker, *Landscape and Religion from Van Eyck to Rembrandt*, trans. Diane Webb (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), which provides an excellent overview of the religious content and intellectual context for Northern landscape painting. More recent general surveys, which often oversimplify the complex history of the genre, but are nevertheless helpful for their expansiveness, include Malcolm Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) and Nils Büttner, *Landscape Painting: A History*, trans. Russell Stockman (New York: Abbeville Press, 2006). Andrews begins his text by question the definitions of landscape put forth in
the original intent of the paintings. Unlike Poussin, whose works are often regarded as enigmatic puzzles with layers of meaning that can be decoded, Dughet is relegated to the status of simple “landscape painter,” frequently resulting in scholarly dismissal of his paintings as serving a decorative function rather than exemplifying poetic, literary, religious, or didactic metaphors. This study, however, presents a more nuanced understanding of the Dughet’s work as a landscape painter.

In this dissertation, the first book-length study dedicated to Dughet since Boisclair’s monograph, I address the difficult question of interpreting the “meaning,” or more accurately the intention, of Dughet’s landscape paintings. The methodology employed, based on the work of my advisor Anthony Colantuono, is an attempt to recover the *invenzione*, or “the original poetic or rhetorical argument . . . conceived as the basis for a given pictorial image,” that can be understood through examining the elements, composition, and style of Dughet’s paintings, as well as their original context.

the early study by Kenneth Clark, *Landscape into Art* (originally published in 1949), who classified landscape paintings as simple representations of the countryside, which neglects the intricate creative process necessary to distill an open view into a framed picture, 2-4.

13 Boisclair, “Gaspard Dughet: sa conception de la nature et les fresques du palais Colonna,” *Revue d’art canadienne* XII, no. 2 (1985), 215-226, which briefly examines the history of the representation of natural phenomena, arguing that Dughet consciously sought to represent a harmony with nature and connection between man and the landscape.

14 See note 2 above regarding scholarly views of Dughet’s paintings. Even Pierre Rosenberg, whose analysis of Poussin’s landscape paintings is particularly insightful, dismisses Dughet. In “Landscapes in a Noble and Heroic Style,” a brief introduction to a section of his catalogue entries in *Poussin and Nature: Arcadian Visions*, ed. Pierre Rosenberg and Keith Christiansen (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2008), 187, he argues that Poussin was able to give “nature a construction, a range, a role, and a function,” a talent that Dughet, a specialist in the genre, lacked.

15 Anthony Colantuono, *Titian, Colonna and the Renaissance Science of Procreation: Equicola’s Seasons of Desire* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 12. This is in contrast to the recent approach proposed by Alexander Nagel and Lorenzo Pericolo in their introduction to *Subject as Aporia in Early Modern Art*, ed. Nagel and Pericolo (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 9-10, where they define the aporetic method, in which the original intention of the work is an impassable path. According to the authors, works such as Giorgione’s *Three Philosophers*, the Laurentian Library, Titian’s *Le Concert Champêtre*, and Rembrandt’s *Danae*, “have remained difficult to decipher, but . . . that difficulty, and thus a history of difficulty of
*Invenzione* is the primary intent of the patron or artist present within a work of art while meaning is what the viewers understand and perceive. Meaning then is nearly impossible to fully grasp as it covers the conceivably wide-ranging interpretations of all contemporary beholders. Sources for complex works could include multiple and varying literary and artistic models compiled by artists or advisors engaged by the patron to create an original painting. Patrons commissioned art for a purpose: to impart a message about their status or their lives. To create this didactic message, whether instructing the viewer on the history of the family, patrons’ political aspirations, their religious devotions, or erudite knowledge of ancient and contemporary literature, the paintings, like poetry and other literary genres, were constructed through the composite gathering and analyzing of texts and artistic predecessors.

A work of art in seventeenth-century Rome thus had to include some type of rhetorical argument, chosen by the patron or the artist. This dissertation proposes a way of understanding the argument of Dughet’s works, how his patrons viewed the paintings, and the original intent of his landscapes. I approach this through the study of

---


17 This aligns with the iconographical method as defined by Creighton Gilbert, “On Subject and Not-Subject in Italian Renaissance Pictures,” *The Art Bulletin* 34, no. 3 (September 1952), 202, which, based on Erwin Panofsky’s *Studies in Iconology*, describes iconology as “the investigation of the meanings of a work of art, the interpretation of it by its literary or philosophical context.” Gilbert’s definition of subject, however, is far too narrow in scope, equating subject only with narrative. Salvatore Settis, *Giorgione’s “Tempest”: Interpreting the Hidden Subject*, trans. Ellen Bianchini (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 8-10, provides a valuable analysis of Gilbert’s article, stating that his definition of subject is too simplistic because ‘subject’ is certainly not the same as “allegory” or “symbol,” meaning that even if a work has no narrative, it still has a meaning, which cannot be separated from the style, and a subject, whether Nativity or Landscape.
contemporary literature and culture, and through the analysis of paintings by the artist for which the original context is known or still preserved. Any study of Dughet is complicated by the fact that, in contrast to his brother-in-law, he left no letters to friends or patrons that have been traced today, which would aid in evaluating his beliefs and goals as an artist. Instead, my understanding of Dughet’s artistic ambitions, and the purpose of his painting, is based on the study of the rhetorical nature of seventeenth-century art, in this case landscape painting, and on the consideration of his patrons and their scholarly interests. To this end, the dissertation is divided into two sections. The first addresses the history of landscape painting and the genre of pastoral literature, which, in general, is the “subject” of Dughet’s landscapes representing herdsmen in the bucolic countryside around Rome. The second half centers on the scholarly circles in which Dughet moved and on the analysis of ancient paintings uncovered in Rome in the seventeenth century, which influenced both the style and subject of his paintings.

The first chapter of this dissertation places Dughet within the historical context of landscape painting by examining the development of the genre and analyzing the style of his paintings within the milieu of Poussin and other artists. For the purpose of this study, I am defining landscape paintings as works in which the figures, located within an outdoor setting, do not dominate the composition. By the early seventeenth century, the term paesaggio had become commonplace in family inventories. The inquiry focuses on Dughet’s paintings for which the patron is known; the works are often still in their original locations within the family palaces in Rome and the surrounding countryside or they are documented in inventories. A brief biography of each noble patron is also included in order to better understand the purpose of each work, which is the core of the
second chapter, which moves from stylistic history to the nature and meaning of subject. Dughet’s paintings fit within the pastoral mode, a literary genre that began in ancient Greece and continued rising in popularity through the seventeenth century. The paintings also relate to the theory of art and poetic invention described by his master and brother-in-law in various letters. Poussin intended to publish a treatise of art that was never realized, but his thoughts are preserved in letters to patrons and in Giovanni Pietro Bellori’s biography of the artist. Poussin’s notes rely most heavily on treatises on poetry written by the sixteenth-century poet Torquato Tasso, whose pastoral play *Aminta* and heroic epic *Gerusalemme liberata* were highly influential on both literature and art. Poussin modeled his theory of art on Tasso’s principles of poetry, in particular the importance of selecting a subject in which an artist can best display his genius and ambition and executing the work with proper decorum, only including what is correct and necessary.

Dughet’s landscapes correspond to the contemporary idea of art as serving a didactic function and are evocative of not only the complex history of pastoral literature, but of the nature of the landscape itself as God’s creation. In contrast to paintings with an identifiable narrative subject, Dughet’s works are generally not based on mythological, Biblical, or historical stories. Thus there is not a true textual source for the paintings, but

---


19 Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting*, 15-17. Poussin’s patrons often allowed the artist to choose the subject of his paintings and the artist would select obscure themes or present well-known stories with novel concetti, or conceits – metaphors designed to display inventiveness. The artist specialized in smaller cabinet pictures of historical subjects for private patrons rather than large-scale history paintings, altarpieces, or frescoes. His focus on the inventive historical subjects was likely done to distinguish himself from other foreign artists in Rome, such as the bamboccianti who produced genre scenes.
the paintings still convey meaning.\textsuperscript{20} I argue that they are built upon the understanding of not only the generalized concept of the pastoral, but are augmented by the artist’s engagement with ancient Roman frescoes and the scholarly interpretation of such works, the focus of the second half of this dissertation.

The third chapter examines the history of antiquarianism and the study of ancient painting beginning in the early Renaissance and ending with the various scholarly circles in which Dughet worked. By considering not only the intellectual aspirations of his patrons, but also the environment in which he began his training as an artist, the chapter explains how Dughet would have processed the various discussion on ancient Rome. The final chapter tackles Dughet’s interest in ancient Roman frescoes. Beyond stylistic comparisons to the landscapes of Poussin, scholars have not addressed Dughet’s emulation of artistic models, particularly ancient paintings and literary sources. Dughet, like all artists in seventeenth-century Rome, consciously sought to incorporate images and quotations from both art and literature. It is only through the study and integration of earlier models that a work transforms into something new and original – emulation, rather than pure imitation.\textsuperscript{21} The process involves altering the sources and nearly concealing the process to create a novel and innovative work that competes with the very models it

\textsuperscript{20} As noted by Settis, Giorgione’s “Tempest,” 9, “an invitation to identify with a mythological or religious painting cannot possibly be classified as ‘not-subject.’ The emotive response is the meeting point between the patron’s request and the artist’s offer . . . it is also the record of a particular religious attitude, or of a particular way of looking at the past – in other words, a fragment of history.” Settis argues that scholars must try to unlock the response in order to fully understand the meaning of a work and its context. He goes on to note that the study of form and content should not be separated, 10.

\textsuperscript{21} For a concise and insightful summation of the various theories of imitation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see G.W. Pigman III, “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance,” Renaissance Quarterly 33, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 1-32. Although Pigman focuses on imitation in literature and scholarly texts, the same approach was employed in art.
emulates. As Dughet does not generally represent narratives, the sources for his paintings include pastoral literature and, beyond the standard artistic models of his predecessors in the genre of landscape, he also looked to the ancient past in the form of Roman frescoes. This chapter examines how, even beyond Poussin, Dughet sought to connect his work to the few known frescoes and paintings from ancient Rome. Most importantly, the study concentrates on motifs that can be directly associated with ancient paintings, such as natural arches, which suggest the famous Barberini Landscape, a now lost Roman fresco that was believed to represent a nymphaeum, or sacred grotto.

This dissertation presents a renewed and comprehensive appreciation for Dughet’s landscapes and a more nuanced view of his intellectual contribution as an artist. The first two chapters contextualize Dughet within the history of landscape painting and place him within more recent scholarly appreciation for the significance and meaning of the genre, while the final two chapters contribute deeper insights into the role of ancient Roman frescoes in seventeenth-century painting. The representation of landscape has always been intimately linked to cultural identity and formation. In seventeenth-century Italy, artists explored not only man’s relationship to the land, but also the relationship to the past, particularly ancient Rome. The study explores this theme through one particular artist and his patrons and will advance our knowledge of the interpretation of seventeenth-century Roman landscape imagery. The goal of this dissertation is thus to uncover the invenzione – the intended meaning – of the work of a single landscape painter who has been regarded as merely a painter of nature rather than a skillful practitioner and knowledgeable intellectual who incorporated literary and artistic

---

22 Pigman, “Versions of Imitation,” 17, considers the various authors, particularly Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541), who discuss the importance of competition to spur artistic creativity.
precedents in a distinctive and accomplished manner, marketing himself as the ideal landscape artist for Roman patrons.
Chapter 1: Gaspard Dughet and the History of Landscape Painting in Italy

Introduction

When Gaspard Dughet began his career, the genre of landscape painting in Rome had been on a steady ascension since the beginning of the seventeenth century. Although classified as a lower genre in the hierarchy, with history painting still regarded as an artist’s primary and most worthy aspiration, patrons were decorating their palaces and villas inside of Rome and in the country with landscape images.\(^{23}\) Rather than pursuing a path as a history painter, Dughet instead marketed himself as an artist ideally suited for depicting the Roman Campagna, or countryside. His understanding of the history of landscape painting and the pastoral genre in literature, along with his fascination with ancient Roman art and culture all converged in his pictures, which made him one of the most popular and prolific artists working in seventeenth-century Rome. This first chapter examines Dughet’s place within the genre of landscape painting in Italy.

The depiction of pure landscape can be traced back to ancient Greece and Rome, where frescoes of gardens and idyllic views with little or no trace of human presence graced the walls of wealthy homes.\(^{24}\) With the collapse of the Roman Empire in the fifth

---

\(^{23}\) For more on the history of the hierarchy of genres, see the general overview in Gauvin Bailey, *Baroque and Rococo* (New York: Phaidon, 2012), 87-148. Although Giovanni Pietro Bellori, author of the influential biographies of contemporary artists often praised landscapes, particularly the naturalism of Annibale Carracci or the powerful vision created by Poussin, he still regarded the genre as lower than that of history painting. Gaspard Dughet receives only a brief mention at the end of Poussin’s biography as having “succeeded to his fame” through the “representation of landscapes,” see Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects: A New Translation and Critical Edition*, trans. Alice Sedgwick Wohl and Hellmut Wohl (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 333.

\(^{24}\) A concise survey of the early history is provided in the first two chapters of Nils Büttner, *Landscape Painting: A History*, trans. Russell Stockman (New York: Abbeville Press, 2006), 23-70. Also see Eugenio
century, the genre of landscape declined, with elements of the natural world serving only as a backdrop to religious or secular narrative scenes. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, a renewed interest in antiquity and the study of nature led to the rise of landscape, which eventually developed into a separate specialty for artists. For patrons in the Renaissance, images of the countryside served as places of retreat and relaxation. Pictures of pastoral settings became necessary decoration for homes in the city in order to calm the spirits of their owners, providing a respite from their hectic daily lives. From the sixteenth century onwards, landscape was increasingly fashionable and quickly developed into different trends, from the topographic in Northern Europe to the Classical in Italy and France. Constructing a clear linear history of the progression of landscape from the Renaissance into the Baroque is a nearly impossible feat as noted by W.J.T. Mitchell, who deconstructs the evolution put forth by Ernst Gombrich in his early pivotal study on the creation of the pure landscape. Mitchell is certainly correct in describing the history of the genre as complex and incompatible with the neat and continuous line proposed by Gombrich. However, it is possible to survey some of the major developments, beginning with the earliest easel pictures in Northern Europe. This chapter provides a basic overview of the major phases and advancements in landscape painting.


leading up to the mid-seventeenth century, focusing primarily on Italy and the artists whose work had the most profound influence on Dughet’s paintings. It then presents a detailed analysis of Dughet’s stylistic development along with a biographical sketch of his major Roman patrons and the works they commissioned.

Early Landscape Painting in Italy: The Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

The Influence of the North

Although scholars still debate whether landscape reemerged as an independent genre in Northern Europe or in Italy, the first “pure landscape” images, or pictures with no human presence, are almost certainly those of Albrecht Altdorfer (c.1480-1538), a German artist who worked in the early sixteenth century. As in the example here, the *Danubian Landscape* of about 1520-25 (fig. 1.1), Altdorfer’s distinctive pictures were not based on studies after nature, but instead are more fantastical images of the local landscape, seemingly without a narrative or story. Altdorfer’s paintings and drawings focus on the landscape and its lack of figures, its emptiness, as the subject. The paintings depict either forests or mountainous views. Although Altdorfer’s better-known and slightly older contemporary, Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528), produced no images of

---

26 See Christopher Wood, *Albrecht Altdorfer and the Origins of Landscape* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 9. The search for “pure landscape” has, as noted by Mitchell, “Gombrich and the Rise of Landscape,” 104, has become a sort of romantic quest for the early history of pure, or modern, painting. Mitchell also argues against Gombrich’s privileging of the genre, instead suggesting that the rising popularity of landscape painting, particularly in the Netherlands, can be tied to religious issues as Protestants favored the so-called “pure landscapes” without clearly religious subjects.

27 Wood, *Albrecht Altdorfer*, 23-25, notes that the artist was not showing the juxtaposition of nature versus culture, which was a later Romantic interpretation of landscape paintings. Wood argues that Altdorfer chose landscape as a subject as a marketing strategy, much like his other works of esoteric subjects in smaller formats, 19. Larry Silver, “Nature and Nature’s God: Landscape and the Cosmos of Albrecht Altdorfer,” *The Art Bulletin* 81, no 2 (June 1999): 197, observes that Altdorfer preferred the isolated wilderness landscape for his religious paintings, which were appropriate for “meditation or mystic revelation.”
independent landscapes, the backgrounds for his paintings and prints were based on actual studies of the natural world. The narratives in these Northern prints and paintings are set in a naturalistic, but still exaggerated landscape, with the craggy mountains, based primarily on the Alps, serving as models for the Christian Holy Mount, as seen in the engraving of *St. Eustace* of around 1501 (fig. 1.2). The settings for the religious scenes aided in disseminating the moral message of the subject. There is no single beginning point for the history of landscape painting, but various areas in the North, including the Danube, where Larry Silver has traced the wooded images to the nationalism of the court of Emperor Maximillian I, all serve as locations where artists began to produce what are now referred to as landscape paintings. As noted by Beverly Louise Brown, both patrons and artists became interested in landscape because of the need to portray a message, generally a moralizing one, within a naturalistic setting. Landscape paintings, even those images without figures, are not simple representations of the natural world, but express a conceit, whether a political or a moral message.

---

28 For more on Dürer, see the excellent volume of essays, *Dürer and His Culture*, eds. Dagmar Eichberger and Charles Zika (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) as well as the recent biography, Jeffrey Chipps Smith, *Dürer* (New York: Phaidon, 2012). Dürer traveled to Italy twice in his lifetime, working in Venice for a total of about three years.


31 Brown, “From Hell to Paradise,” 425.
Landscape Painting in Venice

The early history of landscape as a separate genre in Italy is difficult to trace as the depiction of the natural world was generally considered the setting for the narrative rather than a separate specialized genre until the end of the fifteenth-century in Venice. This changed when artists such as Giovanni Bellini (c.1430-1516) began creating paintings with more detailed natural settings and when Giorgione (1470-1510) and Titian (c.1488-1576) began producing poetic landscapes. Dürer’s prints, with their elaborate and often fantastical landscapes, had circulated widely throughout Europe and were especially popular in Italy, where a number of artists used his work as the settings for their own paintings. This was most prevalent in Venice in the early sixteenth century, as evidenced in the works of Bellini, such as the St. Jerome Reading of 1505 (fig. 1.3). The settings for these paintings still reflect a trace of Northern influence in the mountainous backgrounds and in the careful description of the natural world, which most impressed Italian artists. For Bellini, landscape is more than just setting; it can reinforce the meaning and intent of the narrative. Here the barren and desolate cave of the penitent St. Jerome contrasts with the fertile countryside in the middle and backgrounds.

---

32 Gombrich, in “The Renaissance Theory of Art and the Rise of Landscape,” was the first scholar to seriously address this issue, linking the phenomenon to renewed interest in the ancient world, as Pliny the Elder had described the landscapes of the Roman painter Studius, whom he believed invented the genre. His assessment was widely accepted for a number of years. More recently, however, as discussed above and in the introduction, more scholars have begun to question his definition of the term landscape and the use of a clear linear progression. For more on Studius and the supposed invention of landscape, see Roger Ling, “Studius and the Beginnings of Roman Landscape Painting,” Journal of Roman Studies 67 (1977): 1-16.

33 Brown, “From Hell to Paradise,” 427 and Agusto Gentili, “Bellini and Landscape,” in The Cambridge Companion to Giovanni Bellini, ed. Peter Humfrey (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 167-181. Bellini creates the environment through the orderly arrangement of symbolic elements. Altdorfer’s compositions also circulated in prints that made their way to Italy and Dürer’s drawings were also known as he worked in Venice.
Artists in Venice in the early sixteenth century began to reflect on the pastoral tradition, a literary genre that addressed the lives of shepherds and celebrated the bucolic landscape, which will be discussed in depth in the following chapter. Enigmatic paintings, including Giorgione’s *The Tempest* (fig. 1.4) of around 1505-10 and Titian’s *Concert Champêtre* (fig. 1.5), dated between 1504-10, appear to depict no set narrative, but instead focus on natural processes or poets in the landscape, and on observation of and mediation in the natural world. Giorgione’s evocative landscape, comprised of rising hills leading up to a city and the aura of savagery in the storm, are based on both Venetian and Northern precedents. The composition is framed on either side by trees and buildings, with a vista at center leading to a town in the middleground. The distant background is obscured by the dark storm clouds gathering over the horizon line, just above the center of the painting. Rather than the collection of symbolic elements interspersed into an idealized view, Giorgione’s landscapes present naturalistic and persuasive vistas of the countryside near Venice. In the *Concert Champêtre*, as in a number of his other early landscapes, Titian represents a vision of the pastoral realm with rolling hills and groves of trees leading the viewer’s eye into the softly receding distance. Rather than the framing trees anchoring the composition, Titian often locates the distant view at the corner of his composition, as in the *Bacchus and Ariadne* of 1520-23.

---

34 Such works are often described as *paese* in inventories and records, see, for example, Marcantonio Michiel, *Notizia d'opere di disegno, pubblicata e illustrata da D. Jacopo Morelli*, ed. Gustavo Frizzoni (Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1884), 195-96. Brown, “From Hell to Paradise,” 428.

35 Lucco also notes that Venetian artists may have first begun producing landscape paintings as a way of competing with the description of Studius in Pliny’s *Natural History* Book 35.
(fig. 1.6), allowing the viewer to imagine the continuation of the landscape beyond the picture plane. Theorists as well as artists stressed the importance of the study of the natural world and philosophy. Later Venetian artists, particularly Paolo Veronese (1528-1588) and the Antwerp born Paolo Fiammino (c.1540-1596), who trained in Tintoretto’s studio, also produced paintings with figures often dwarfed by the landscape. In Fiammingo’s work in particular, such as the *Landscape with a Scene of Enchantment* (fig. 1.7), part of series of scenes from the *Argonautica*, from around 1590, the approach to nature is closer to the Italian models through the use of softened light and the trees framing the composition, which becomes a common element in later landscapes. The higher horizon line and rugged mountains are closer to Northern landscapes produced toward the end of the sixteenth century.

*Leonardo and the Representation of Nature*

The comparisons between painting and poetry as equal arts, an important theme present in the works of Titian and Giorgione in particular, were first raised by the ancient

---

37 See Stephen J. Campbell, “Naturalism and the Venetian ‘Poesia’: Grafting, Metaphor, and Embodiment in Giorgione, Titian, and the Campagnolas,” in *The Subject as Aporia in Early Modern Art*, ed. Alexander Nagel and Lorenzo Pericolo (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 122-23, for a letter of 1502 from Jacopo de’Barbari to the Elector Saxony in which the artist discussed the importance of study after nature. Campbell discusses the letter in relation to de’Barbari’s insistence on artists also knowing poetry, history, and astronomy in order to create proper inventions for their works. The entire letter was published in Jay A. Levenson, “Jacopo de’Barbari and the Northern Art of the Early Sixteenth Century” (Ph.D. diss.: New York University, 1978), 8 and 132.

38 See Stefania Mason, “Low Life and Landscape: minor picture in Late Sixteenth-Century Venice,” in *Renaissance Venice and the North: Crosscurrents in the Time of Bellini, Dürer and Titian*, 565, for a detailed analysis of Fiammingo’s paintings. The artist specialized in various mythological and religious scenes set with in fantastical landscapes rendered with both a Northern sensitivity toward carefully recorded details and a particularly Venetian approach to light and coloring. While Mason’s reading of the landscapes of Fiammingo and other Venetian artists is helpful, she often romanticizes the approach to landscape, stating that “the true subject becomes the reaction of nature, of the atmosphere and of the vegetation itself,” neglecting the fact that the landscape plays a part in the subject, but the natural world itself is never the “true subject,” 567.
Roman writer Horace and resurrected in the Renaissance by theorists such as Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472).\(^{39}\) Prior to the early sixteenth century, the art of painting had been regarded as a manual labor and not a liberal art like poetry. The status of painting only began to rise through the efforts of artists and theorists like Alberti and Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519). Although he produced no landscape paintings, Leonardo’s influence on the development of landscape painting cannot be ignored. The great Florentine master advocated not only painting’s equality to the art of poetry, but more importantly, the study of nature and natural processes rather than the simple copying of backgrounds from Northern prints.\(^{40}\) Leonardo was one of the earliest artists to embark on journeys into the countryside to draw after nature; a pursuit he insisted was the basis for artistic study.\(^{41}\) His studies served primarily as the basis for the backgrounds his paintings, as a method to explore natural phenomena, such as *A Storm in an Alpine Valley* of around 1508-10 (fig. 1.8), and as inquiries for his treatises, which were only published posthumously.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{39}\) See the pivotal study by Rensselaer W. Lee, *Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967), for a thorough analysis. Art theorists seeking to define the nature of painting turned to ancient philosophy and treatises on poetry to raise the status of art, 5-7. Alberti’s discussion of landscape will be addressed in the next chapter.


\(^{42}\) Leonardo’s *Trattato della pittura* was first published in 1651 under the direction of Cassiano dal Pozzo, an important patron, scholar, and antiquarian whose life and collection will be discussed in depth in Chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation. Poussin aided dal Pozzo in collecting notes and producing illustrations and his reading of Leonardo’s ideas influenced his own artistic production and theoretical writings. For
Leonardo’s emphasis on the careful representation of nature developed into the basis for later art of the Renaissance, including landscape painting through the naturalism of his painted settings and use of atmospheric perspective. Although the status of landscape as a separate specialty was ascending beyond that of mere background, it was still classified as a lower genre and less worthy of study than the representation of the human figure.

*From the North to the South*

The majority of the landscape paintings produced in Italy throughout the sixteenth century were religious works in which the setting supported the narrative, though theorists, including Vasari, did stress that artists must be able to depict the natural world. Despite Leonardo’s interest in atmospheric perspective and how best to fully incorporate figures into a landscape, which was his intention in the large scale *Battle of Anghiari* of 1503-05, the depiction of landscape remained a Northern specialty, which Vasari also acknowledged. Landscape had continued as a popular genre and separate

---

43 See Karen Hope Goodchild, “‘A Hand More Practiced and Sure’: The History of Landscape Painting in Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists*,” *Artibus et Historiae* 64, no. 32 (2011): 25-40, who is the first scholar to seriously address Vasari’s discussion of paesi. She notes, however, that the artist was not concerned with “pure landscapes,” but instead was discussing the representation of outdoor spaces of details of nature. Although Vasari classified disegno as the most important skill in art, he recognized the necessity of coloring for depicting a naturalistic landscape. For Vasari, the third era, beginning in the sixteenth century, demonstrates the height of painting, where artists portray distance in the landscape through perspective and coloring, as well as a variety of architectural elements and the glorious variety present in the natural world. The historian and scholar Paolo Giovio also discussed landscape in his biography of Raphael, certainly inspired by Pliny, see Robert Colby, “Dosso’s Early Artistic Reputation and the Origins of Landscape Painting,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 76 (2008): 207-08.

44 Hope Goodchild, “‘A Hand More Practiced and Sure,’” 33-35, Vasari admits that Northern artists excelled at naturalistic details and realistic landscapes, but that they needed to idealize the settings to compete with Italian artists. See Farago, “Leonardo’s *Battle of Anghiari*,” 301, for the lost painting.
specialty in Northern Europe throughout the sixteenth century. In general, Northern artists were viewed as more skilled in the depiction of landscapes. Many traveled to Italy, where they established workshops or collaborated with Italian artists, painting the background settings for religious and secular scenes. Whether in Italy or at home in Flanders and the Netherlands, certain artists focused more on the setting than the figures in the landscape. Large, panoramic views, such as the *Harvesters* of 1565 (fig. 1.9) by Pieter Bruegel the Elder (1525/30-1569) and *Landscape with St. Jerome* of 1516-17 (fig. 1.10) by Joachim Patinir, (c. 1480-1524) dwarf the figures and invite the viewer to consider the natural surroundings and man’s relationship to nature.45 The construction of the landscape, with the viewer set at a higher point, looking down onto the scene, and the use of modulated tonality to lead the eye into the distance, became the standard formula for representing landscapes until the very end of the sixteenth century. This type of landscape, allowing for the expansive view filled with fantastical elements and featuring brilliant colors shifting from greens to blues to depict distance, was enormously popular with later sixteenth century Italian artists who worked in a Mannerist style.46

Recently, scholars have begun to address the landscapes painted by Italian artists in the early sixteenth century, particularly Dosso Dossi (c.1487-1542). Dosso, a court artist for the d’Este family in Ferrara, produced landscapes throughout his career, first

---

45 See Gibson, *Mirror of the Earth*, for an excellent overview of the landscapes of both Patinir and Bruegel, and Mark Roskill, *The Languages of Landscape* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 49-58, for a reading of the choice of viewpoint for the artists. Roskill argues that the higher viewpoint allows the artists to depict the “view as a whole,” 55.

46 Despite the problematic nature of the term Mannerism, the application is particularly appropriate for late sixteenth-century landscapes produced in Italy when using the definition put forward by both John Shearman, *Mannerism* (New York: Penguin, 1984) and S.J. Freedberg, “Observations on the Painting of the Maniera,” *The Art Bulletin* 47, no. 2 (June 1965): 187-197, which describes the self-consciousness of artists working in the *maniera* style and their attempt to improve upon nature.
closely modeled on German prints and then following the more expansive, panoramic works of Flemish painters.\textsuperscript{47} Despite the connection to the Flemish composition style, in terms of the actual landscape and use of naturalistic coloring, Dosso’s paintings resemble the work of Titian, representing an idealized Italian countryside rather than a more dramatic scene of craggy mountains with jagged rocky outcrops painted in artificial hues. This is most clearly exemplified in the \textit{Circe and Her Lovers in a Landscape} of 1514-16 (fig. 1.11). By the mid-sixteenth century, patrons at various courts across Italy had begun to appreciate landscape painting as a separate genre, the reasons for which will be explored in the following chapter. In Rome, however, the rise of landscape did not occur until the end of the century.

\textit{Landscape Painting from the Sixteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries}

\textit{Northern Artists in Rome}

Toward the end of the sixteenth century, as Rome rose again in prominence as an artistic center after the sack of 1527 and the new ideals put forth by the Council of Trent, artists flocked to the seat of the Catholic Church. The brothers Matthijs (1550-1583) and Paul Bril (1554-1626), two of the premier landscape artists in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, produced both artificial and naturalistic landscapes for patrons in Rome, including Pope Gregory XIII.\textsuperscript{48} In the Brils’ paintings, there is a clear distinction

\textsuperscript{47} See Colby, “Dosso’s Early Artistic Reputation,” 202-05, for a brief overview of Dosso’s career and the development of his landscape style.

between fore, middle, and backgrounds, all of which are separated by different shades: often browns for the foreground, greens and grays for the middle, and blues for the distant background, as demonstrated in Paul’s *Fantastic Landscape* of 1598 (fig. 1.12). The color changes, generally using dark *repoussir* effects in the foreground as seen at left in this painting, are a common feature of both his and Matthijs’ landscapes. The horizon is set high on the picture plane, although less so than in earlier Flemish landscapes, but still tilting the image forward, which results in the loss of a sense of clear movement into the far distance.

The Bril brothers’ subjects ranged from the religious to the mythological to purely secular images of peasants in a topographically realistic landscape or cityscape, as in Matthijs’ fresco from the Tower of the Winds, the *View of Rome from the Viminal Hill* (fig. 1.13). More artists in the early seventeenth century began to depict landscapes without any necessarily overt sacred imagery or mythological narratives. Instead, images of peasants and pastoral stock characters, like shepherds and goatherds, began to appear with more frequency. Additionally, Matthijs Bril was one of the earliest artists who used actual ruins from around the city of Rome in his paintings, although these were usually

---

York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), particularly 104-146. Matthijs, the elder brother, actually received the commission, but Paul is often attributed as the primary artist. Courtright argues that Matthijs was entirely responsible for the frescoes in the Tower. The program, she proposes, is designed around the Christian idea of *renovation* and incorporated “ancient imagery for a reform purpose . . . to acknowledge and claim but definitively supersede the ‘pagan’ tradition,” 172. The use of realistic views of Rome with the elaborate scheme serve to show the viewer that the “Christian Golden Age, the earthly paradise, has arrived in the Eternal City,” 172. The connection between writings of post-Tridentine scholars and the renewed interest in landscape painting will be discusses in Chapter 2 of this dissertation. Other major northern artists included the German Adam Elsheimer (1578-1610), who was particularly interested in lighting effects and produced a few night scenes set in the landscape, and Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625), the son of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, who worked in Italy from 1589 to 1596. For more on Elsheimer, see the recent exhibition catalogue Rüdiger Klessmann et al, *Adam Elsheimer, 1578-1610* (Edinburgh: National Gallery of Scotland, 2006). Brueghel the Elder’s work for Cardinal Federico Borromeo will be discussed in the next chapter.
taken out of the original context.\textsuperscript{49} The Brils worked continuously in Rome, aiding in the expansion of the genre of landscape. The growing popularity of landscape painting in Rome, which at the start of the seventeenth century was primarily dominated by Northern artists, laid the way for two Bolognese artists to revitalize the representation of the natural world.

\textit{The Carracci Revival of Italian Landscape Painting}

The development and subsequent rise of landscape painting in Italy in the seventeenth-century is emphatically linked to the Carracci reform of painting. Through Annibale (1560-1609) and his brother Agostino (1557-1602), the idea of the “classical” landscape arrived in Rome at the end of the sixteenth-century, which their followers promptly imitated.\textsuperscript{50} The Carracci, however, did not invent the genre of landscape painting, but filtered what they observed in Bologna and on trips around Emilia and the Veneto, experiencing firsthand the work of Correggio and Titian, among others, to create a radical new interpretation of nature that was founded on their own interests to improve painting by constant life study.\textsuperscript{51} With the arrival in Rome of Annibale Carracci in 1595,


\textsuperscript{50} The major text on the Bolognese impact on landscape painting remains Francesco Arcangeli et al, \textit{L’ideale classico del Seicento in Italia e la pittura di paesaggio} (Bologna: Edizioni Alfa, 1962), which provides a short introduction and detailed biographies of major artists. The recent catalogue, \textit{La pittura di paesaggio in Italia: Il Seicento}, part of a three volume series on the history of landscape, provides an excellent overview of developments in the seventeenth century.

\textsuperscript{51} For the Caracci reform, see Charles Dempsey “The Carracci Reform of Painting,” in \textit{The Age of Correggio and the Carracci: Emilian Painting of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries}, ed. Frances P. Smyth (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1986), 237-254; Dempsey, \textit{Annibale Carracci and the Beginnings of Baroque Style} (Glückstadt, Germany: Augustin, 1977); and also Donald Posner, \textit{Annibale Carracci: A Study in the Reform of Italian Painting Around 1590} (New York: Phaidon, 1971), although the latter is problematic as Posner does not connect Annibale’s artistic practice to theoretical writings at the
and Agostino following shortly after, the status of landscape began to rise even higher.

Although primarily history painters or artists who represented Biblical and mythological scenes, Annibale and Agostino had painted landscapes populated with common figures and used naturalistic colors during their time in their native Bologna, as seen in Annibale’s *Hunting* of around 1585-88 (fig. 1.14). The viewpoint is also much lower than in typical Northern paintings, placing the beholder on the same plane as the figures in the landscape, rather than standing above the scene. The viewer can thus nearly step into the landscape and participate in the activities presented within the countryside.

Both Annibale and Agostino, along with their older cousin Ludovico (1555-1619), set out to depose the leading style in their native city, which was dominated by artists working *a la maniera*, and reestablish an artistic tradition based on the study of nature, but filtered through the artist’s mind. A renewed interest in landscape, a genre that captured the natural world, served as a perfect vehicle for furthering these aims. This coincided with a rising interest in selecting landscape as decoration for palaces in Rome and suburban villas, as evidenced by Gregory XIII’s patronage of Matthijs Bril. Upon time. For the application to drawing, see Clare Robertson, “Annibale Carracci and *Invenzione*: Medium and Function in the Early Drawings,” *Master Drawings* 35, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 3-42.

52 For the most recent study of the brothers’ landscapes, see Stéphane Loire, “Le paysage à Rome: Annibal Carrache et se suiveurs,” in *Nature et Idéal: Le paysage à Rome 1600-1650* (Paris: Éditions de la Rmn-Grand Palais, 2011), 15-27. Although Annibale is often credited as the primary innovator for landscapes, Clovis Whitfield, “The Landscapes of Agostino Carracci: Reflections on His Role in the Carracci School,” in *Les Carrache et les décors profanes: actes du colloque* (Rome: École Français de Rome, 1988), 73-95, argues that Agostino was the driving force behind the push toward landscape as evidenced by the construction of space in his landscape drawings.

53 Clare Robertson, “Cardinals Odoardo Farnese and Pietro Aldobrandini as Patrons of Landscape Painting,” in *Archivi dello sguardo: Origini e momenti della pittura di paesaggio in Italia*, ed. Francesca Cappelletti (Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 2006), 243-63, analyzes two patrons of landscape painting in the early seventeenth century. Odoardo Farnese, the patron who encouraged Annibale to come to Rome, was an avid gardener who wrote botanical treatises, 247. Most of the landscapes he commissioned were intended for decoration of his urban retreat, the Palazzetto, just across from the family palace in the city, and his country villa at Caprarola, 245-48. The importance of villa decoration is covered in Chapter 2. As for
his arrival in Rome, Annibale’s style changed and his landscapes became more idealized as he manipulated the compositions to correspond to the earlier Roman classical aesthetics present in the work of Raphael as in the important Flight into Egypt of 1603-04 (fig. 1.15), but the naturalism of his work is in striking contrast to the artificial tonality and compositions of the Brils and other Northern artists working in Rome. Instead of the dark repousoir effects in the foreground, which prevent the viewer from entering the scene, Annibale employs lighter, more naturalistic colors and an open space that invites the viewer into the picture plane. Like the earlier Northern models, however, the viewpoint is again higher, allowing for an expansive vista. Constructed along a series of planes that are nearly horizontal, rather than dramatically rising diagonals, and framed by trees that enclose the composition, allowing the viewer to focus on the scene presented, Annibale’s vision of the landscape became a model for artists in Rome. In contrast to the often-fantastical images of mountains or forests, however, Annibale’s Roman landscapes represent an idealized view of the natural world – closer to the vision of the Roman countryside cultivated in the estates of noble patrons.

---

Pietro Aldobrandini, Robertson argues that he was likely influenced by Farnese, although he chose to commission landscapes, including the series of lunettes of religious subjects set within landscapes, for his central palace in Rome rather than just for his country or suburban villas, 250-51.

54 See Robert C. Cafritz “Classical Revision of the Pastoral Landscape,” in Places of Delight: The Pastoral Landscape, ed. Robert C. Cafritz et al (Washington, DC: The Phillips Collection, 1988), 99, who describes Annibale’s paintings as fitting the landscapes to Roman Classical aesthetics through the use of geometric arrangements of the planes and the carefully constructed relationship between the natural world and the figures. Also see Patrizia Cavazzini, “Towards the Pure Landscape,” in The Genius of Rome, 223-226, who calls the paintings intellectualized and rationalized visions of nature. For a brief overview of the commission, which was given to Francesco Albani after Annibale’s death, see Catherine Puglisi, Francesco Albani (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 104-06. The lunettes were originally intended for the chapel in the palace on the Via del Corso.

55 Robertson, “Cardinals Odoardo Farnese and Pietro Aldobrandini as Patrons of Landscape Painting,” 253 and see the discussion of villa culture and landscape painting in the following chapter. See Xavier F. Salomon, “Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini’s Paesi: Carracci’s Aldobrandini Lunettes and their context in Rome ca.1600,” in Le paysage sacré: Le paysage comme exégés dans l’Europe de la première modernité,
Domenichino, a pupil of the Carracci, continued the combination of naturalism and idealization that become the predominant quality of art in the seventeenth century. The Landscape with a Child Overturning Wine of 1604-05 (fig. 1.16), likely executed for Cardinal Odoardo Farnese, closely follows Annibale’s paintings. The landscape is a carefully constructed rationalization of the natural world, built along the path of a river that winds into the distance and composed of receding planes that become progressively lighter in color towards the horizon through atmospheric perspective. The viewer’s eye follows the path through the expansive landscape, taking in all of the terrain. Although initial study began in drawing after nature, these works were composed in the studio and were never based on accurate topographical views of the Roman countryside. The construction of the composition favored by Domenichino and other Carracci pupils was expressed in the landscapes of Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665).

*Classical Landscapes: Poussin and Claude*

Poussin, who spent the majority of his career in Rome, worked in Domenichino’s studio as part of a group of artists who gathered to draw after the model, a practice...
reintroduced by the Carracci. Poussin’s landscapes, and his paintings in general, have been the focus of intense scholarship as the intellectual aspirations of the artist are easily visible in his paintings and writings. His patrons were primarily erudite Italian bourgeoisie, such as Cassiano dal Pozzo (who will be discussed in depth in Chapter 3) the French nobility, including Paul Fréart de Chantelou, and wealthy merchants like Jean Pointel, rather than princely or papal families like the Borghese, Barberini, Colonna, or Pamphili. Poussin’s patrons often allowed him to select his own subjects and, for the most part, devise his own programs. He was fascinated by philosophy and poetry, researched his subjects thoroughly before beginning work on a painting, and kept notes on his theories of art, which he likely intended to turn into a treatise. Bellori envisaged


59 Chantelou helped convince Poussin to return briefly to France in 1640 to work as the First Painter to Louis XIII. For the correspondence between the artist and his patrons, see Nicolas Poussin, Correspondance de Nicolas Poussin, ed. C. Jouanny (Paris: F. de Nobele, 1911).

60 For example, in the Rebecca and Eliezar at the Well, painted for Pointel in 1648, Poussin’s only instructions were to paint an image of feminine beauty, see Christopher G. Hughes, “Embarrass and Disconvenance in Poussin’s Rebecca and Eliezar at the Well,” Art History 24, no. 4 (September 2001): 493-519, for the reception and intended reading of the painting.

him as the ideal artist and the “new Raphael,” who could combine an extensive study of
nature and antiquity with his own inventions and thus create paintings that truly reflected
Bellori’s idea of perfect art.⁶²

Poussin’s earliest landscapes, which he first began to produce upon his arrival in
Rome in 1624, reflect his study of sixteenth-century Venetian painting. Works like the
*Nurture of Bacchus* of 1624-25 (fig. 1.17), set in a small grove and dominated by a
mountain rising up to the right, clearly reflect the vision of the natural world portrayed in
Titian’s landscape paintings.⁶³ The subjects of these paintings are generally mythological
characters, often based on the study of ancient sculptures found in Rome, or
unidentifiable figures in antique garb, placed within a shady grove and rendered in
naturalistic earth tones punctuated by splashes of colorful cloth.⁶⁴ In the 1630s, after
Dughet arrived in the studio, Poussin’s landscapes underwent a radical shift in style,
moving from the poetic ideals of Venice, with larger figures residing in enclosed spaces,
to the manner of the Carracci and Domenichino, with a more expansive view of smaller
figures set within the Roman countryside. In the *Landscape with a Man Pursued by a
Snake* of around 1634 (fig. 1.18), there is movement through the landscape along a path,
leading the viewer into the distance, and trees frame the scene. The setting is clearly based on the study of nature and the Italian countryside.

In a 1647 letter to his patron and friend Chantelou, Poussin wrote of the modes of painting, which he based on his study of ancient music. He believed that an artist should be able to change his style, including lines, composition, and color, in order to fully realize the meaning of the subject. Poussin used two terms for style, one that referred to personal (stile) and another for overall, grand style (maniera). According to Poussin, an artist must subordinate his personal style and work in the grand manner, which could be employed for different types of subjects, whether tragic or lyrical. Thus for Poussin, the landscape and its forms had to be treated appropriately based on the selected subject to

---

65 See the entry in Poussin and Nature: Arcadian Visions, no. 27, 192. The patron was likely dal Pozzo. Malcolm Bull has attempted to link the painting to the story of Tylos and the snake, but Pierre Rosenberg, the author of the catalogue, rightly notes the problems with this interpretation. Tylos, who was killed by a snake and brought back to life, was usually represented as driving a chariot with snakes.

66 See Poussin, Correspondance de Nicolas Poussin, no. 156, 370-75 for the letter and Jennifer Montagu, “The Theory of the Musical Modes in the Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 55 (1992): 233-48, in which she notes that the term “style” does not directly correspond to the notion of artistic style in terms of application of paint or use of color. Instead, for Poussin, this relates to proper decorum – the arrangement of the composition, whether employing sharp vertical lines or soft diagonals, should fit with the type of scene represented.

67 For the best overview of sixteenth and seventeenth-century understandings of the meaning and variations of style, see Philip Sohn, Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), particularly the fifth chapter on Poussin.

68 Poussin worked with dal Pozzo on different treatises concerning art, see note 18 above for Leonardo’s Trattato. Dal Pozzo and Poussin also worked on the treatise by Matteo Zaccolini (1576-1630), an artist and lay brother of the Theatine order who composed an extensive manuscript on perspective and color theory, which influenced Poussin’s construction of space and employment of color. The manuscript is preserved in one copy (believed to have belonged to dal Pozzo) at the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Cod. Ashburnham 1212). See Janis Bell, “Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Copy of the Zaccolini Manuscripts,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 51 (1988): 103-125. Gaspard Dughet’s younger brother, Jean, who also trained in Poussin’s studio, copied the manuscript for his master sometime before 1640, when he accompanied Poussin to Paris. Scholars have misidentified Jean, based on the notations by Jouanny in Poussin, Correspondance de Nicolas Poussin, no. 214, 483-86, who thought that Gaspard was the executor of Poussin’s will when, in fact, it was Jean. See Puttfarken, “Poussin’s Thoughts on Painting,” 54-56. For more on Poussin’s theory of art, see Jonathan Unglaub, Poussin and the Poetics of Painting: Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
further elicit the intended response from the viewer. This is visible in his work, such as
the Landscape with Burial of Phocion of 1648 (fig. 1.19) for the Lyonnais silk merchant
Jacques Serisier, with its strict lines, pale tonality, sharply defined contours and rhythms
that evoke the tragedy and dignity of the scene, compared to the Landscape with
Polyphemus of just a year later (fig. 1.20), with its soft lines, more blended contours,
overall verdant green tonality, and undulating patterns that relate to the lyrical nature of
the narrative.\footnote{69}

Roger de Piles (1635-1709), a French painter and theorist writing at the end of the
seventeenth century, first described Poussin’s later landscapes as “heroic,” a term that is
now a standard description of the artist’s work, and contrasted this to the landscapes of
Claude Lorrain (1600-1682), which he labeled as “pastoral.”\footnote{70} For de Piles, Poussin’s
landscapes suggested a greater power and evoked loftier themes than Claude. Poussin’s
landscape subjects are generally mythological, Biblical, or historical events, placed
within the appropriate landscape setting. Michael Kitson has further qualified these

\footnote{69} See Eleanor Windsor Leach, “Polyphemus in a Landscape: Traditions of Pastoral Courtship,” in The
Pastoral Landscape, ed. John Dixon Hunt (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1992), 63-87 for the
sources of the painting. The unusual representation of the scene portrays nymphs in the foreground while
the giant Cyclops at the top of the mountain, his back to the viewer, plays the pipes for Galatea. For the
Landscape with the Burial of Phocion, see the entry in Nature et Idéal: Le paysage à Rome 1600-1650, no.
80, 222. Phocion was an Athenian general falsely accused of treason who was forced to drink hemlock. His
remains had to be carried outside the city and burned, and his widow gathered the ashes (seen in Poussin’s
pendant to the painting). She then buried them within Athens. Phocion was later exonerated and his
enemies executed.

\footnote{70} Roger de Piles, Cours de peinture par principes (Paris: Jacques Estienne, 1708), translated and cited in
Marianne Roland Michel, “Landscape Painting in the Eighteenth Century: Theory, Training, and its Place
in Academic Doctrine,” in Claude to Corot: The Development of Landscape Painting in France, ed. Alan
Wintermute (New York: Colnaghi, 1990), 99. This distinction was recognized before de Piles, but his work
provides the best and most comprehensive summary of the two styles. The French author was inspired by
Torquato Tasso’s poetic theory and the division between “heroic” and “idyllic” modes. See Claire Pace,
“‘Free from Business and Debate’: City and Country in Responses to Landscape in 17th-Century Italy and
France,” Konsthistorisk Tidskrift 73, no. 3 (2004): 168.
distinctions through rigorous formal analysis of the two artists. Poussin, he rightly argues, was hardly interested in light effects and instead preferred an overall clarity that defined and illuminated forms, resulting in a drier finish, whereas Claude was particularly intrigued by changes in light and the ability to represent different times of the day, reflected in the glossier varnish and more polished appearance common in his paintings. Although their works are compositionally similar, employing framing trees and receding planes to lead the viewer into the distance, the two artists could never be mistaken for one another. Claude’s atmospheric landscapes depicting classical ruins and, quite often, shepherds, are the epitome of the pastoral as represented in the seventeenth century, where the quiet atmosphere and softly diffused lighting invite the viewer into the composition.

Kitson describes Claude’s paintings as “nature . . . without ornament and without artifice.” His landscapes were, however, as artificially composed as any other artist. His seemingly realistic images with beautifully diffused lighting are carefully constructed views with framing repousoir effects that keep the viewer’s attention directed towards the foreground before leading off towards the distant horizon, as for example in the

---

71 See Kitson, Studies on Claude and Poussin (London: The Pindar Press, 2000), 182-201. The literature on Claude is also vast, but the most important sources remain the exhibition catalogue, H. Diane Russell, Claude Lorrain: 1600-1682 (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1982), the essays from the accompanying symposium, Claude Lorrain 1600-1682: A Symposium, ed. Pamela Askew (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1984), and the biography by Helen Langdon, Claude Lorrain (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1989). Claude began his training in the studio of Agostino Tassi (1578-1644), an artist who specialized in landscapes, seascapes, and architectural settings, but is now infamous for having raped Artemisia Gentileschi. The recent volume, Agostino Tassi (1578-1644): un paesaggista tra immaginario e realtà, ed. Patrizia Cavazzini (Rome: Iride per il Terzo Milenio, 2008), works to restore Tassi’s reputation as one of the premier landscape artists in Rome in the early seventeenth century, whose work influenced future painters of the genre. Tassi’s frescoes graced the walls of the palaces of the major families in Rome, including the Pamphilj, Borghese, and Rospigliosi. His works relate to the paintings of Matthijs Bril, generally showing topographical views with ruins, but are more naturalistic and closer in composition to the Classical landscapes of the Carracci school.

72 Kitson, Studies on Claude and Poussin, 185.
Landscape with Dancing Figures (The Mill) of 1648 (fig. 1.21), painted for Prince Camillo Pamphilj.\textsuperscript{73} The differences between Poussin and Claude are stylistic and based on their distinctive interpretations of nature and painting as well as their patrons. While Poussin focuses on a more rational approach, with more careful descriptions of the elements and more consistent lighting to achieve his desired effect on his audience, who favored the obscure and complicated subjects he often chose, Claude is more concerned with depicting the Golden Age as described by Vergil and with the effects of time as evidenced by his interest in representing different hours of the day in his subtle lighting. Claude’s primary patrons were the Roman elite and his popularity was likely based on his ability to locate narratives within the landscapes that replicate the territories owned by his patrons and to connect the ancient Roman histories shown to their own lineages.\textsuperscript{74}

\textit{Salvator Rosa and Storm Landscapes}

The work of one other major artist in Rome in the seventeenth century epitomizes a third tradition, beyond the heroic and the pastoral styles. Salvator Rosa (1615-1673), a Neapolitan artist who established his studio in Rome, created works that follow another ancient Roman genre, that of the sublime.\textsuperscript{75} These paintings depict wild and untamed

\textsuperscript{73} See Francesca Cappelletti, “Il palazzo di Camillo Pamphilj e la nascita della quaderia sentesca,” in \textit{Il Palazzo Doria Pamphilj al Corso e le sue collezioni}, ed. Andrea De’Marchi (Florence: Centro Di, 1999), 45.

\textsuperscript{74} See Rosemary Maclean, “‘O Gran Principe o Gran Prelato’: Claude’s Roman Patrons and the Appeal of His Landscape Easel Paintings,” \textit{Gazette des Beaux-Arts} 126, no. 1523 (December 1995): 223-234, for a discussion of how the paintings reflect the status of their owners, a topic that will be addressed in regards to Dughet in Chapters 2 and 4 of this dissertation.

scenes, from gathering storms to dangerous bandits lurking in the outskirts of Rome, as in the *Mercury and the Dishonest Woodsman* of around 1663 (fig. 1.22), done for Prince Lorenzno Onofrio Colonna. Under a darkening sky, the figures, whose clothes are whipped by the wind, head toward the shadowy woods, which are barely penetrated by any light. Trees cracked and torn apart by lighting frame the canvas, rather than the soft and green foliage found in the paintings of Claude. Images of the sublime are meant to overpower the viewer and allow for the suspension of reason and rationality. Although often inspiring a sense of terror, they still allow the viewer to remain free from the actual pain represented in the picture. Rosa, one of the few Italian artists of the seventeenth century who chose to produce landscapes, was as intellectually remarkable as Poussin. Longing to be recognized as a history painter, Rosa nevertheless turned to landscape in

---

“Landscapes,” in *Salvator Rosa*, 126-135, as well as Langdon, “A Theatre of Marvels: The Poetics of Salvator Rosa,” *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* 73, no. 3 (2004): 179-192, for a discussion of Rosa’s connection to the ancient theory of the sublime. The genre includes the wilder view of nature, particularly the storms described by Lucretius in his treatise, *On the Sublime*, written in the first century CE.


77 In the vast three volume catalogue compiled by Luigi Salerno, *Pittori di paesaggio del Seicento a Roma* (Rome: Ugo Bozzi, 1977), only a small handful of the artists are Italian (about 40, but most were history painters who produced landscapes rather than specialists in the genre). Of the primarily Dutch and some Flemish artists (around 20 and 90), a large number were part of the group referred to as the *bamboccianti*. The name derives from the nickname given to the artist Pieter van Laer (1599-c.1642), which translates to “ugly doll,” likely because of a physical deformity. The group of artists specialized in scenes of everyday life of the lower classes in Rome. Italian artists were upset by the increasing popularity of the paintings with noble patrons. Rosa in particular was vocal in his denouncement of the group, criticizing those who collected works of vulgar subjects, like beggars, and yet refused to actually donate to the living poor. See the excellent analysis in Anton W. Boschloo, *The Limits of Artistic Freedom: Criticism of Art in Italy from 1500 to 1800*, trans. Robert Symonds (Leiden: Premavera Pers, 2008), 144. Additionally, although the paintings were criticized as nothing more than unadorned reality and therefore a blow against the goals of the artist, which were to elevate nature and produced idealized forms, the scenes include quotations from ancient and contemporary art and were as artificially composed as any history painting, 151. For further reading on the Italian reaction to the *bamboccianti*, see Francis Haskell, *Patrons and Painters: Art and Society in Baroque Italy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), 132-136. For a brief overview of the various artists working in Rome in the seventeenth century, see the introduction by Ann Sutherland Harris in *Landscape Painting in Rome 1595-1675* (New York: Richard L. Feigen & Co, 1985), 13-27.
his search to represent novel subjects, which led to his interest in the sublime.⁷⁸ Rosa’s landscapes are wilder and more untamed than Poussin and Claude’s strictly ordered nature, with fantastical rocky outcrops, contemporary figures, which are often bandits or other unsavory characters, and tempestuous cloud formations that signal the changing weather. Rosa knew Claude and also Gaspard Dughet, who produced some storm landscapes that differ from the more Classical works of Poussin and Claude.

**Gaspard Dughet’s Career and Stylistic Development**

**In Poussin’s Studio**

Kitson characterizes Dughet as the “purest of pure landscape painters.”⁷⁹ His paintings embody what Salvatore Donato describes as a “luminist sensibility which is closer to the realistic datum of nature and observation of the environment, albeit in the shared, unquestionable idealization.”⁸⁰ Dughet’s paintings fall between the two generally accepted modes of landscape painting, the heroic and pastoral. By creating works that are more topographical than either Poussin or Claude, focusing more closely on the actual landscape rather than buildings or ruins, but still representing idealized and manipulated

---

⁷⁸ Langdon, “Landscapes,” 126, notes that for artists and patrons in the seventeenth century, the “sublime was in harmony with a new sense of the vastness and mutability of the universe revealed by the science of Galileo.”

⁷⁹ Michael Kitson “London: Gaspard Dughet at Kenwood,” The Burlington Magazine 122, no. 930 (September 1980): 644-51, summarizes the views of eighteenth and nineteenth century writers on Dughet as compared to Claude, Poussin or Rosa.

views of nature, and portraying simple peasant types, Dughet’s paintings can be viewed as a blending of the two styles.  

During his time in Poussin’s studio, Dughet would have learned the basic skills necessary to become a painter. This included how to prepare a canvas, which pigments to use and how to apply the paint to the canvas. What he might not have experienced, however, was the typical training for an artist in the seventeenth century. Poussin did not have what was considered a standard studio, as he preferred to work from wax figures rather than live models. Dughet’s figures, in fact, are generally quite small, displaying ungainly proportions and a lack of knowledge of human anatomy compared to those of his master, who trained in a more traditional studio. A number of works are, in fact, collaborations with other artists, including Guglielmo Cortese (or Guillaume Courtois, 1628-1679), Charle Le Brun (1619-1690), Pier Francesco Mola (1612-1666), Pietro Testa (1611-1650), Carlo Maratta (1625-1713), Jan Miel (1599-1663), and Filippo Lauri (1623-

---

81 Kitson, Studies on Claude and Poussin, 15. Scholars have continuously recognized the analogy to the blending of poetical styles. Luigi Lanzi in the Storica Pittorica from 1789 (reprinted in Marcel Roethlisberger, Gaspard Dughet: Rome 1615-1675 (New York: Richard L. Feigen, 1975), 14) even goes so far as to compare Dughet to Torquato Tasso, stating that both “composed imaginary landscapes” and that Dughet was an artist who represented truth. Dughet’s interest in Tasso will be covered in the following chapter.

82 For a detailed analysis of Poussin’s working methods, including a more accurate reconstruction of his wax figures and the box he would have used, see De Grazia and Steele, “The ‘Grande Machine,’” 64-75, also Ann Sutherland Harris, “Poussin Dessinateur,” in Nicolas Poussin 1594-1665, eds. Pierre Rosenberg and Louis-Antoine Prat (Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1994), 36-42 and Pierre Rosenberg, From Drawing to Painting: Poussin, Watteau, Fragonard, David and Ingres (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). The practice of using wax models was not uncommon, dating back to the fifteenth century, but it had fallen out of use by the seventeenth century. Poussin’s studio was also unusual compared to the structure of the workshops of Carracci followers in that he had very few students, just Dughet and Dughet’s younger brother Jean, who are confirmed through documentation. Other artists who likely worked in his studio include the elusive Pierre Lemaire, see Arnauld Brejon De Lavergné, “Who was Pierre Lemaire?,” The Burlington Magazine 140, no. 1148 (November 1998): 739-46, and Pietro Santi Bartoli, who will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 in connection with his work on ancient Roman painting.
1694), all of whom would paint the figures while Dughet executed the landscapes.  
Although Poussin preferred to draw after wax models or wooden figurines instead of employing live models, he did work from models at times, visiting the studios of Domenichino and Sacchi. Dughet’s training was exceptional when compared to other artists working in the early seventeenth century. He would not have worked consistently from the model, from which he would have learned correct human anatomy and movement of the body. This deficiency is reflected in the small figures portrayed in the landscapes.

For landscapes, Poussin left the studio and drew directly from nature, setting off on sketching trips with other artists, including Claude and the German artist and theorist Joachim von Sandrart (1606-1688). As a young student, Dughet would have accompanied Poussin, Claude, and Sandrart, who worked in Rome from about 1627 to 1634, on their sketching trips in the early 1630s, drawing after trees, rocks, and anything that struck his fancy. Baldinucci states that after his return to Rome in 1635, Dughet

---

83 See Marie Nicole Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre (1615-1675) (Paris: Arthéna, 1986), 17-30, for an overview of the collaborations throughout Dughet’s career.

84 De Grazia and Steele, “The ‘Grande Machine,’” 64, Sandrart, who knew Poussin during his stay in Rome from 1628-1635, records the artist going out on sketching trips with friends. Poussin carefully recorded the effects of light and the overall structure of forms, displaying little interest in details. Like his composition drawings, Poussin worked primarily in pen and ink and wash. There are, however, a number of difficulties involving the connoisseurship of Poussin’s landscape drawings. Unless a drawing can be connected with certainty to a painting, it is often difficult to confirm Poussin’s authorship. See Rosenberg From Drawing to Painting, 96-107 and Ann Sutherland Harris. “A propos de Nicolas Poussin paysagiste,” Revue du Louvre et des Musées de France 44, no. 2 (April 1994): 36-41, for analysis of this debate. As noted in Sutherland Harris, “Gaspard Dughet’s Drawings: Function and Fame,” Master Drawings 47, no. 3 (Autumn 2009): 268, Poussin’s landscapes before the 1630s represent only vaguely described types of plants and trees whereas his work after 1630 includes more definable flora, a change that certainly affected Dughet’s evolution and his depiction of nature. It is also possible that Dughet, who grew up in an area of Rome inhabited by many artists and who was interested in art from a young age, may have inspired Poussin’s new treatment of the plant life.
entered Claude’s studio for further instruction.\textsuperscript{85} It is unclear whether or not he was actually Claude’s official pupil, but he certainly absorbed the work of the French artist, as he did other landscape specialists working in Rome.\textsuperscript{86} As Poussin did not execute frescoes, it is possible that Dughet learned the technique from Claude. Dughet’s early pen and ink drawings do, however, most closely follow Poussin’s model of individual studies of trees, rocks, or small groves.\textsuperscript{87} This reliance on careful observations allowed him to understand different types of trees and the natural world in general.\textsuperscript{88} Poussin must have

\textsuperscript{85} Filippo Baldinucci, Notizie de’ professor del disegno da Cimabue in qua. Secolo V: dal 1610 al 1670 (Florence, 1681-1728), 474, “Tornato a Roma, dove avendo fatto molto studio sotto gl’insegnamenti di Claudio Gelle Lorenese, insigne pittore di paesi nel colorigli a fresco, gli fu ordinate il dipignere, nella Chiesa de’Carmelitiani di San Martino ai Monti” (Back in Rome, where he having studied extensively under the teachings of Claude Lorrain, an eminent painter of landscapes in color in fresco, he was ordered to paint in the Carmelite Church of San Martino ai Monti).

\textsuperscript{86} Eckhart Knab, “Observations about Claude, Angeluccio, Dughet, and Poussin,” Master Drawings 9, no. 4 (Winter 1971): 367-383, believes Baldinucci’s assertion because of the similarities between Claude’s frescoes and Dughet’s, which he supposes Dughet could only have seen just after their completion as Claude did not work in fresco after the mid-1630s. Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, 41-42, argues that Dughet most likely accompanied Poussin and Claude on their sketching excursions while he was still in Poussin’s studio and thus would have been introduced to the older artist. Her argument is reasonable as Dughet had already been working as an independent artist for at least five years and would not have found it necessary to continue working in the studio of another artist.

\textsuperscript{87} See Sutherland Harris, “Gaspard Dughet’s Drawings: Function and Fame” and Sarah Cantor, “Gaspard Dughet: Some Problems in the Connoisseurship of Chalk Drawings,” (MA Thesis, University of Maryland, 2005), for the most recent scholarship on Dughet’s drawings.

\textsuperscript{88} There are few preliminary sketches from early in Dughet’s career, possibly due to the fact that he might have painted en plein air, as recorded by Pierre Jean Mariette, Abecedario de P.J. Mariette et autres notes inédites de cet amateur sur les arts et les artistes Vol. II (Paris; J-B Dumoulin, 1853-54), 127-28, “Le Guaspre ne se contentoit pas de dessiner et de faire ses études d’après nature, comme le font la plupart des peintres de paysages. Il peignoit aussi d’après nature une bonne partie de ses tableaux. Un petit asne qu’il nourrissoit à la maison, et qui estoit son unique domestique, luy servoit à porter tout son attrail de peinture, sa provision et une tente pour peindre à l’ombre et à l’abri du vent: on l’a veu souvent passer ainsi des journées entières aux environs de Rome. Des gens dignes de foy me l’ont raconté à Rome.” (Gaspar was not contented to just draw and make his studies after nature, as was common for landscape painters. He also painted much of his paintings from nature. A small ass that he kept at his home, and which was uniquely domesticated, served to carry all his painting equipment, his supplies, and a tent for painting in the shade and protected from the wind, he was often seen spending the entire day in the environs of Rome. Notable trustworthy people recounted this to me in Rome). Philip Conisbee, “Pre-Romantic Plein-air Painting,” Art History 2, no. 4 (December 1979): 413-428, discusses the history of plein-air painting, including Mariette’s comments on Dughet. He identifies three oil studies by Dughet that may have been painted directly on site. Although a number of Dughet’s paintings are based on actual sites around Rome, including Tivoli, the majority are idealized, imaginary views. Even if Dughet did paint directly from nature,
recognized his brother-in-law’s precocious talent for representing nature during these trips and, aware of the shortcomings of his own studio practice, encouraged the younger artist to pursue a career as a specialist in landscape painting, a genre that was not as well-respected as history painting in the early seventeenth century, but was certainly profitable for a talented and charismatic artist.89 Dughet learned how to market his works toward an ideal audience – the most powerful families residing in Rome who would commission paintings and frescoes from him to grace both their palaces in the city and suburban villas.

*Dughet’s Stylistic Development and Works for Roman Patrons*

Dughet’s biographers Baldinucci and Pascoli divided his development into three phases, which, based on documented works, appears to be a valid and accurate survey of Dughet’s chronology.90 The earliest period is the most naturalistic and continues into the 1640s, seen here in a scene from the frieze done for the Muti-Bussi family in about 1638-89

---

89 There was a rising respect for landscape painting in Rome in the seventeenth century as evidenced by the number of patrons and paintings produced. Landscape painters, including Dughet, were also accepted into the Accademia di San Luca. See Roland Michel, “Landscape Painting in the 18th Century,” 99-109, for an analysis of the views on landscape painting in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Also see Salerno Pintorri di paesaggio del Seicento a Roma, 519, where the author notes that Carlo Maratta, a classical artist and president of the Academy of St. Luke, worked with Dughet. As Salerno notes, landscape “was appreciated even in classicist circles.” Dughet is recorded as a member of the Accademia in 1657 see Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, 139, for the records of Dughet’s attendance at meetings as early as 1634, when he was still living in Poussin’s household. He was voted in as an academician at the age of forty-two on the same day as Guglielmo Cortese, his frequent collaborator for Pamphilj family commissions.

90 See Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, 31-71 for a complete overview of Dughet’s stylistic development and major works from each period. She follows both Baldinucci and Pascoli, dividing the phases into early style, first maturity, and grand maturity. Also see Marcel Roethlisberger, Gaspard Dughet: Rome 1615-1675 (New York: Richard L. Feigen & Co, 1975), 22-27.
The frieze is composed of scenes of landscapes and seascapes, in elaborate painted frames, alternating between ovals and rectangles, and connected by a garland painted to resemble stucco. The figures represented are all peasants or hunters, with some in contemporary clothing and others dressed all’antica. In paintings such as the Muti-Bussi fresco, Dughet focuses on details, describing each tree and plant. His work often recorded smaller areas, concentrating on a section of the forest, or even just a group of one or two trees, painted in the rich greens and browns typical of Poussin’s landscapes in the 1620s and 30s, but with a finish that is even drier than that of his master. Dughet’s brushstrokes are often clearly visible and the paint is applied in thin layers, even allowing some of the ground to show through, as in the Landscape with Hunters of around 1638-40 (fig. 1.24), originally in the collection of Chigi family. It is now generally accepted that the group of paintings and drawings of forest scenes once given to the Silver Birch Master are, in fact, some of the earliest examples of Dughet’s work. In these and other early paintings, the thicker and rough brushwork is applied in patches with patterns of light hitting the landscape, trees, and foliage.

---

91 Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 48, fig. 67, 180-81, who dates the frieze to the mid 1630s. Her dating of the fresco cycle has recently been questioned in Ilaria Miarelli Mariani and Claudia Viggiani, “La decorazione secentesca, le collezioni e il fregio Dughet,” in Palazzo Muti Bussi all’Aracoeli, ed. Roberto Di Paola (Rome: Edindustria, 2006), 142-150, and the authors place the frieze in the later 1630s through early 1640s. The frieze is located in a room on the piano nobile, at the end of a large salon. See Miarelli Mariani and Viggiani, “La decorazione secentesca, le collezioni e il fregio Dughet,” 43-44.

92 See Giancarlo Sestieri, “Gaspard Dughet: L’arte del paesaggio a Palazzo Muti Bussi,” in Palazzo Muti Bussi all’Aracoeli, 157-167, for a full description of each scene.

93 Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 66, fig. 90, 187.

94 Anthony Blunt, “Poussin Studies V: The Silver Birch Master,” The Burlington Magazine 92, no. 564 (March 1950): 69-73, was the first to group these paintings together and created the name, based on the species of tree represented in all the paintings. He believed that the paintings and connected drawings were done by a follower of Dughet in the 1640s. In a later letter, “The Silver Birch Master, Nicolas Poussin, Gaspard Dughet and Others,” The Burlington Magazine 122, no. 929 (August 1980): 577-582, Blunt
The second phase, beginning in the 1650s, is more classical, characterized by idealized landscapes with more open and balanced compositions that are closer to Poussin’s work from the same time. It was during this period that Dughet began work on the commission that launched his career, the fresco cycle covering the walls of San Martino ai Monti (figs. 1.25-26), starting in 1647 and continuing until 1651.\(^{95}\) The frescoes, which depict events from the lives of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, whom the Carmelites believed were the true founders of their order, were a popular stop for tourists and artists alike, well into the nineteenth century. The works from this time reflect Dughet’s study of Claude and the Carracci school, with a more expansive vision of the space, carefully ordered compositions, and clear, bright lighting. Dughet devoted a great deal of time to planning each fresco for San Martino, as shown by the number of surviving drawings. This was his most important commission to date and would establish attributed the paintings and drawings to Dughet. The letter was written in reaction to Clovis Whitfield’s article “Poussin’s Early Landscapes,” *The Burlington Magazine* 121, no. 910 (January 1979): 10-19, in which the author gave all the works in the group to Poussin himself. Whitfield also observed that the trees in the paintings were not, in fact, silver birches as this species is not common in southern climates.

\(^{95}\) Much scholarship has been devoted to this series, which was begun by Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi (1606-1680), a Bolognese landscape painter and finished by Dughet after Grimaldi was called to France by Cardinal Mazarin to work for the royal court. See Ann B. Sutherland, “The Decoration of San Martino ai Monti-I,” *The Burlington Magazine* 106, no. 731 (February 1964): 58-69 and “The Decoration of San Martino ai Monti-II,” *The Burlington Magazine* 106, no. 732 (March 1964): 115-120, for the documents connected with the project and for descriptions of each artist’s contribution to the series. Also see Ann Sutherland Harris, “A Lost Drawing by Dughet for a Fresco by Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi,” *The Burlington Magazine* 110, no. 780 (March 1968): 142-145, for an analysis of which artist was in charge of designing the frescoes. Harris believed that Dughet might have executed the initial designs for the frescoes, not Grimaldi. She has since retracted this argument, which was based on a drawing believed to be by Dughet for one of Grimaldi’s frescoes. For a complete investigation of the iconography of each fresco, see Susan J. Bandes, “Gaspard Dughet and San Martino ai Monti,” *Storia dell’arte* 26 (1976): 45-60. Finally, for the best analysis on the dating of the frescoes, see Johanna Heideman, “The Dating of Gaspard Dughet’s Frescoes in San Martino ai Monti in Rome,” *The Burlington Magazine* 122, no. 929 (August 1980): 540-546. The author disputes Harris’s earlier argument that Dughet was first given the commission. Instead, she argues that Dughet only took over the decoration of the church after Grimaldi left for Paris in the fall of 1648, which seems more logical as Grimaldi was the older artist with an established reputation. See Bandes, “Gaspard Dughet and San Martino ai Monti,” for a complete history of the order and the relevance of the episodes depicted in the frescoes. Pietro Parboni executed a series of engravings after the frescoes as late as 1810.
his reputation in Rome. There are four drawings attributed to Dughet for the single fresco of *The Anointing of the Kings* alone (fig. 1.26).\(^9^6\) While close to the final paintings, there are some differences, most notably in the absence of figures. Dughet may have completed the initial composition studies before consulting with the advisor on the project, J.B. de Lezana, an assistant general of the Carmelite order and friend of prior general Filippini, who commissioned the decoration of the church, likely on the occasion of his election to prior.\(^9^7\) The drawings from San Martino ai Monti were done at the start of Dughet’s classical phase and are characterized by more open spaces and a lower horizon. In the final paintings at San Martino, Dughet’s lighting becomes softer and closer to Claude’s, although his palette is comprised of more neutral colors and earth tones.

While Dughet was working on the frescoes, Pope Innocent X visited the church in 1649. This was a critical moment for Dughet as he was welcomed into the fold of papal

---

\(^{96}\) These drawings are thoroughly discussed in Sutherland Harris, “Gaspard Dughet’s Drawings: Function and Fame,” 278-83. They include a study at the Fogg Museum, Harvard University, (pen, brown ink and brown wash, 305 x 280 mm) and one at Städelches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt (pen, brown ink and brown wash, 197x 142 mm). Both are accepted by Harris as autograph. The other two, at the Hermitage, St. Petersburg (brush tip and brown ink, 412 x 403 mm) and at Chatsworth (black chalk with touches of white chalk, 428 x 309 mm) are rejected by Harris. She believes the Hermitage drawing may have been done by Dughet’s pupil, Crescenzo Onofri, who used the same composition for a painting at the Palazzo Doria Pamphilj, see Salerno, *Pittori di paesaggio del Seicento a Roma*, cat. no. 108.11. As for the Chatsworth drawing, which is the only one of the four to include figures, Harris considers the handling of the chalk too “finicky.” The figures in the drawing do not correspond to the final painting. It was suggested that Dughet made the drawing for his own records and planned to reuse his composition at a later date, but no painting exists, nor did Dughet ever exactly repeat a composition. Also see Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 94, fig. 126, 197-98.

\(^{97}\) For more on the project see Heideman, “The Dating of Gaspard Dughet’s Frescoes in San Martino ai Monti in Rome,” 545 and Bandes, “Gaspard Dughet and San Martino ai Monti.” Lezana was composing a treatise on the history of the order and the ideal choice to aid the artist. Such a complex and uncommon iconographical project could not have been the invention of Dughet. He would have had direction as to exactly which figures to include for the obscure subjects and the placement within the landscape, although the design of the setting itself was likely left to the artist. The unusual choice of landscape frescoes harkened back to the early decades of the seventeenth century as artists, such as Matthijs and Paul Bril, painted landscapes in religious settings. But the scale of the project, covering the walls of the church, was unprecedented.
For the next decade, Dughet worked for both Innocent X at the Palazzo Pamphilj at Piazza Navona, painting a frescoed frieze in one of the receiving rooms in the newly renovated family palace around 1649 (fig. 1.27), and for his nephew, Camillo Pamphilj (1622-1666). Camillo was made a cardinal soon after Innocent’s election, but renounced the cardinalate to marry Olimpia Aldobrandini, a widow who inherited her family’s palace on the Via del Corso, what is today known as the Galleria Doria-Pamphilj. For Camillo, Dughet painted a series of easel paintings, including collaborations with Guglielmo Cortese dating from about 1651-53 with religious subjects, such as the (fig. 1.28) and a number of landscapes with no figures done a few years later that now hang in the main gallery of the palace (fig. 1.29), which at the time was the primary receiving room. Stylistically, the paintings relate to the San Martino

---

98 Cappelletti, “Il palazzo di Camillo Pamphilj e la nascita della quaderia sentesca,” 46-47. Susan Russell, “A Taste for Landscape: Innocent X and Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona,” in Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome, ed. Jill Burke and Michael Bury (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 155-170, argues that Innocent X was first interested in landscape painting, a pursuit that was then picked up by his nephew, who would cover the walls of his palace and villas with scenes of the countryside.

99 See Stephanie Leone, The Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona: Constructing Identity in Early Modern Rome (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2008), for the complete history of the palace and the renovations undertaken after Innocent was elected pope in 1644. Dughet’s frieze was in the first anticamera. Also see Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 103-106, figs. 144-147, 201-03.

100 For the history of that palace, see Il Palazzo Doria Pamphilj al Corso e le sue collezioni. Olimpia’s inheritance also included the extensive art collection, with works by Titian, Raphael, and other Renaissance masters, and also the landscape lunettes of the Carracci studio (fig. 1.15). Dughet also painted frescoes for other Pamphilj properties, including a frescoed room dating from 1658-59 in the palace at Valmontone, for which Pier Francesco Mola executed the figures, see Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 171-175, figs. 213-217, 226 for Dughet’s work and Barbara Fabjan and Monica Di Gregorio, Palazzo Doria Pamphilj a Valmontone (Rome: Viviani, 2004) for the palace in general.

101 The room has been called the Salone del Poussin since the eighteenth century as recorded in documents concerning restoration work at the palace (Archivio Doria Pamphilj, Libro Mastro 1769, Parte I, n. 270, Filza 111). For the use of space within palaces, which included a progression of receiving rooms for visitors, see the pivotal study by Patricia Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces: Use and the Art of the Plan, (New York: The Architectural History Foundation, 1990), and also Waddy, “Many Courts, Many Spaces,” in The Politics of Space: European Courts ca. 1500-1700, ed. Marcello Fantoni et al (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2009), 209-230, for a brief overview. A guest’s rank would determine the location within the palace where the host would greet him or her. By the later seventeenth century, the nobility were designing specific audience rooms for the greeting of guests depending on rank. The century also saw the
frescos, usually having a lower vantage point and depicting a rocky countryside, close to the actual topography around the city of Rome. The intense naturalism of the Pamphilj canvases without figures contrasts with the more classical and clearly idealized vision of the landscape visible in the frescoes from San Martino and the Palazzo Pamphilj at Piazza Navona. Although the majority of the paintings produced in the 1650s resemble the frescoes, such as the *Landscape with Hunter and Cowherds* of 1653-54 (fig. 1.30), as they are closer to the Classical style – more expansive views, clearly designated paths for the viewer to follow, and a brighter color palette – Dughet would manipulate his style to suit the interests of his patron.  

The third period in Dughet’s stylistic development, lasting from the early 1660s until his death, incorporates a more lyrical approach to nature and more dramatic settings. The greatest examples from this time are the works done for the Borghese family (fig. 1.31), and for Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna (1637-1689), which included a frescoed apartment (fig. 1.32) and a series of gouache, or opaque watercolor, on canvas, which were hung in a room at the end of the main gallery (fig. 1.33-35). The Borghese frescoes, commissioned by Giovan Battista Borghese (1639-1717), are in the apartments of his wife, Eleonora Boncampgni on the mezzanine in rooms added in a rebuilding

---

102 Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 133, colorplate III, 212-13. The painting may have belonged to the Colonna family as recorded by a nineteenth-century visitor to the English estate Charlton Park.

103 For the paintings, see Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 376, fig. 409, 284 and cat. nos. 300-313, figs. 340-347, 263-66.
campaign overseen by the architect Carlo Rainaldi. The ceiling fresco consists of four landscapes framed by elaborate decorative elements and images of flowers and plants. Dughet also painted the landscapes for frescoes with mythological scenes in another room in the same set of apartments for which Filippo Lauri executed the figures. The frescoes are richer and brighter in color than the majority of works of the previous period, while the compositions are closer in arrangement to the classical works of the Carracci followers. In contrast to the smaller framed scenes of the Borghese frescoes, the apartment for the Colonna family is a continuous panoramic vista that stretches from floor to nearly ceiling. The frescoed landscape, with a lower horizon line, presents an expansive view of the countryside, moving from valleys to mountains. These later paintings, often described as picturesque and romantic, were the most sought after by collectors, especially British travelers on the Grand Tour. Illustrating “undisciplined nature,” the landscape was often broken and rocky and included a body of water, such as a lake, a river, or Dughet’s favorite motif, a waterfall, as in the examples represented here, from the gouache series (fig. 1.34-35), dating to around 1671-73. As a result of


106 Salerno, *Pittori di paesaggio del Seicento a Roma*, 528. The choice of medium for this series will be covered in the fourth chapter of this dissertation. Also see Natalia Gozzano, *La quadreria di Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna: Prestigio nobiliare e collezionismo nella Roma barocca* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2004), 49-101, for more on Colonna and 194-96, for Dughet’s paintings as listed in inventories from 1664, 1674, and 1689, which included at least thirty-seven works. The gouache series consisted of twelve paintings, still in their original location, see Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 351-362, figs. 386-403, 278-82; and Eduard A. Safarik, *Palazzo Colonna* (Rome: De Luca Editori d’Arte, 2009), 148.
the medium, this group of paintings is even brighter in tonality and drier in finish than the earliest works from the beginning of Dughet’s career. The more open compositions, featuring a return to primarily earth tones, present a more naturalized vision of the Roman countryside than the paintings of Claude, Poussin, or Rosa. For patrons, Dughet’s work represented a perfect vision of the Campagna, which they displayed prominently in their palaces and villas.

**Conclusion**

All of Dughet’s work focuses on the interaction of light and shade to create movement and distinctive planes that make the landscape come alive. Based on the classical tradition established in Rome by the Carracci revival of landscape, Dughet’s paintings represent idealized views of the actual Roman countryside, often populated with figures in classical dress. Unlike his brother-in-law, he concentrates on depicting simple, lovely views populated with tranquil and contented peasants, instead of representing narratives of obscure ancient and Biblical texts. As discussed in the introduction, this seeming lack of identifiable subject resulted in scholarly dismissal of Dughet’s work as pure landscape without any deeper intellectual meaning. The following chapters will dispel this myth, beginning by placing Dughet’s work in the context of the development of the pastoral genre in literature and art.
Chapter 2: The History of the Pastoral Genre and the Subject of Dughet’s Landscape Paintings

Introduction

Dughet’s paintings, populated with herdsman in the Roman countryside, embody the concept of the pastoral genre. Pastoral poetry originated in ancient Greece with Theocritus’s verses on musical shepherds and goatherds and continued in Rome with Vergil’s better-known Eclogues. Revived in the fifteenth century, pastoral poems and plays were enormously popular in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Also referred to as bucolic, these poems stress the idea of the landscape as a place of retreat and contemplation where one could escape from life in the city and time itself. In pastoral poems, herdsmen compose verses or sing of themes of unrequited love or death, standing in for the poet himself. The herdsman becomes a “natural philosopher,” living “a life of contemplation and true peace” in harmony with nature.

The literary genre is defined today through its focus on retiring to the country, the complete contrast to daily urban life, and the apparent glossing over of the social reality of peasant life. But the escape to the forest or pastures is not a simple holiday – as described by Charles Segal, “the civic realm is always there as the implied opposite pole

107 The scholarship on the pastoral genre and its many authors is vast. Neglected by scholars until the 1950s, since then, there have been numerous focused studies on individual poets and on defining the genre. For general overviews, see Terry Gifford, Pastoral (New York: Routledge, 1999), Paul Alpers, What is Pastoral? (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), Annabel Patterson, Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987), and E. Kegel-Brinkgreve, The Echoing Woods: Bucolic and Pastoral from Theocritus to Wordsworth (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1990).


109 Gifford, Pastoral, 1-2. The precise meaning of the term is still debated by scholars, but for this dissertation, pastoral shall refer to literature, poetry (in any form), and art that references herdsmen in an idealized setting and where there is generally a conflict or clear disparity between civilization and nature as it was understood in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
of the bucolic experience.”¹¹⁰ There is an aspect of timeless ness in pastoral literature and imagery that still resonates today in the artifice of creating a diversion from the reality of the world.¹¹¹ Pastoral poetry, from its earliest inception, revels in this contrast as a truly conceptual and artistic form. The landscape became a site of contemplation and poetic invention, the ideal locus of artistic genius.

This chapter begins with the early history of the pastoral in Hellenistic Greece and then moves to an analysis of the most influential poems on Renaissance literature, the Eclogues of Vergil. The discussions shifts from the early history to the revival of the pastoral in the later fifteenth century, primarily looking at the poems and prose of Jacopo Sannazaro and his influence on the birth of the pastoral painting. The renewed interest in the pastoral and the view of the countryside as an idealized place of retreat and contemplation coincides with the rise of villa culture and the construction of a number of country estates and gardens in the Renaissance. The importance of villa life, where one can rest and indulge in the beauty and beneficial effects of nature, was stressed in the writings of Pliny the Younger and expounded by Renaissance theorists, such as Leon Battista Alberti. The approach to the decoration of villas also expanded into a theoretical discussion on the importance of the type and nature of imagery to include, with the representation of landscape as the most prominent element. This debate on the genre of landscape painting influenced both contemporary and later artists and the representation of nature in their images. This brief overview and background provides the basis for how later artists regarded the texts and applied the term pastoral to their paintings.


¹¹¹ Segal, Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral, 3–4.
The chapter then focuses on the seventeenth century and the popularity of the poems of Torquato Tasso. His play *Aminta* and the pastoral interludes from the famous *Gerusalemme Liberata* were rich sources for both history and landscape paintings. After Giovanni Battista Agucchi commissioned a painting of Erminia and the shepherds from Ludovico Carracci in the early seventeenth century, scenes from the epic poem became a favorite theme for artists, including Dughet. Tasso’s epic, which juxtaposes a Christian narrative onto an ancient genre, is not the only instance of the connection between landscape and religious thought. The writings of Cardinal Federico Borromeo, who was an important patron of landscape painting, were hugely influential for the development of the genre in Rome in the seventeenth century and the linking of the pastoral landscape to spirituality.

Beyond the implied connection to Vergil or Tasso, pastoral imagery, with its melancholic atmosphere and nostalgia for antiquity, was most effectively assimilated into landscape painting in the work of Poussin, Claude, and, above all, Dughet. The final section addresses the important, and sometimes overlooked, concept of subject matter in Dughet’s paintings. Unlike Poussin, Dughet rarely relies on myths, historical texts, or the Bible for inspiration for his work. His patrons did not insist on the representation of recognizable characters or obscure poems or stories. Instead, the subject of Dughet’s work is the landscape itself, inhabited by herdsmen tending to their flocks, and relating to the entire history of the pastoral genre, joining Vergil’s Arcadia to contemporary politics and Christianity.
The Development of the Genre

The Birth of the Pastoral: Theocritus and His Followers

The earliest pastoral poems are those of Theocritus, who lived in Sicily in the early Hellenistic Period, and who also travelled to Alexandria.\textsuperscript{112} His collection of verse, now known as the \textit{Idylls}, comprises around twenty poems along with a few epigrams and the longer \textit{Syrinx}, all written in varying styles and dialects. Most of the bucolic poems were composed in the Ionic dialect, spoken in Sicily at the time, and viewed by later scholars, particularly from the sixteenth century, as indicating “rusticity.”\textsuperscript{113} The characters of the poems are generally of the lower class and discuss daily life, mostly of tending flocks in the countryside.\textsuperscript{114} They reside in a \textit{locus amoenus}, the idealized natural setting, where difficulties of the world are forgotten. In a few of the \textit{Idylls}, nature itself plays a role, responding to the mood of the characters – the “pleasant place” described by Theocritus becomes almost alive.\textsuperscript{115} While seemingly based in the reality of the bucolic countryside of what is identified as southern Italy, the pastoral realm created by Theocritus is imbued with mythic origins and artistic connotations.\textsuperscript{116} One major

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{112} See Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 3-42 for an overview of Theocritus’ life and work. The secure dates that can be deduced from references in his writings, appeals to rulers as his patrons, are 275/4 and 274-70 BCE. The title of his collection actually translates to “poems in various styles,” and \textit{Idylls} is a later term applied to the poems.
  \item \textsuperscript{113} Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 5, proposes that rather than relating to Sicilian shepherds, Theocritus’ choice of dialect was based on the use of the mime, a form of poetry relating a dramatic scene in which the characters are the speakers rather than a narrator.
  \item \textsuperscript{114} A recurrent character in the \textit{Idylls} and later poetry is that of Daphnis, who appeared in Homer’s \textit{Odyssey} and was later identified a neatherd (or cowherd) who was from Sicily. See Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 17-18. Daphnis was believed to have been the creator of bucolic songs and established the genre.
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 137.
  \item \textsuperscript{116} Segal, \textit{Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral}, 210-234 and Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 40-41.
\end{itemize}
mythological character who appears in the poems is the god Pan, the half-man and half-goat deity of herdsman whose homeland was Arcadia.\(^{117}\) The herdsmen in the poems call upon him and refer to other gods and mythological figures, such as Aphrodite and Polyphemus. Theocritus draws upon the Greek literary tradition, most importantly Homer and Hesiod, to construct a new world for his characters.

David Halperin argues that Theocritus did not set out to create a new genre of poetry, but instead used imagery from Homer’s epic poems as the basis for his bucolic verses.\(^{118}\) Other poets followed his lead, composing verses on rustic themes, which were categorized under the genre of epic because the majority employ dactylic hexameter and also because the themes explicitly are in contrast with the grandeur of heroic poems.\(^{119}\) There is a dichotomy between the supposed simplicity of the characters in the bucolic verses and the highly rhetorical poetic language in which they speak – a noticeable blending of high and low culture and language. Ancient audiences, as noted by Segal, would have recognized the “discrepancy between the noble associations of the verse form


\(^{118}\) David Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983) and Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, provide detailed analysis of the terms pastoral and bucolic. Pastoral is probably derived from the Latin word for herdsman and bucolic from the Greek for cowherd – the words are not synonymous. Halperin presents a summary of how the two terms were used in antiquity, 8-16. Pastoral referred to the subject matter of the poems (pertaining to herdsmen), whereas the genre was generally called bucolic. But by the sixteenth century, pastoral was the term used to describe the genre of poetry rather than the subject.

\(^{119}\) Segal, *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral*, 8 and Halperin, *Before Pastoral*, 15. For ancient authors, genre was defined by its metric form rather than the subject matter. It was only in later antiquity that thematic categorizations began to influence literary classifications. For more on ancient genre theory as described by both Greek and Roman writers, see Halperin, 193-216 and Joseph Farrell, “Classical Genre in Theory and Practice,” *New Literary History* 34, no. 3 (Summer 2003): 383-408.
and the humble rusticity of the characters.”\textsuperscript{120} The early authors would not have classified themselves as pastoral poets, but instead as composers of bucolic verses.\textsuperscript{121} The actual definition of pastoral was not theorized until late antiquity or even the sixteenth century. Theocritus’ successors continued creating bucolic poetry in the same manner, although few of their names have been recorded for posterity.\textsuperscript{122} These poets composed verses about herdsmen in the countryside, sometimes shifting the perspective from songs by the characters to songs about the characters, and also expanding the subject to include more explicit references to mythology and the gods. By the time Vergil, whose poetry would become the primary source for later pastoral literature, began writing nearly two centuries later, a literary tradition had been established.\textsuperscript{123}

\textit{Codification of a Genre: The Poetry of Vergil}

Although Theocritus is credited as the first poet of the bucolic genre, Vergil’s \textit{Eclogues} provided the inspiration for later authors and artists writing in what would

\textsuperscript{120} Segal, \textit{Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral}, 8.

\textsuperscript{121} Halperin, \textit{Before Pastoral}, 8-9 notes that Theocritus would have been completely unfamiliar with the term pastoral and referred to his poems as bucolic.

\textsuperscript{122} Included in this group is the anonymous author (or authors) of \textit{Idylls} 8 and 9, which were included with early Roman editions of the poems, see Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 44-47 for commentary on the two poems. Kegel-Brinkgreve also provides an overview of the poets working after Theocritus, 47-78. These authors include Moschus and Bion, and the most well known, Longus, author of \textit{Four Books of Pastors about Daphnis and Chole}, a tale based on the work of Theocritus, but written entirely in prose and featuring mostly third person narrative rather than purely mimic exposition. The author addresses the question of how available and popular the original poems of Theocritus were to later readers, accepting the proposal that interested collectors copied the works and kept them in private libraries, 60-61. Beyond imitation of subject and dialect, poets after Theocritus employed the mimic form and the dialogue as well as the same names of characters, suggesting that followers had read the older author’s work firsthand.

\textsuperscript{123} Halperin, \textit{Before Pastoral}, 2-3 argues that Theocritus was indeed recognized in the Renaissance. Latin editions of his poems appeared by 1531 and the first English translation was published in 1588. Vergil, however, was the dominant poet and the source of inspiration for later pastoral writers. Halperin argues that Vergil’s fame and the greater knowledge of Latin than Greek caused this discrepancy.
become the pastoral genre. Before conceiving the influential epic, the *Aeneid*, the poet composed the *Eclogues* between 42 and 38 BCE, while Rome was engaged in a civil war, and the *Georgics* around 29 BCE, after the Battle of Actium.\(^{124}\) The former consists of ten poems directly inspired by the *Idylls* of Theocritus and the latter, while not truly part of the bucolic genre, is a single poem set in the countryside and focusing on agriculture. The poems of the *Eclogues* are mostly located in Arcadia, which, while based on an actual location on the Peloponnese peninsula, becomes a “symbolic landscape, a delicate blend of myth and reality.”\(^{125}\) In this setting, which no longer represents an identifiable country, but is instead an idealized landscape, herdsmen sing and play instruments, as in the poems of Theocritus. Under the shade of trees in a glade, the characters’ songs are echoed in the setting as nature responds to the verses.\(^{126}\) The *Georgics*, although still a book of poems, contrast with the *Eclogues* in that the verses discuss technical aspects of farming and animal husbandry, as well as the difficulties man faces against nature.\(^{127}\) The


\(^{125}\) Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 19. Vergil’s Arcadia combines elements Sicily as described by Theocritus and the countryside of other parts of Italy. See Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 125-136 for more on the landscape created by Vergil. Arcadia was already established in the mythic tradition as the homeland of Pan, where the goat-legged god chased after Daphnis. Beyond the idealized image of the landscape in Vergil’s poetry, there was a push to revive ancient shrines in the countryside under the rule of Augustus. See Bettina Bergmann, “Meanwhile Back in Italy . . . Creating Landscapes of Allusion,” in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, ed. Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry, and Jas Elsner (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 154-166. The actual Arcadian landscape is not the pastoral ideal conjured by Vergil; instead, it is a rocky and barren place. See Erwin Panofsky, “*Et in Arcadia Ego*: Poussin and the Elegiac Tradition,” in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1955), 298-99.

\(^{126}\) See Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 137-143. There is a “magical aspect” in the connection between the herdsmen and the trees – the characters’ “songs ‘charm’ Nature,” 139.

disparity between the poems becomes a significant point of discussion in the sixteenth century.

With the *Eclogues*, Vergil is reinventing Greek bucolic poetry in a contemporary Roman context. Whereas there is a thread of commentary on contemporary culture in Theocritus’ work, there is a more distinct political overtone to Vergil’s pastoral *Eclogues*. His poems are not simple expressions of appreciation for the countryside, but embody a political message – the spread of Rome’s power into this idealized landscape. He establishes this in the opening poem of the *Eclogues*, distinguishing his collection of verse as different from the bucolic poetry of Theocritus. *Eclogue* 1 begins with Meliboeus greeting Tityrus who rests under a beech tree while playing a reed pipe, a scene that immediately evokes the bucolic tradition. But then, Tityrus and Meliboeus, herdsmen with names derived from the poetry of Theocritus, discuss the former’s visit to


At the time, the government had begun seizing territory from small landholders and bestowing the plots on military veterans. Vergil’s land was part of this appropriation. For more on contemporary events in Vergil’s poetry, see R.J. Tarrant, “Poetry and Power: Virgil’s Poetry in Contemporary Context,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. Charles Martindale (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 169-187. Augustus intervened to restore Vergil’s lands that were appropriated after the civil war.


For the original poem and recent translation, see Vergil, *Vergil’s Eclogues*, trans. Barbara Hughes Fowler (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 1-3. The famous opening lines of the poem – “Tityrus, you lie beneath the spreading beech / and practice country songs upon a slender pipe. / I leave my father’s fields and my sweet ploughlands, / an exile from my native soil. You sprawl in the shade / and school the woods to sound with Amaryllis’s charms.” (Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi silvestre tenui Musam meditaris avena; nos patriae fines et dulcia linquimus avra: nos patriam fugimus; tu Tityre, lentus in umbra formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas) – and the use of the term *umbra* play a part in later interpretations of the *Eclogues* and the allegorical implications of the pastoral, which will be discussed below.
Rome to purchase his freedom and prevent his land being confiscated and the latter’s having been forcefully removed from his property by the government. The harsh reality of contemporary problems has intruded on the idealized world of the pastoral realm as the policies of the political power now dictate and control the natural world and bucolic way of life. The government can command who is able to access “privileged space of repose.”

Additionally, incidents in the poems occasionally parallel events from contemporary Rome. In *Eclogue* 5, scholars have associated the apotheosis of Daphnis with the death and deification of Julius Caesar. Finally, Vergil also mentions a return to the Golden Age, the earliest age of man described by the Greek poet Hesiod, in *Eclogue* 4, which is expected in the near future. With the arrival of the new Golden Age, for Vergil, the world will return to the pastoral ideal with harmony between man and nature, where the land provides for the shepherd. Despite this aspiration, reality always threatens to intrude on this perfect artistic world created in the *Eclogues* through war, violence, and politics.

Vergil’s collection of verse is self-conscious, as the poems often appear especially perceptive of the overtly stylistic and allegoric nature of bucolic poetry. In the *Eclogues*,

---


134 Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 92-95, the poem foretells of the birth of a child who will inaugurate a new Golden Age. The author does not believe that the child represents a particular figure, such as Octavian, but is a symbol of hope for the future of the Roman Republic after the death of Caesar. Also see R.G.M. Nisbet, “Vergil’s Fourth Eclogue: Easterners and Westerners,” in *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil’s Eclogues*, ed. Katharina Volk (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 155-188, which discusses how Vergil uses Eastern religion, particularly the Jewish hope for a messiah, and adapts into Western thinking and political context.
as in the verses of Vergil’s bucolic predecessors, the ostensibly simple and humble nature of the characters and subject conflicts with the sophisticated language employed by the poet.\textsuperscript{135} Throughout the collection, herdsmen are conspicuously speaking for the poet – Vergil posits himself as “as an inhabitant of his bucolic world . . . sitting at ease” with the characters who reside in the Arcadian setting.\textsuperscript{136} Through these characters, the poet can speak of the turbulent political landscape in Rome, while not endangering his career or patronage. Annabel Patterson discusses Vergil’s use of the herdsman speaking as the voice of the poet as a shifting authorial presence from which the author can escape the authoritative presence of Octavian.\textsuperscript{137} There is a push and pull between the poet’s personal motives, including his commentary on the hegemony of the Roman state and its seeming abuse of power, and his need to please his patrons so that he can continue to enjoy his freedom to write. Later authors continue this theme as the thread of political commentary and gradations of seriousness woven into a seemingly pleasant poem about singing herdsmen comes to define the genre of pastoral.\textsuperscript{138} The artfulness of the pastoral, poetry in which a rustic character tending his flock stands in for the erudite poet who speaks to issues of greater cultural relevance, became a model for writers and artists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

\textsuperscript{135} Charles Martindale, “Green politics: the Eclogues,” in The Cambridge Companion to Virgil, 118, states “for all the supposed rusticity of the bucolic style, its ‘lowness,’ the Eclogues belong evidently to ‘high’ culture.”

\textsuperscript{136} Martindale, “Green politics,” 113.

\textsuperscript{137} Patterson, Pastoral and Ideology, 4.

\textsuperscript{138} See Martindale, “Green politics,” 115-119. The commentaries of Servius, written in the early fifth century, particularly explore the political connotations of the Eclogues.
Poetry into Painting

Jacopo Sannazaro and the Rebirth of the Pastoral

Pastoral poetry did not vanish entirely after the death of Vergil as his work never declined in popularity and a number of his successors published pastoral poetry in later antiquity.¹³⁹ Authors throughout the Middle Ages and into the early Renaissance continued producing verses following Vergil’s model – poems of herdsmen singing in the countryside with subtle or sometimes specific references to political commentary.¹⁴⁰ Imitating the pastoral became common throughout the Renaissance as a way to fully understand the mind of ancient authors.¹⁴¹ The self-consciousness of the pastoral, which celebrated the artfulness of its metaphors and language, was connected with ancient philosophy as the shepherd-poet would strive for a life of contemplation. The genre reached new levels of fame with the poetry of Jacopo Sannazaro (1458-1530), a nobleman from Naples who served as courtier to Federico d’Aragona (Frederick of Aragon), the last king of Naples.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ For a complete overview of pastoral literature after the death of Vergil, see Kegel-Brinkgreve, The Echoing Woods, 151-313. Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio composed eclogues in imitation of Vergil. Their Latin verses became a primary inspiration for later writers. The first pastoral poems in Italian appeared in 1481, but the most influential text was Sannazaro’s Arcadia, published in 1504. Images from two important fifth-century illuminated manuscripts containing the complete works of Vergil, including the Eclogues and Georgics, will be discussed in relation to their importance to the history of landscape painting and Dughet’s interest in ancient painting in Chapter 4.

¹⁴⁰ See Patterson, Pastoral and Ideology, 21-42, where the author reasserts the importance of Servius’ commentary for all later writers in the pastoral genre. Beginning in the last eighteenth century, scholars rejected the political connotations and the relevance of Servius’ text for understanding the allegorical meaning of Vergil’s work and pastoral poetry in general. As Patterson notes, such interpretation neglects the multiple levels of meaning possible within the pastoral genre, relegating the poetry to simple appreciation for the countryside and the importance of nature.


¹⁴² See the introduction to Jacopo Sannazaro, Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues, trans. Ralph Nash (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1966), 7-10 for a brief overview of the poet’s life, and also Carol Kidwell,
Sannazaro began composing his pastoral verses in the 1480s and completed a draft of *Arcadia* by 1489, which was published in 1504. The text, composed of twelve eclogues and accompanying prose, is written in Italian and introduces a clear narrative element into the genre. Sincero, the narrator of *Arcadia*, represents the author himself who relates his life story throughout the prose, while the eclogues are the songs sung by the herdsmen in response to the text. Originally from Naples, Sincero has withdrawn into the countryside and become a shepherd because of his unrequited love for a young woman. He returns to the city only to learn of her death and, much later in his life, again retreats into the romanticized countryside, this time around Naples. Immediately upon

---

*Sannazaro and Arcadia* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co, 1993) for a full biography. After the exile of Federico to France, Sannazaro sold off some his properties and accompanied the king on his journey. He returned to Naples in 1504 after the death of Federico. Also see Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 310-13 for more on Sannazaro’s life and also his *Piscatorial Eclogues*, and William J. Kennedy, *Jacopo Sannazaro and the Uses of the Pastoral* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1983), for a critical analysis of the rest of Sannazaro’s entire literary production.

143 Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 8-10. While Sannazaro was in France, an unauthorized and incomplete version of *Arcadia* was published in Venice. Upon his return to Italy, Sannazaro likely oversaw a complete publication by Pietro Summonte in Naples.

144 Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 8. Upon Sannazaro’s acceptance as a member of the Academy founded by Giovanni Pontano (1426-1503) sometime in the 1480s, he was given the Latin name of Actius Syncerus. Nash interprets the name as meaning “of the sea” and “open, honest, sincere.” Sannazaro continued using the name throughout his life, including in the persona of the narrator of *Arcadia*.

145 As Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 334, observes, the choice of Arcadia as the setting is likely derived directly from the few mentions of the country in Vergil’s poems. Later antique and medieval followers often located their verses in Sicily. Beyond Vergil though, Sannazaro provides longer and more detailed descriptions of the setting. The mourning for the death of his beloved is likely based not only on a few pastoral precedents, but also on the poems of both Dante and Petrarch. Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 8, connects this to the death of his friend Pontano’s wife. For Sannazaro, the setting of Arcadia becomes a utopia, but “it is a realm irretrievably lost, seen through a veil of reminiscent melancholy,” as described in Panofsky, “Et in Arcadia Ego,” 304.
its publication, *Arcadia* earned praise and recognition across Europe with new editions published almost every two years throughout the sixteenth century.\(^{146}\)

*Arcadia* opens with a description of the idealized pastoral landscape in which the narrator stresses the superior beauty and allure of the untouched countryside compared to the cultivated landscape of the civilized world.\(^{147}\) The first five chapters of the text are generally optimistic in tone as the narrator recounts the exploits of the singing shepherds and their daily lives. A more melancholy mood begins to descend in Chapter 5 as the power of nature is recounted in the stream of Erymanthus, which “hurls itself forth with a mighty and fearful uproar, and . . . for anyone travelling there alone, this would at first encounter breed incalculable fear.”\(^{148}\) This continues in Chapter 7 as Sincero, representing Sannazaro, begins his sad tale, which ends with his shepherd friends believing that his suffering will not be in vain. After learning the simple and bucolic songs of herdsmen, he will eventually return to the city as poet who will find eternal fame.\(^{149}\) As Ralph Nash notes, the poem becomes self-conscious, revealing the inferiority

---


\(^{147}\) Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 29, “More often than not the tall and spreading trees brought forth by nature on the shaggy mountains are wont to bring greater pleasure to those who view them than are the cultivated trees pruned and thinned by cunning hands in ornamented gardens . . . And who has any doubt that a fountain that issues naturally from the living rock, surrounded by green growth, is more pleasing to the human mind than all the others made by art of whitest marble, resplendent with much gold? Certainly no one, to my thinking.” For a brief overview of the outline of the text, see Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 318-333.

\(^{148}\) Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 57

\(^{149}\) Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 74-75, “And even as up to this point you have fruitlessly spent the beginnings of your adolescence among the simple and rustic songs of shepherds, so hereafter you will pass your fortunate young manhood among the sounding trumpets of the most famous poets of your century, not without hope of eternal fame.”
of the pastoral genre to the heroic, to which Sannazaro himself aspired.\textsuperscript{150} The elegiac mood endures through the rest of the poem, particularly in Chapter 10 and its accompanying eclogue, when the herdsmen visit the tomb of Massilia, the mother of Ergasto, a character in the text.\textsuperscript{151} Sannazaro also incorporated political allegory into this melancholy atmosphere in \textit{Arcadia}. In Chapter 12, the poet laments the death of an uprooted orange tree, a symbol of his patrons, the house of Aragon. Like the shade of the beech tree over Tityrus that represented Octavian’s protection of Vergil, the dead orange tree – the now exiled dynasty of Federico d’Aragona, Sannazaro’s patron – once provided security for the poet.\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{150} Sannazaro, \textit{Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues}, 15. \textit{Arcadia} was written early in Sannazaro’s career. After returning to Naples from France, he switched to composing verses in Latin, including a heroic version of the Annunciation, the \textit{De Partu Virginis}. Also see Michael C.J. Putnam, “Virgil and Sannazaro’s Ekphrastic Vision,” \textit{Ramus: Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature} 40, no. 1 (2011): 73-86, where the author argues that the switch to Latin is prompted by Sannazaro’s debt to Vergil as he emulates both the \textit{Aeneid} and the \textit{Georgics} when composing the \textit{De Partu Virginis}. Nash also discusses the contrast between the active life described in heroic poetry compared to the contemplative nature of the pastoral, 17. This division will be discussed in more detail below in relation to the development of villa culture in Italy. The idea of mixing genres, combining pastoral and heroic in the same poem, becomes an important element in late sixteenth-century poetry.

\textsuperscript{151} Sannazaro, \textit{Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues}, 109-11, “The beautiful pyramid [the tomb monument] was set on a little plateau on a low-lying mountain ridge, between two springs of water most clear and sweet, with its tip advanced toward heaven in the form of a cypress thick and straight . . . It was shaded round by the branches of some very young and flourishing trees, not yet grown to a height equal to the white apex . . . Finally whatever children and magnanimous Kings were wept by the olden shepherds in that first age, all were seen flowering here in metamorphosis, still keeping the names they had: Adonis, Hyacinth, Ajax, and young Crocus, with his beloved maid; and among these could also be numbered the vain Narcissus who gazed in those waters upon the fatal beauty that was the cause of his departure from the living.” The extensive description of the tomb and its surrounding environment conjure a picture of peace, and one of sorrow, for the departed woman, who was “almost a divine Sibyl” for the shepherds. Even the trees and flowers seem to lament her passing in Sannazaro’s prose.

\textsuperscript{152} See Sannazaro, \textit{Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues}, 134, “Grieving bitterly . . . and exclaiming over the beloved trunk, ‘where then shall I take my repose? under what shade now shall I sing my verses?’” For an analysis, see the introduction to the translation by Nash, 22, as well as Kennedy, \textit{Jacopo Sannazaro and the Uses of the Pastoral}, 28-37. Nash argues that the final three chapters were likely written between 1496 and 1504, when the political turmoil in Naples began and culminated with the death of Frederick of Aragon during his exile.
The Poetic Landscape in Art

In Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, the landscape “becomes a country of the mind, a symbol of dedication to poetry, pleasure, to love, to contemplation,” according to Nash. The genre is both internal and external, as described by William J. Kennedy, as the outer world of the idealized countryside becomes the site where the poet can reflect on his own writing and work. The genre was thus perfect for representation in the visual arts, where painters could represent not only the natural world conjured by Theocritus and Vergil, but also stress the meditative aspect of the pastoral realm inhabited by herdsmen-poets. The earliest examples of early modern painted pastoral representations come from Venice in the first decades of the sixteenth century. Both Titian and Giorgione, whose contributions to the development of the independent landscape genre were covered in the previous chapter, produced paintings that would serve as models for later artists. In works such as the *Concert Champêtre* from around 1504-10 (fig. 1.5), Titian depicts an idealized version of Arcadia in which the shepherds from Vergil’s *Eclogues* and Sannazaro’s poem become courtiers, accompanied by nude female figures, often

153 Sannazaro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues*, 23. As Nash explains, Sannazaro was “celebrating and exploring his own commitment to poetry,” written for an erudite audience who were attune to the history of the genre and the sophisticated, stylish language in which he composed the text.


156 Although the majority of paintings originated in Venice, other court cities favored pastoral landscape, as discussed in the previous chapter. For example, Dosso Dossi produced pastoral works for the d’Este family in Ferrara, see Robert Colby, “Dosso’s Early Artistic Reputation and the Origins of Landscape Painting,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 76 (2008): 212.
interpreted as muses or nymphs.\textsuperscript{157} Seated next to the man in elegant dress is a rustic figure with tousled hair in contemporary dress, while the actual working herdsman is relegated to the middleground, and the city is present in the background.\textsuperscript{158} The painting is a visual counterpart to the tale described in \textit{Arcadia} as a young city dweller has escaped into the realm of the pastoral, playing the lute among his companions, the nymphs and the herdsman.

Titian recognizes the self-consciousness of pastoral literature, where the poet is playing at being a herdsman in an idealized setting. The \textit{Concert Champêtre}, like a number of other landscape images by Titian, stresses the intellectual aspect of the pastoral world, where music and poetry are created. Later in his career, Titian even referred to some of his paintings for King Philip II of Spain as \textit{poesie} rather than just \textit{favole}.\textsuperscript{159} Stephen Campbell has proposed that rather than viewing Titian or Giorgione as “radical artists who liberate[d] painting from the strictures of determinate subject matter,”

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{157} For a recent overview on the interpretation of the painting and debate over attribution to Titian or Giorgione, see Peter Humphrey, \textit{Titian} (New York: Phaidon Press, 2007), 28-30, who favors the attribution to Titian. Humphrey also argues that the commission for the painting was certainly inspired by the fame of Sannazaro’s \textit{Arcadia}, first published in Venice around 1501. Humphrey dates the work to the months following the death of Giorgione in October of 1510.
\item \textsuperscript{158} See Giancarlo Maiorino, “Titian’s \textit{Concert Champêtre} and Sannazaro’s \textit{Arcadia}: Titology and the Invention of the Renaissance Pastoral,” in \textit{The Eye of the Poet: Studies in the Reciprocity of the Visual and Literary Arts from the Renaissance to the Present}, ed. Amy Golahny (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1996), 57, who notes that rather than the primitive, nearly untouched landscape imagined by Vergil, Titian portrays a civilized landscape, which is “not of the country, but by and for the court or the city.” The pastoral landscape is reserved for those of a higher status who could fully appreciate its literary connotations. The shepherd in the middleground, who is herding his flock, represents the utilitarian rustic life, which is described by Vergil in the \textit{Georgics}, 63-64.
\end{itemize}
works such as the *Concert Champêtre* should be viewed as falling within the historical
tradition of poetry by bringing together multiple sources to create a metaphor.\textsuperscript{160}

Both Titian and Giorgione may have incorporated political commentary into their
landscape paintings. Jonathan Unglaub has persuasively argued that the *Concert
Champêtre* was intended to evoke the ideal countryside during the War of the League of
Cambrai, when the Republic of Venice was losing territory to the Papal States and
allies.\textsuperscript{161} This reading places the painting perfectly within the history of the pastoral
genre, relating back to Vergil’s political allegories in the *Eclogues*. As Unglaub observes,
Titian’s patron and his erudite visitors would have been conditioned to perceiving this
type of landscape as pastoral and understanding the well-known history and political
implications of the literary genre.\textsuperscript{162} For viewers, the *Concert Champêtre* was “a wistful
souvenir of a landscape now utterly annihilated and purged of its populace.”\textsuperscript{163}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{160} Stephen J. Campbell, “Naturalism and the Venetian ‘Poesia’: Grafting, Metaphor, and Embodiment in
Giorgione, Titian, and the Campagnolas,” in *The Subject as Aporia in Early Modern Art*, ed. Alexander
Nagel and Lorenzo Pericolo (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 115. Campbell goes on to suggest that
Titian’s early paintings, with figures that do not appear to be fully integrated into the landscape are devised
as “a problematic of poetic naturalism,” 135.

\textsuperscript{161} See Unglaub, “The *Concert Champêtre*,” 46-96. As Unglaub states, “this was the cataclysmic moment
in Venetian history, when its ‘Arcadian’ possessions on the mainland succumbed to the aggressors and
seemed forever lost. Despite expectations, the *Concert Champêtre* reveals not so much an idyllic refuge
from the ravages of history as a lush but fragile counterbalance to the despoliation of the countryside,” 46.
The author does, however, accept the painting as Giorgione and not Titian, and dates it to 1510.

\textsuperscript{162} Unglaub, “The *Concert Champêtre*,” 47. A widely popular anthology of pastoral literature, including
verses by Vergil, Petrarch, and Boccaccio had been published in Italy in 1504. Unglaub traces the elements
of pastoral literature present in the painting. For example, he reads the standing female nude as the Source,
the nymph who leads Sannazzaro/Sincero to the source of all the rivers and then from Arcadia to his home in
Naples, 53-54. Additionally, a tradition had been established in Venice of poetic appreciation for the
terraferma in the first decade of the sixteenth century as the Republic shifted its focus inland and away
from the Adriatic Sea, 61. Ownership of a villa in the countryside soon became required part of patrician
identity, which will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{163} Unglaub, “The *Concert Champêtre*,” 75. He proposes that the painting explicitly relates to Vergil’s first
*Eclogue*, in which pitiable Meliboeus has been deprived of his lands.
\end{flushleft}
Giorgione’s enigmatic *The Tempest* (fig. 1.4), while not a true pastoral image since there are not any clearly recognizable herdsmen, remains one of the most widely known landscape images of the early sixteenth century. Creighton Gilbert has argued that the true subject of the painting is the storm itself, recalling the evocative landscapes described by Sanzarro, while Paul Kaplan has connected the painting with a confrontation that took place between Venetian and Hapsburg forces for the control of Padua in the summer of 1509. Kaplan reads the city in the background as Padua and the storm as the forces clashing over its control. The mother and child in the foreground and broken columns indicate the devastation felt by inhabitants of the countryside around Venice during the skirmishes. For Giorgione and his patron, the actual figures in the painting appear not to have been as important as the landscape because the supposed soldier or shepherd was once another nude female. Even if the perplexing image does not represent Venice’s troubles during the War of the League of Cambrai, there is certainly an allegorical element to the painting and a particular significance given to the landscape, which, for Giorgione was the means to complete the picture and not just a framing element for the story. Although not a typical image of the pastoral world,

---

164 For more on the patronage of the painting, see *Giorgione: Myth and Enigma*, ed. Sylvia Ferino-Pagden and Giovanna Nepi Scirè (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum, 2004), cat. no. 7 and the essay by Stefania Mason, “‘By the true hand of this master very few things are seen’ Giorgione in Venetian Collections,” 33-39, in the same catalogue. The painting was almost certainly commissioned by Gabriele Vendramin.

165 Creighton Gilbert, “On Subject and Not-Subject in Italian Renaissance Pictures,” 34, no. 3 (September 1952): 212-14, addresses the depiction of elements of nature having almost a “life of feeling.” Trees can be polite, rocks can listen and rivers can remember. Thus, for Giorgione, the storm itself is a protagonist. Paul H.D. Kaplan, “The Storm of War: The Paduan Key to Giorgione’s *Tempesta*,” *Art History* 9, no. 4 (December 1986): 405-27, picks up on Edgar Wind’s interpretation of the storm as an allegory of fortune, but unrelated to any specific event.

166 *Giorgione: Myth and Enigma*, cat. no. 7, 67, for the image of the x-radiograph of the female figure.

Giorgione’s unusual painting, in which the figures occupy a lesser role than the landscape, was influenced by the renewed interest in pastoral literature, depicting a bucolic realm reminiscent of the world conjured by Vergil and Sannazaro.\(^{168}\)

*The Rise of the Pastoral and Villa Culture in Italy*

The connection between images of landscape and pastoral poetry is even more evident in painting in the later sixteenth century with the rise of villa culture and decoration of homes. In the countryside, wealthy families constructed villas where the purpose was pleasure and retreat rather than profit.\(^{169}\) The letters of the Roman author Pliny the Younger, in which he described his Tuscan villa, located near the ancient Roman town of Tifernum, and his villa on the seashore at Laurentium, served as models for fifteenth and sixteenth-century authors, architects, and artists.\(^{170}\) The comprehensive account of the various buildings and arrangement of Pliny’s villas inspired the Italian

---

\(^{168}\) Rudolf Schier, “Giorgione’s *Tempesta*: a Virgilian Pastoral,” *Renaissance Studies* 22, no. 4 (September 2008): 476-506, identifies the painting as related to Vergil’s fourth *Eclogue*, which describes the coming of the Golden Age with the birth of a child. He argues that the male figures is the poet-shepherd who remains outside the realm that he describes, 494. The breastfeeding mother is an image of the Virgin, but the unusual and immodest presentation of her nudity is meant to disorient the viewer, 497. Schier proposes that the mother is an altered version of the Madonna of Humility, who was often shown seated on the ground, 502. In his conclusion, Schier states that “viewers of Giorgione’s composition are led to experience what may be called a second sight through which they, like the poet-shepherd in the picture, are able to discover in Virgil’s pastoral landscape not only a mother nursing a pagan progeny sent from heaven, but the intimation of the Virgin Mary and the advent of the Messiah as well,” 506.

\(^{169}\) The major text for the history of Renaissance villas remains David R. Coffin, *The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979). Leon Battista Alberti, in his *De re aedificatoria*, IX, discusses the differences between the villas of the wealthy that are designed for leisure and escape and those that are intended for pleasure and profit, 11.

nobility to replicate the placement of buildings, design, and decoration, down to the inclusion of particular elements. Paolo Veronese’s decoration of the Villa Barbaro at Maser of around 1560 (figs. 2.1-2.2) perfectly recreates the directives of Pliny who advocated the visual experience of landscape in country homes, with images that blended art and nature. Here, the owners of the villa, the wealthy Barbaro family, could relax in the countryside while reflecting on the idyllic painted settings framed by tromp l’oeil frescoes side by side with the actual landscape views framed by the windows. Leon Battista Alberti’s treatise on architecture, the *De re aedificatoria*, written between 1443 and 1452 and published in 1485, addresses the use of landscape painting as decoration for country villas in Book IX, describing the importance of such paintings as aiding in relaxation and diversion. Paintings of generalized pastoral landscapes, depicting the

---


172 Ackerman, “The Influence of Antiquity on Italian Renaissance Villas,” 203-12, notes that the villa was built on a slope to allow for proper drainage, as dictated by Pliny, but the actual architecture of Renaissance villas is not based on ancient descriptions. Instead, the buildings followed contemporary models and the more elegant designs of ancient temples. This style of decoration – frescoed landscapes in a country villa that appear to be windows with views of the countryside – continued throughout the sixteenth century as numerous examples were produced across Italy, including outside Rome, such as the Villa d’Este at Tivoli and the Farnese Villa at Caprarola.

bucolic countryside, became standard decoration in the form of both frescoes and easel paintings for both country and suburban villas throughout the sixteenth century and later.

The apparent contradiction of the country villa, which is both a place of escape from city life and a manifestation of the owner’s cultured ideals, is exemplified by the Villa of Hadrian, which became an critical center for the study of ancient Roman life and architecture in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The extensive grounds with a multitude of structures, including a palace, baths, libraries, and grottos, were the ultimate prototype for villa culture in the Renaissance, where noblemen and their visitors could relax and engage in philosophical discussions and artistic pursuits. The benefit of escaping into the countryside in order to rest and reflect was recognized by a number of scholars in the seventeenth century. Irene Baldriga clarifies the importance of the country villa, as “the celebration of the Latin *otium litteratum*, meant as an edifying activity aimed at stimulating the virtues of the learned man through the quiet contemplation of nature, was a very well diffused topic in Renaissance culture.”

---

174 William L. MacDonald and John A. Pinto, *Hadrian’s Villa and Its Legacy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 266-69. The discovery and study of the Villa will be more thoroughly discussed in Chapter 3.

175 Irene Baldriga, “Reading the Universal Book of Nature: The Accademia dei Lincei in Rome (1603-1630),” in *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* Vol. 2, ed. Arjan van Dixhoorn and Susie Speakman Sutch (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 385-86. Federico Cesi, the primary founder of the Academia dei Lincei, which will be discussed in the following chapter, preferred writing in his home in Acquasparta, north of the city in Umbria, where the peace of the countryside allowed him to write without distraction. Being in nature also allowed Cesi and his fellow academicians the opportunity to pursue their primary goal – the study of nature and natural phenomena through empirical observation. The Academy, in fact, organized field studies near Cesi’s home. One such trip is described by Johannes Faber, the chancellor of the Academy: “Fourteen years ago, after having spent the whole day searching for and examining plants, not without a pleasant fatigue, with our Prince [Cesi], so
concept of withdrawing from work and daily life to engage in morally uplifting or scholarly pursuits in contrast to *negotium*, or daily work. In the early seventeenth century, Cardinal Scipione Borghese’s (1577-1633) favorite poet, Lelio Guidiccioni (1570-before 1644) would lead discussions and recite pastoral poems to guests at the Borghese villa at Frascati and at their suburban villa on Pincian Hill. The recitations, as described by Tracy Ehrlich, “offered listeners the opportunity to explore more fully in their minds what they saw from fixed viewpoints,” which were “Virgilian glimpses of the countryside, which he move[d] through as a kind of surrogate for his audience.”

See Eleanor Winsor Leach, "*Otium as Luxuria*: Economy of Status in the Younger Pliny's *Letters*,” *Arethusa* 36, no. 2 (2003): 147-65. For Pliny, *otium* includes writing and study as well as exercise, such as walking and playing games. The most respectable *negotium* was political life. For more on Roman villa culture, see Alfred Frazer, “The Roman Villa and the Pastoral Ideal,” in *The Pastoral Landscape*, ed. John Dixon Hunt (Washington, DC: The National Gallery of Art, 1992), 49-61. A the end of the sixteenth century, a new type of villa arose—the “estate-villas” of papal families, all built near or inside the city walls of Rome. See Mirka Beneš, “Pastoralism in the Roman Baroque Villa and in Claude Lorrain: Myths and Realities of the Roman Campagna,” in *Villas and Gardens in Early Modern Italy and France*, ed. Mirka Beneš and Dianne Harris (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 93. The grounds included formal gardens, land for agricultural, and forests of trees, in contrast to the typical Renaissance villa, which was intended primarily for pleasure and were much smaller than the Baroque estate-villas. Also see Claire Pace, “‘Free from Business and Debate’: City and Country in Responses to Landscape in 17th-Century Italy and France,” *Konsthistorisk Tidsskrift* 73, no. 3 (2004): 158-178, for another analysis of *otium* and *negotium*. Pace argues that even if a villa included agricultural production, the type of imagery that decorated the walls was focused on the pastoral world and the idea of promoting *otium*, 162.

Tracy L. Ehrlich, *Landscape and Identity in Early Modern Rome: Villa Culture at Frascati in the Borghese Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 261-62, visitors were meant to contemplate the expressive power of the landscape and also its ancient history, traced back to the glory of Rome, and now owned by the prominent Borghese family. Guidiccioni’s poems contain pastoral herdsmen and nymphs, who engage in singing and lovemaking rather than the actual work conducted by the laborers to keep the estate running, 263. The knowledge and understanding of the visual arts in general was an
landscape around the villa became a pastoral *locus amoenus* where the patron and his visitors could escape the irritations of city life.

*The Pastoral Landscape into the Seventeenth-Century*

*Torquato Tasso, the Pastoral Drama, and Landscape Painting*

The popularity of Sannazaro’s *Arcadia* continued to rise throughout the sixteenth century and the unusual format of the text, combining prose with verse, inspired the conception of the pastoral drama as a new mode of pastoral literature. The most famous example of this form, which incorporated a fully developed plot and characters, was first performed in 1573. Torquato Tasso (1544-1595), born to a noble family in Sorrento whose fortune was lost while he was young, eventually arrived in Ferrara to enter the service of the d’Este household around the age of twenty. Tasso, a precocious youth, followed his father in composing poetry and his earliest published work was the narrative epic, *Rinaldo*, written before 1562. At the court of Ferrara, he wrote hundreds of love poems, discourses on the art of poetry, and the pastoral drama, *Aminta*. The play was hugely popular after the first performance. It was staged multiple times over the next few years, published in 1581, reissued every few years after, translated into multiple

---

178 See Peter Marinelli, “Narrative Poetry,” in *The Cambridge History of Italian Literature*, ed. Peter Brand and Lino Pertili (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 243-50, for a brief overview of Tasso’s biography. Although he found fame at the d’Este court, Tasso was unstable and unable to handle any criticism. Duke Alfonso II had to incarcerate the poet in an asylum, although he was still able to write. After he was freed, he was virtually penniless and wandered across the peninsula, eventually dying in Rome.
languages, and inspired a number of followers from Giovanni Battista Guarini’s *Il Pastor Fido* of 1590 to the comedies of William Shakespeare.\(^{179}\)

Performed for Duke Alfonso II d’Este and his court at one of the palaces owned by the family just outside the city, the simple play is set in the pastoral realm where Cupid determines to make the nymph Silvia accept the love of the shepherd Aminta.\(^{180}\) Cupid appears only in the Prologue, dressed as a shepherd, to tell the audience of his plan for the lovers. The play is both tragic and comic as Aminta and Silvia each think the other has died, but eventually find love as Cupid predicted.\(^{181}\) The actual setting for the drama is Italy rather than Arcadia, likely in a territory owned by the d’Este family, which would have reminded the audience of their own familiar world.\(^{182}\) Other common tropes of pastoral are included in the play as the characters refer to the Golden Age in the chorus of the first act and the main character is a shepherd.\(^{183}\) Nevertheless, there is little mention of the shepherd’s actual flock – the primary discussions focus instead on love and hunting, two important courtly activities. The drama, though set within the bucolic


\(^{180}\) See Torquato Tasso, *Aminta: A Pastoral Play*, for the most recent English translation, which is paired with the original text in Italian.

\(^{181}\) Kristin Phillips-Court, *The Perfect Genre. Drama and Painting in Renaissance Italy* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 144, notes that the text combines both lyric and epic modes in a plot that is relatively simplistic, in contrast to the earliest examples of pastoral drama, which involved multiple storylines. Phillips-Court also characterizes the “emotionalism, content, and expressive range” of the drama as “incipiently ‘baroque.’”

\(^{182}\) Kegel-Brinkgreve, *The Echoing Woods*, 348, notes that the setting is intentionally vague as the only reference to an actual location is ‘Eliceto,’ which Kegel-Brinkgreve interprets as the forest of Elica, which was a residence of the d’Este family.

countryside, is a reflection of the court.\footnote{Kegel-Brinkgreve, \textit{The Echoing Woods}, 350. Also see Phillips-Court, \textit{The Perfect Genre}, 165-67, where the author connects the shifting authorial presence of the play to the ambiguous landscape paintings of Giorgione and Titian. Scholars have connected Tasso with the character Tirsi, the shepherd/poet, and also with the hero, Aminta. Certainly, the conflation of the identity of characters in pastoral literature with the author of the poem or play was an important trope for the genre and in the case of Tasso’s \textit{Aminta}, the poet may have been influenced by pastoral paintings, where Christian and pagan imagery seem to blend together, a topic that will be addressed below.} The shepherds and nymphs are not uncouth and rustic, but follow the pastoral tradition of speaking in sophisticated poetic verse.\footnote{See the introduction to Torquato Tasso, \textit{Aminta: A Pastoral Play}, XX. As noted by Cody, \textit{The Landscape of the Mind}, 61, the play is more concerned with the skill of Tasso as an artist than it is about the life of the shepherd characters.} Still, one of the most important elements present in the play is the symbolism of the landscape and the various elements described within the setting. From the woods as a place of retreat to the appearance of the beech and palm trees to bees, wolves, and sheep, Tasso references imagery that appears in Vergil and other pastoral literature.\footnote{Cody, \textit{The Landscape of the Mind}, 46-47.} For Tasso the landscape itself can affect the characters and actions of the drama, a theme that is present in his most famous work, the epic \textit{Gerusalemme liberata}, written at the same time as \textit{Aminta}.

\textit{Giovanni Battista Agucchi’s Program for Tasso’s Erminia and the Shepherds}

Tasso is best known for \textit{Gerusalemme liberata}, a poem that blends the genres of the heroic epic and romantic lyric poetry and the classical tradition with modern poetry, to create a grand vision of the Christian quest during the Crusades.\footnote{The best English translation of the poem is Torquato Tasso, \textit{Jerusalem Delivered/Gerusalemme liberata}, ed. and trans. Anthony M. Esolen (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000). In the introduction, Esolen discusses the historical context surrounding the writing of the poem. The first full edition appeared in 1581. Also see Andrew Fichter, “Tasso’s Epic of Deliverance,” \textit{PMLA} 93, no. 2 (March 1978): 265-74, where the author describes Tasso’s use of the romantic passages a means to demonstrate how the negative tendencies of the genre can be conquered by the Christian faith and Anthony Colantuono,} Tasso never fully
acknowledged any published edition of the poem, even at the end of his life, and he rewrote his epic to remove what are today the most praised sections, the passages on the multiple romances throughout *Gerusalemme liberata*. These passages concern the stories of the formidable knight Rinaldo and the witch Armida who entices him to leave the Christian camp and live with her on a magical island, the Saracen princess Erminia, who, while wearing the armor of the female knight Clorinda, is chased by the Christians and takes refuge with a family of shepherds, and Tancred, who is wounded in battle and healed by Erminia, who has secretly loved him and eventually converts to Christianity. Beginning in the early seventeenth century, soon after the publication of the poem, the episodes became popular subjects for artists because, as Clovis Whitfield notes, “the lyrical character of its narrative and heroes suggested of itself the embodiment of poetical qualities in paint and so it was a ready ground for the attempted union between Painting and Poetry.”

Beyond the actual paintings by artists including Annibale Carracci, Domenichino, Guercino, Claude, Poussin, and Dughet, a program written by the diplomat and scholar Giovanni Battista Agucchi (1570-1632) exists for a commission from Ludovico Carracci.

---

188 Tasso, *Jerusalem Delivered*, 12. Esolen argues that Tasso thought of the passages as distractions from the “important doctrinal purposes” of the poem. The interludes are, however, the most humane and deeply moving episodes in the poem, as Esolen states, Tasso “always returns from doctrinal Truth to a sensitive appreciation of the actions, great and small, which distinguish us as human beings. Men are all in desperate need of salvation; but some measure of Grace may shine forth to render believer and unbeliever alike worthy of admiration or compassion,” 14.

in 1602, now in the royal collection in Spain. Ludovico’s painting of *Erminia and the Shepherds* (fig. 2.3) is the earliest known example of the subject, which soon became the most popular pastoral interlude from the poem for artists to represent. The scene portrays Erminia, still dressed in the armor of Clorinda after her flight from the Christian camp, encountering an elderly shepherd and his three sons in a landscape that perfectly fits the idealized *locus amoenus* of pastoral literature, a refuge from the war-ravaged world of the city from which the princess fled. Stylistically, the painting is close to the landscapes produced by Annibale Carracci before he left for Rome (fig. 1.14), with brown and green earth tones and set within a grove. Agucchi referred to the entire painting as representing the idealized landscapes of the pastoral realm, “in sum, the whole landscape set as a place of peace, and happy Arcadia.” The presentation of the setting in this scene of the poem contrasts with other romantic and more evocative images of the landscape throughout the poem, where Tasso’s choice of words and language create either an ominous mood as when Tancred is wandering through the enchanted forest or a fantastic one, such as the description of Rinaldo’s entrapment within Armida’s garden. Agucchi’s choice of the

---

190 The program was first published by Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi.” It was discovered in a volume of papers in a manuscript in the British Library (Harleian MS 3463), 217. The painting was identified by Antonio Vannugli, “Ludovico Carracci: Un’Erminia ritrovata e un riesame delle committenze romane,” *Storia dell’Arte* 59 (1987): 47-69. Also see Gail Feigenbaum, *Ludovico Carracci*, ed. Andrea Emiliani (Fort Worth, TX: Kimbell Art Museum, 1994), 125-28. The current location is the Royal Palace of La Granja de San Ildefonso, near the city of Segovia. The painting entered the royal collection in the eighteenth century as part of a group of paintings once owned by Carlo Maratta.


192 See Mario Praz, “Armida’s Garden,” *Comparative Literature Studies*, 5, no. 1 (March 1968): 1-20, for a full analysis of the passages and their relationship to the history of romantic literature and to later garden design. Also see Gianni Venturi, “La selva e il giardino: Tasso e il paesaggio,” in *Archivi dello sguardo: Origini e momenti della pittura di paesaggio in Italia*, ed. Francesca Cappelletti (Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 2006), 75-92, for more on Tasso’s descriptions of the landscape, their emotional affect on the reader, and their representation in seventeenth-century painting. Poussin especially was influenced by
particular moment of peace reflects his own desire for a respite from his busy career as secretary to Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini (1571-1621).\textsuperscript{193} As with other noble patrons in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Agucchi valued the importance of a life of contemplation outside of court, where one could escape into the countryside and engage in philosophical discussions and writings.

Agucchi was somewhat disappointed with Ludovico’s landscape, which did not exactly follow the description with its large foreground figures, and likely shared his view on the painting and the program he composed with Domenichino, from whom he commissioned a number of works.\textsuperscript{194} Domenichino executed a painting of the same subject sometime after Ludovio’s \textit{Erminia and the Shepherds} was delivered to Agucchi.

---

\textsuperscript{193} Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi,” 222, also notes that Agucchi met Tasso just before the poet’s death at the monastery of Sant’Onofrio in Rome, where Agucchi and his brother Girolamo were employed by their uncle Cardinal Filippo Sega. Agucchi did retire from public life from 1607-1615, and was able to write. Also see Daniel M. Unger, “The Yearning for the Holy Land: Agucchi’s Program for \textit{Erminia and the Shepherds},” \textit{Word & Image} 24, no. 4 (2008): 367-68. It was during this time that Agucchi composed his treatise on artistic practice, the \textit{Tratto}, which influenced later theorists and authors including Giovanni Pietro Bellori. Agucchi likely identified with the shepherd in the interlude, who tells Erminia that he once lived at court, but retired to the country to live out his days in peace, 369. See Tasso, \textit{Jerusalem Delivered}, Canto 7, verse 13, 136, “I longed for the repose of this sweet time / and sighed for lost simplicity and peace. / I bid goodbye to the court and all its strife, / and in these woods have lived a happy life.” Unger argues for a political agenda behind Agucchi’s choice of a scene from Tasso’s epic in which the secretary to the papal nephew sought to draw attention away from the heretical work of authors like Giordano Bruno and Tommaso Campanella, who wrote on the discoveries of the New World, but focusing attention back on Jerusalem, 372. Although the political motivations of Tasso have been discussed in terms of his linking the Crusades to the Catholic Church’s mission against Protestantism, the connection for Agucchi’s program is more difficult to reach because of the limited audience for which the text was written and who had access to the single painting.

\textsuperscript{194} Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi,” 217. Both Vannugli, “Ludovico Carracci: Un’Erminia ritrovata” and Feigenbaum, \textit{Ludovico Carracci}, 127, however, believe that the tone of Agucchi’s letter expressed his irritation at the painting having been damaged while in transit rather than disappointment with the work itself.
in 1603 (fig. 2.4).\textsuperscript{195} In this painting – generally dated to 1622-25, but which Whitfield places around 1607, when Domenichino was still close to Agucchi – the size of the figures and grandeur of the landscape vista correspond more closely to Agucchi’s program.\textsuperscript{196} A number of works by other artists representing the pastoral interlude emerged in the following decades of the seventeenth century, all likely inspired by the program composed by Agucchi. Other scenes from Tasso’s poem also began to appear as patrons and artists scoured the epic, ignoring the heroic battle scenes and instead choosing the romantic passages, usually set within a landscape. Poussin created at least five paintings based on the poem, including the \textit{Tancred and Erminia} of around 1630 (fig. 2.5) and \textit{Rinaldo and Armida} of c. 1628-30 (fig. 2.6).\textsuperscript{197} Dughet also produced at least one painting from the poem around 1656-57, a large-scale landscape depicting Armida about to strike the wounded Rinaldo, but restrained by Cupid (fig. 2.7).\textsuperscript{198} His choice of this subject, rather than the more popular image of Rinaldo and Armida in the garden, is likely based on Poussin’s model, but Dughet’s vision is closer to Domenichino’s \textit{Erminia and the Shepherds} as the landscape dominates the figures.\textsuperscript{199} The dramatic moment of Armida realizing her love for the Christian knight as she is about to

\textsuperscript{195} See Richard Spear, \textit{Domenichino} (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), cat. no. 84, pl. 262, 237-38. The original patron is unknown and the landscape was attributed to Annibale Carracci from the late seventeenth century into the eighteenth.

\textsuperscript{196} Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi,” 228.


\textsuperscript{198} Marie Nicole Boisclair, \textit{Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre (1615-1675)} (Paris: Arthéna, 1986), cat. no. 146, fig. 185, 217. Boisclair identifies the work as Erminia and Tancred, but the female figure is clearly Armida being restrained by Cupid. The painting was actually attributed to Poussin in the nineteenth century.

\textsuperscript{199} For the relationship between Poussin’s treatment of the moment and images of Echo and Narcissus, see Unglaub, \textit{Poussin and the Poetics of Painting}, 71-107.
kill him and then deciding to carry him off to her enchanted island is nearly overshadowed by the imposing and expansive landscape, particularly the mountain looming in the background. Identified as an actual view of Mount Sorrata, just north of Rome, the mountain, based in the Roman countryside, is standing in for Mount of Olives in Jerusalem, which figures prominently in the poem. Either the unknown original patron or the artist himself devised this conceit in which a recognizable image of the Roman landscape stands in for an important Biblical geographical feature that is an important element in Tasso’s narrative. Simultaneously, the landscape is able to conjure an image of the remote world of the east as described by Tasso and the impression of the known countryside in Rome.

The text of Agucchi’s program is entitled an impresa, or an undertaking through a picture and motto that embodies a complex metaphor, which Whitfield defines as Agucchi’s innovative attempt to express the notion of identifying himself with the pastoral sanctuary to which Erminia has fled. While Tasso locates the scene on the banks of the River Jordan, he does not provide the exacting description demanded by

---

200 See Fichter, “Tasso’s Epic of Deliverance,” 267-68, for more on how the mountain figures in the poem. Goffredo, the central hero of the epic, ascends the mountain before attacking the city. The Mount of Olives is featured in several Old and New Testament scenes, of which Tasso was well aware. The mountain is identified as Sorrata in Sivigliano Alloisi, *Arcadie e vecchi merletti: Paesaggi della Collezione Corsini* (Rome: Gebart, 2002), 66. P.A. Tomory, “Passion, Imagination, and Intellect: Poussin, Claude, and Gaspard Dughet in the Roman Campagna,” in *The Classical Temper in Western Europe*, ed. John Hardy and Andrew McCredie (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 46, was likely the first to make the connection. Additionally, the cloud of smoke rising from the mountain may be the burning castle referenced in Agucchi’s impresa for Ludovico’s painting. See Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi,” 220.

Agucchi, who specified the types of trees and plants that Ludovico must include to render the scene as naturalistic as possible.\textsuperscript{202} This naturalism accords with Counter Reformation theories on art, such as the writings of Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597), the archbishop of Bologna, whose text on sacred images influence Agucchi’s theories of art. Paleotti argued for the importance of religious images that were legible and based upon the study of nature, while secular art should follow the rules of decorum.\textsuperscript{203} Whitfield connects Agucchi’s novel choice of this particular scene from Tasso’s poem to both the Counter Reformation in that the epic depicts the Christian soldiers defeating the infidels and it manages to “achieve a balance between the Christian ideal and the qualities of classical precedents,” in its relationship and adherence to ancient epic poetry.\textsuperscript{204}

\textit{Christianity and the Pastoral: Spirituality in Landscape Painting}

An important element of Tasso’s poetry is his imitation of Classical sources – the heroic epics of Homer and Vergil – within a contemporary, Christian context. \textit{Gerusalemme liberata} contains a clear moral message arguing for the triumph of the

\textsuperscript{202} See Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi,” 219, “E per far il paese al più natural, che fosse possibile, sarebbe ben di mettervi delle palme de platani, sicomori, lentische, serrebenti, genebri, olter qualcheduno di più domestici, che ulivi, alori, olmi, querice, e frassano, e pome, e fichi ma perché non potrebbono ne discernersi tutti bastaria più facili da riconoscervi come le Palme, i Platani, e pieni i Olivi, e Alori.” (And to make the landscape more natural, as much as possible, it would be good to include some palm trees, sycamore, mastic trees, terebinth, juniper, other domestic types, like olives, laurels, oaks, elms, and ash, and apple, and figs, but because one could not discern all, it will be enough that you can more easily recognize the palms, the planes, and filled in the olives and laurels).

\textsuperscript{203} See the recent translation with an excellent introduction by Paolo Prodi in Gabriele Paleotti, \textit{Discourse on Sacred and Profane Images}, trans. William McCuaig (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2012), 1-42.

\textsuperscript{204} Whitfield, “A Programme for ‘Erminia and the Shepherds’ by G.B. Aguchhi,” 223. Tasso stressed the importance of naturalism in his poetry, but also the necessity for the miraculous, which is beyond the normal experience and allows for a sense of astonishment. Agucchi noted this in another letter of 1603 in which he stated that painters should stay as close to truth as possible, but also look to other examples in art for miraculous events that are not found in everyday life.
Christian faith.\textsuperscript{205} This same subtext is present in the paintings based on the epic narrative, including the landscape paintings of artist such as Dughet. But the presence of faith within the natural world extends beyond landscapes based on Tasso and those representing Biblical stories set in nature.\textsuperscript{206}

For audiences in the sixteenth century, nature was viewed as a manifestation of God’s greatness. This concept is best exemplified in the writings of Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564-1631), an important patron of landscape and still life paintings in Rome, who served as a protector to the Accademia di San Luca before moving to Milan in 1595 when he was appointed the archbishop of the city.\textsuperscript{207} Borromeo’s impact in Rome cannot be underestimated as he was one of the early leading patrons of the Northern artists like Paul Bril (1554-1626), Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625), and Adam Elsheimer (1578-1610). In Milan, he established the Biblioteca Ambrosiana for his vast art collection and library and also the Accademia del Disegno, housed in the same building.\textsuperscript{208}

Borromeo had studied in Bologna from 1579-80 under Gabriel Paleotti and was influenced by his work and theoretical writings on art. Recognized by his contemporaries as humble and dedicated to the ideals of the Counter Reformation, Borromeo composed

\textsuperscript{205} For a more general overview of this type of imitation, see G.W. Pigman III, “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance,” \textit{Renaissance Quarterly} 33, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 30.

\textsuperscript{206} Freedman, \textit{The Classical Pastoral in the Visual Arts}, 25, notes that in commentaries in the early Renaissance would associate the shepherd in the landscape with Christ.

\textsuperscript{207} See Pamela Jones, “Federico Borromeo as Patron of Landscapes and Still Lifes: Christian Optimism in Italy ca. 1600,” \textit{The Art Bulletin} 70, no. 2 (June 1988): 261-72, and Jones, \textit{Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana: Art Patronage and Reform in Seventeenth-Century Milan} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), for a complete overview of Borromeo’s biography. He was born to an influential noble family in Milan an appointed a cardinal in 1587. His older cousin, Carlo Borromeo (1538-1584), who was his guardian after his father’s death, was canonized in 1610.

\textsuperscript{208} Jones, \textit{Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana}, 39. The Ambrosiana was named after St. Ambrose, a fourth-century archbishop of Milan.
two treatises on art, *De pictura sacra* (*Sacred Painting*), published in 1624, and *Musaeum* (*Museum*), which appeared the next year. He began writing *Sacred Painting* after he was appointed archbishop and the text is divided into a section on general guidelines and one on iconography in religious paintings. In the treatise, Borromeo’s view on art is processed through the lens of Christian optimism as expressed by his friend and mentor, the Oratorian founder Filippo Neri (1515-1595), which appealed to the emotions of the faithful and stressed the delight that came from contemplating the power of God through his creation. The goal of artists was to produce work that would encourage viewers to live upright and moral lives as good Christians, which could best be achieved through a naturalistic style. The later text, *Museum*, is a guidebook to his art collection, based on Pliny the Elder’s chapters on art in *Natural History*. Borromeo’s understanding of the

---

209 Both texts have been recently translated and published, Federico Borromeo, *Sacred Painting and Museum*, ed. and trans. Kenneth S. Rothwell, Jr. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), which includes an introduction by Pamela Jones. The treatises are written in Latin.

210 Jones, “Federico Borromeo as Patron of Landscapes and Still Lifes,” 270. The importance of this strain of thinking was manifested early in Borromeo’s career as evidenced by the unpublished text by Agostino Valier, a follower of Neri who also tutored Borromeo. The text is a dialogue between Neri and his followers – at one point, he poses a question to Borromeo on how to find Christian joy to which the younger man responds that it comes from studying God’s creation. For more on Borromeo’s devotional practices and relationship to art, see Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana*, 65-76. Nicola Courtright, *The Papacy and the Art of Reform in Sixteenth-Century Rome: Gregory XIII’s Tower of the Winds in the Vatican* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 142-44, also discusses Gregory XIII’s use of pastoral imagery – landscapes with images of shepherds and peasants – in the Tower of the Winds as an idealized example of the humility expressed through artistic style, an important goal of the pope’s ideological program. As stated by Courtright, “the humble pastoral style employed throughout the cycles illustrates poetically the harmonious continuity of Jewish and Christian history that the program asserts polemically.” 144. Additionally, texts on teaching the catechism after the Reformation would feature images stressing the power of nature as God’s creation, see Arnold Witte, “The Power of Repetition: Christian Doctrine and the Visual Exegesis of Nature in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Painting,” in *Le paysage sacré: Le paysage comme exégès dans l’Europe de la première modernité*, ed. Denis Ribouillault and Michel Weemans (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2011), 93-112. In a number of Jesuit publications, the glory of nature was used to explain the Credo and tours of church gardens incorporated discussions on the diversity of nature as exemplifying the existence of God. The result of this repetitive instruction would be that anyone who attended sermons would immediately associate an image of the landscape with the Creator, 112.

211 Borromeo, *Sacred Painting and Museum*, xv. Borromeo was also influenced by excavations of early Christian catacombs, which he was likely interested in because the images demonstrated the history of the
purpose of art was not an entirely new phenomenon. As Creighton Gilbert has noted, fifteenth-century treatises on morality addressed pictures and their moral objectives. Giovanni Dominici’s text on the education of children refers to what seem to be genre paintings of sleeping children that are meant to remind the viewer of the infancy of Christ through the representation of typical family life.

Beyond the spiritual function of landscape images, the paintings also had a practical function as well. When employed as decoration for suburban and urban palaces, rather than in country villas, pictures of the Roman landscape allowed patrons to imagine themselves outside, walking through their estate, which was considered beneficial to both physical and mental health. Pamela Jones, through her study of Borromeo’s letters, has connected this aspect of landscape to the archbishop’s patronage of artists who specialized in the genre. She argues that the nearly twenty Flemish landscapes he commissioned during his busy stay in Rome, when he had little time to devote to a life of contemplation in the countryside, were his means of retreating into nature. In another Catholic tradition, xi. Also see Barbara Agosti, *Collezionismo e archeologia cristiana nel Seicento: Federico Borromeo e il Medioevo artistico tra Roma e Milano* (Milan: Jaca Book, 1996).

212 Creighton Gilbert, “On Subject and Not-Subject in Italian Renaissance Pictures,” 34, no. 3 (September 1952): 202-16.

213 Gilbert, “On Subject and Not-Subject,” 206-07. Alberti defines painting as a “mirror-image,” in which the observer can see him or herself.

214 Gage, “Exercise for Mind and Body,” 1184-85. Additionally, such images reinforced the status of the patron and his guests who are “in possession of the necessary intellectual discernment to preserve their health by means of physical exercise and the contemplation of nature,” in opposition to the “laborers [who] merely work the land without manifesting any capacity to draw either material benefit or spiritual reward from it,” 1189. As Gage explains, the ability to even partake in this sort of viewing or the actual physical activity of walking through the landscape, marked the body as noble. Nobility “issued from a conjunction of privilege and effort, residing within a healthy body, especially one that its possessor had diligently preserved by means of exercises performed in select spaces indoors and out, and by means of the informed beholding of luxury objects,” 1202.

treatise of 1625, *I tre libre delle piacere della mente christiniana*, Borromeo wrote that the contemplation of nature brought a Christian soul closer to God.\textsuperscript{216}

The esteemed physician and art theorist Giulio Mancini’s (1559-1630) unpublished treatise on painting, the *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, circulated among his friends and patrons, including the Borghese, Barberini, and Ludovisi families as well as Cassiano dal Pozzo and Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte. In the text, which was influenced by the work of earlier art theorists and biographers as well as the history of medicine, Mancini stresses the benefits of owning and displaying landscape painting in palaces, where visitors could participate in engaged viewing, letting their eyes journey through the extensive landscapes conceived by artists like Annibale Carracci and Domenichino, as in Annibale’s *Fishing* of around 1585-88 (fig. 2.8).\textsuperscript{217} The intense observation and the sense of movement, the physician argued, improved the viewer’s health by instilling a feeling of rejuvenation and nourishment, as if he or she had physically traversed the painted landscape. In *Museum*, Borromeo describes some of his Flemish landscapes in similar terms, illustrating the journey one’s eye travels on through

\textsuperscript{216} Jones, “Federico Borromeo as Patron of Landscapes and Still Lifes,” 264. Borromeo argued for the necessity of living in harmony with nature, God’s creation. Lucy C. Cutler, “Representing an Alternative Empire at the Court of Cardinal Federico Borromeo in Habsburg Milan,” in *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety, and Art 1450-1700*, ed. Mary Hollingsworth and Carol M. Richardson (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), 249-264, argues that Borromeo’s beliefs can be tied to Stoicism through the writings of Justus Lipsius, who stressed that the goal of wisdom was to live life in harmony with nature through correct reason and virtue. For Lipsius this included searching for God, which was the primary objective of life. For more on Borromeo’s patronage of Jan Brueghel the Elder, see Lucy C. Cutler, “The Art of Imitating Nature: Jan Brueghel’s Landscape Paintings for Cardinal Federico Borromeo,” in *Archivi dello sguardo*, 195-209.

\textsuperscript{217} Gage, “Exercise for Mind and Body,” 1194-1200, Mancini describes the three zones of a landscape painting – the fore, middle, and backgrounds – and how the viewer’s eye moves from a more intense and close inspection of the foreground, filled with figures and objects, to a relaxed and softer view of the expansive background. The painting is the pendant to *Hunting* (fig. 1.14).
the extensive backgrounds.\textsuperscript{218} In Bril’s *Seascape* of 1611 (fig. 2.9), Borromeo illustrates how carefully through looking through the painting, one’s eye almost travels along an actual coastline.\textsuperscript{219} Landscape paintings, as demonstrated by Borromeo and Mancini, were not merely decorative objects meant to display the status or power of their owners, but were part of a larger dialogue on spirituality, culture, and social ideals in seventeenth-century Rome.

\textit{The Pastoral in Seventeenth-Century Rome and the “Subject” of Dughet’s Landscapes}

\textit{The Pastoral Tradition and the Politics of Landscape}

Borromeo was not the only collector of landscapes in the early seventeenth century as the genre was rising in popularity. In Rome, patrons from noble households were steadily adding landscapes to their collections, primarily works from Northern artists like the \textit{bamboccianti} and Dutch Italianates, and French painters such as Claude, with a few Italian artists, including Domenichino and Agostino Tassi (1578-1644) in the early decades and Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) and Michelangelo Cerquozzi (1602-1660) later in the century.\textsuperscript{220} The subjects of the landscape paintings in princely collections

\textsuperscript{218} Jones, “Federico Borromeo as Patron of Landscapes and Still Lifes,” 267-68. For Borromeo’s entry on Brill’s *Seascape*, see *Sacred Painting and Museum*, 179. The painting is described as “a view of the sea that is so soothing, peaceful, and panoramic that anyone who sees it would think that he is looking at the real thing or walking along the seacoast.”

\textsuperscript{219} For the painting, see Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana*, cat. no. 24, 232.

\textsuperscript{220} See Richard E. Spear, “Rome: Setting the Stage,” in *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters*, ed. Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohm (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 97-104 for a discussion in the rise of landscape from an economic perspective. Spear traces the percentages of landscapes in collections from the early decades of the century until the last, which shifted from less than ten percent to nearly thirty for some collectors, such as Cardinal Camillo Massimo. Also see Francesca Cappelletti and Patrizia Cavazzini, “Collectionnisme et commerce de la peinture de paysage à Rome dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle,” in *Nature et idéal: Le paysage à Rome 1600-1650* (Paris: Éditions de la RMN-Grand Palais, 2011), 77-89, for an overview of major collectors and the artists they favored.
ranged from the daily life of the lower classes depicted by Northern artists, denounced by theorists and Italian artists as an affront to the glory of painting, to the idealized images of the Roman Campagna that were meant to invoke the *locus amoenus* described in pastoral literature and its multiple connotations, and also to religious scenes that suggested the pastoral landscape through the inclusion of herdsmen or their flocks. Two of the most popular artists creating pastoral landscapes by mid-century were Claude and Dughet, who, while often producing paintings with the same subject, worked in entirely different styles but toward the same goal for their patrons.

The paintings of Claude were clearly intended to suggest the pastoral ideal – the Golden Age of Vergil’s *Eclogues* filtered through Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*. In the majority of the scenes set within the Roman countryside, Claude represents the essential elements present in the poems and texts, including the shady grove under which the herdsmen could rest and cool streams or pools to provide refreshing water, seen in the later *Pastoral Landscape* of around 1677 (fig. 2.10), painted for Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna (1637-1689).\(^{221}\) The luminous quality of Claude’s work, with multiple layers of paint applied to achieve the lustrous effect is in stark contrast to Dughet’s paintings, with their drier surfaces and rough finish. But Dughet’s paintings, as much as those of Claude, directly represent the pastoral world conjured by Vergil’s poetry and later Renaissance followers. His earliest works, such as the *Landscape with Cowherd* of c. 1633-35 (fig. 2.11), portray the herdsmen described by Vergil.\(^{222}\)

---

\(^{221}\) Claire Pace, “‘The Golden Age . . . The First and Last Days of Mankind’: Claude Lorrain and Classical Pastoral, with Special Emphasis on Themes from Ovid’s ‘Metamorphoses,’” *Artibus et Historiae* 23, no. 46 (2002): 130-31, lists the references to trees and water in Theocritus, Vergil, and Sannazaro.

\(^{222}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 6, fig. 10, 170.
grove of trees near a small lake. He is dressed in antique costume, identifiable as a simple, short garment, or *exomis*, draped over one shoulder, which is what the majority of male figures in Dughet’s paintings wear. The theme of the herdsman in a landscape continues throughout Dughet’s career as the majority of his paintings depict such characters from pastoral literature and poetry in repose within the countryside. Rather than the occasional painting of a landscape seemingly without a true subject, Dughet’s works nearly all feature herdsmen or hunters, generally at rest in the idyllic world of the pastoral and not recognizable narratives. A series of late landscapes for Colonna, completed between 1667 and 1673, which include the gouache and oil paintings, all feature figures dressed *all’antica*, conversing or resting in the Roman Campagna as in the *Landscape with Herdsmen* (fig. 2.12).

Mirka Beneš has noted the important political connotations for the selection of landscapes by families such as the Pamphilj, whose status and fortune rose with the election of Innocent X. Papal families gained not only wealth, but also vast tracts of land through the purchase of farms around the Roman countryside from older families that were often in financial trouble. Possession of the farms yielded both monetary

---

223 Roman slaves and lower-class laborers wore the tunic. The term *exomis* is from the Greek meaning outside shoulder. For more, see *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Michael Gagarin and Elaine Fantham (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 230.

224 Of the over 400 paintings catalogued in Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, only around seventy are works with an identifiable historical, mythological, or Biblical subject. Poussin, in contrast, produced only a handful of paintings without “subjects,” which have led scholars to search for obscure passages from literature and history rather than accepting that the landscape, and the response it evokes in the viewer, is the true subject.


226 Beneš, “Pastoralism in the Roman Baroque Villa and in Claude Lorrain,” 97-100, notes that by 1660, the Pamphilj family owned almost twenty large farms, while the Borghese held nearly forty. The Barberini family had sixteen.
rewards through raising livestock and producing crops and ideological value because of the connection of land ownership to feudal nobility.\textsuperscript{227} Additionally, there was a shift in the method of cultivating the land from growing crops to raising livestock, as the latter was more profitable.\textsuperscript{228} The connections to the countryside were thus significant for patrons like Camillo Pamphilj and Claude acknowledges this through his paintings. In the \textit{View of Delphi}, the fantastic temple is imposed onto the Roman Campagna, rather than the actual location of the site in Greece, and the figures are based on literary precedents, not the true laborers and herdsmen who occupied the land.

Dughet’s paintings of the Roman countryside often include recognizable landmarks, specifically locating his works within the landscape owned by his patrons. In the \textit{Ponte Lucano} of around 1651-53 (fig. 2.13) for Camillo Pamphilj (1622-1666), which is part of the series of landscapes completed for the family in the early 1650s, the artist depicts an ancient Roman bridge along the Via Tiburtina, the road leading from Rome to Tivoli, the site of the Villa of Hadrian. As discussed above, the Villa served as a model for Roman nobility when building their country and suburban estates, including Camillo Pamphilj, who began constructing the Casino Bel Respiro on the property bought by his father on the Janiculum Hill in Rome.\textsuperscript{229} Dughet’s painting, which was almost certainly

\textsuperscript{227} Beneš, “Pastoralism in the Roman Baroque Villa and in Claude Lorrain,” 100.

\textsuperscript{228} Beneš, “Pastoralism in the Roman Baroque Villa and in Claude Lorrain,” 100, explains that the reason for this was the cost of labor was much lower for pasturelands than for agriculture. Beginning in the fifteenth century, more villages were abandoned as their inhabitants moved to cities, resulting in a shortage of people to work the land and build proper drainage systems. Landowners realized that a greater profit could be had through renting land to herdsmen for grazing their flocks. As the author states, “for the Borghese and Pamphilj, revenues from cows and sheep paid for paintings and gardens, and the poetic distance of the pastoral art that they acquired both evoked and removed a pastoralist economic reality that they knew well and that mattered to them,” 113.

\textsuperscript{229} Carla Benocci, \textit{Villa Doria Pamphilj} (Rome: Editalia, 1996) is the major source for the Casino. The importance of the Bel Respiro for antiquarianism will be discussed further in the following chapter.
intended for another Pamphilj family property, the palace on the Via del Corso inherited by Camillo after his marriage to Olimpia Aldobrandini in 1647, thus encouraged Pamphilj and his visitors to reflect on the countryside and the importance of the site of the Villa of Hadrian at Tivoli.\textsuperscript{230} The Ponte Lucano hung in a room on the piano nobile, likely the first antecamera for visitors to the Palazzo Pamphilj.\textsuperscript{231}

The painting was one of a number of landscapes covering the walls of this space as recorded in an inventory of 1655. Other works included seven large paintings by Dughet that were collaborations with Guglielmo Cortese, mostly of religious subjects, such as the Landscape with Cain and Abel (fig. 2.14).\textsuperscript{232} It is likely that shortly after the inventory was completed, the Pamphilj prince commissioned at least nine other paintings from Dughet specifically for the room as the canvases are of unusual varying sizes, fitting perfectly within the spaces between the windows and doors (fig. 2.15).\textsuperscript{233} The paintings,  

\textsuperscript{230} The painting is one of the few by Dughet securely recorded in the inventory of 1655 of the palace (Archivio Doria-Pamphilj Scaff. 86, no. 29, not dated, but listed as being immediately after the death of Innocent X), although the author mistakenly records the painting as by Paul Bril. The unusual size, however, matches Dughet’s painting. See Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 114, fig. 155, 205-06, who also publishes the inventory, 145. The room is listed as the galleria.

\textsuperscript{231} The room is located just off a staircase at the northern entrance on the Via del Corso.

\textsuperscript{232} Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. nos. 117-123, figs.158-164, 207-09. The paintings are also recorded in Archivio Doria-Pamphilj Scaff. 86, no. 29, fol. 367v.

\textsuperscript{233} Andrea G. De Marchi, “Paesaggi di Dughet, Onofri, Weenix (e Chiesa),” in Il Palazzo Doria Pamphilj al Corso e le sue collezioni, ed. Andrea G. De Marchi (Florence: Centro Di della Edifimi, 2008), 104-05, suggests that the entire series of paintings (which he describes as reflecting Dughet’s deep interest in the natural world), were originally intended for the Casino Bel Respiro, based on the fact that the nine works were not recorded in family inventories until 1747. He also suggests that the collaborations with Cortese were once in another villa at Nettuno, as the artists were recorded working together there and that the paintings should be dated to later than the early 1650s, 102-03 (although the paintings were recorded in palace inventories in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, see Archivio Doria-Pamphilj Scaff. 86, no. 33, fols. 114-18, which is dated 1709). His most unusual argument is that the larger paintings, measuring around 72 x 178 inches, were originally mounted to lead screens, which explains the folds in the canvas (see fig. 2.13), and then moved from the Bel Respiro to the Salone del Poussin in the Palazzo Pamphilj in the eighteenth century, 104-05. De Marchi mentions the 1655 inventory (Archivio Doria-Pamphilj Scaff. 86, no. 29), which records both the Ponte Lucano and the collaborative works with Cortese in the Salone del Poussin, but does not give the date. Additionally, the damage to the canvases could be the
dated to 1651-53 by Marie Nicole Boisclair, are similar to the Ponte Lucano in that there are few, if any figures, present in the landscape and they record detailed, close-up views of rocks, forests, and waterfalls within the Roman countryside in the dry manner characteristic of Dughet (fig. 2.16).\(^{234}\) If, as seems likely, Pamphilij commissioned the works from Dughet to decorate the room, he intended for the space to display his status as a landowner, selecting an artist who was already established as the premier painter of naturalistic images of the Roman Campagna (fig. 2.17).

The display of status is clearly evident in Dughet’s fresco cycle for Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna (figs. 1.32 and 2.18), executed in 1667-68 in a small room that is part of the suite of summer apartments of Lorenzo Onofrio’s wife, Maria Mancini, in the family palace at the base of the Quirinal Hill.\(^{235}\) The entire room is decorated with a continuous scene of the Roman Campagna populated with small figures dressed all’antica, with the fresco punctuated at regular intervals by elaborate trompe l’oeil Ionic columns. Unlike earlier precedents set forth in the Villa Barber (figs. 2.1 and 2.2), Dughet’s panoramic landscape is located within the central family palace in the city, rather than in a country villa. The frescoes also contrast with Baldassare Peruzzi’s decorative scheme for the

---

\(^{234}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. nos. 107-115, figs. 148-156, 203-207. The paintings were likely commissioned soon after the 1655 inventory and thus date to slightly later than Boisclair’s suggestion of 1651-53. Boisclair rejects the attribution of some of the paintings to Dughet, see cat. no. R185-201, 336-339 for the complete list.

suburban Villa Farnesina of 1515-17 (fig. 2.19), which depicts a panoramic view of contemporary Rome that could be seen from the site. Dughet’s landscape is the pastoral and idealized countryside, which was not visible from the Palazzo Colonna. The continuous fresco, interrupted by columns and pilasters, shows not just a single type of landscape, but moves from the dense woods to more open plains, and then to tall mountains, representing the variety of scenery in the Roman countryside. The painted tiles at the bottom of each scene matched the original floor to the apartment, further stressing the sense of the broken space of the walls, where the room appears to have opened up onto an expansive vista. At the time the room was decorated, the Colonna family had been forced to sell some of their estates in the country, including the fiefdom of Palestrina, which was purchased by the Barberini family. Other rooms in the same set of apartments were also decorated in similar fashion with panoramic landscape and marine frescoes. In the private apartments for his wife, Colonna may have intended to represent the vast estates and territory once owned by his family, whose lineage could be traced back to ancient Rome. The encompassing view of the Campagna provided the

---

236 For a brief overview of the frescoes, which were commissioned by Agostino Chigi, see Michael Rohlmann and Julian Klieman, *Italian Frescoes* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1996), 194-214. The frescoes will be discussed in relation to ancient Roman painting in Chapter 4. Other panoramic landscape vistas include the scenes in the Sala delle Cariatidi in the Villa Imperiale in Pesaro, painted by Dosso and Battista Dossi for Eleonora Gonzaga, wife of Francesco Maria I della Rovere, around 1530, see Craig Hugh Smyth, “On Dosso Dossi at Pesaro,” in *Dosso’s Fate: Painting and Court Culture in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Luisa Ciammitti et al (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998), 241-262.

237 See Bandes, “Gaspard Dughet’s frescoes in Palazzo Colonna, Rome,” 84-88, for a detailed description of each scene and the related preparatory drawings.

238 The importance of Palestrina will be discussed in the final chapter of this dissertation. See Natalia Gozzano, *La quadreria di Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna: Prestigio nobiliare e collezionismo nella Roma barocca* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2004), 49-101, for Colonna’s biography and his choice to turn to art collecting as a demonstration of his status rather than military achievements, which has been a source of family pride for centuries.
family with a place to imagine themselves in the countryside and contemplate the glory of nature – precepts recommended by Mancini and Borromeo.

Further political aspirations can be read into Dughet’s pastoral landscapes for Cardinal Camillo Massimo (1620-1677), for whom he likely began working shortly after he left Poussin’s studio and for whom he continued to produce paintings through the end of his career. The status and fortune of the Massimo family, who traced their lineage back to a Roman general from the Republican period who believed he was descended from Hercules, fluctuated greatly during Camillo’s lifetime. Massimo rose to prominence during the pontificate of Innocent X and under the Pamphilj pope, he became an influential advisor and eventually papal nuncio to Spain. After the death of Innocent X, he lost his position and the family palace when Alexander VII was elected pope. Forced to retire to the countryside in semi-exile, Massimo’s status rose again under Clement X. He returned to Rome in 1663, buying back his family palace and a new property on the Quirinal Hill. Throughout the difficult periods, including his exile, Massimo continued to commission and collect art. He began decorating his newly acquired palace

---


240 See Lisa Beaven, “‘É cortesi, erudito, e disinvolto al pari di qualunque altro buon corteggiano:’ Cardinal Camillo Massimo (1620-1677) at the Court of Pope Clement X,” in *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety, and Art 1450-1700*, ed. Mary Hollingsworth and Carol M. Richardson (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), 309-327 for the Massimo family history. The old family property was the Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne, just at the south of the Piazza Navona, which Massimo leased to his relatives after recouping it. Massimo’s new purchase in 1664 was the Palazzo Mattei alle Quattro Fontane (now Palazzo del Drago), which was near the Palazzo Barberini. Clement X finally appointed him as a cardinal in 1670.

with a number of landscapes, including paintings from Dughet. The inventory taken at his death records that nearly twenty-five percent of his extensive collection of paintings was composed of landscapes.\textsuperscript{242} Unfortunately, none of his commissions from Dughet have been traced today, but based on the simple titles in the inventories (as paesini with no mention of identifiable figures), the paintings were almost certainly Dughet’s typical pastoral landscapes with herdsmen in various states of repose.\textsuperscript{243} It is difficult to imagine that Massimo, who commissioned a number of landscape paintings from different artists, did not connect the history of the pastoral genre, with its longing for the idealized countryside and implications of abuse of power, with his family’s loss of fortune and his own time in exile when some of his properties had been stripped from him. The galleria established in his new palace on the Quirinal was filled with both landscape and history paintings, where Massimo and his viewers could engage in the type of intensive viewing recommended by Mancini, contemplating the significance of the pastoral landscape.

\textit{The Elegiac Landscape}

A central theme present in the pastoral landscapes of seventeenth-century Rome is the passage of time, whether over the course of a single day or thousands of years. In the paintings of Claude, the lighting is often clearly distinguishable as morning, midday, or

\textsuperscript{242} See Beaven, \textit{An Ardent Patron}, 274, for the breakdown of numbers. In 1673, Massimo commissioned the \textit{View of Delphi with a Procession} from Claude, which features a large hill with two temples. The hill resembles the actual landscape around Roccasecco dei Volsci, the area where Massimo lived in exile. The temples are modeled after classical style churches in the area, 221-26.

\textsuperscript{243} Massimo’s inventory from 1677 (BAV Capponiani 280) lists at least eleven paintings by Dughet, see Massimo Pomponi, “La collezione del cardinale Massimo e l’inventario del 1677,” in Marco Buonocore et al., \textit{Camillo Massimo collezionista di antichità: Fonti e materiali} (Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider), 99-138, for a transcription of the inventory. The location of the paintings and their relationship to ancient frescoes will be discussed extensively in the final chapter of this dissertation.
evening. The paintings imply the concept of changing time, which is also present in Vergil’s poems.\textsuperscript{244} This is further exemplified by the theme of travelers in the landscape, which occurs in both the foreground and in the background in a number of Claude’s paintings, and in the inclusion of running water, often crossed by human figures or animals.\textsuperscript{245} One example is the *View of Delphi with a Procession* of 1648-50 (fig. 2.20), executed for Camillo Pamphilj, where the group of figures moving across the middleground toward the temple at right are bathed in the softly glowing light of the sun, which is about to sink over the ocean at the horizon. A shepherd rests on the bridge at center, playing the pipes to his flock of sheep grazing peacefully around him. Claude has captured a single moment that will change in an instant when the clouds shift and the sun continues to set. Marcel Roethlisberger has argued that Claude’s incorporation of these various elements – travelers, changing time of day, moving water – all indicate the passage of time and serve to remind the viewer of the journey of life, inspiring the patrons and their visitors to think on the nature of mortality.\textsuperscript{246} Although Dughet, like Poussin, prefers a constant light that does not often represent a specific time of day, except for his stormy landscapes, he often includes running water in the form of a river or

\begin{justify}
\textsuperscript{244} Pace, “‘The Golden Age . . . The First and Last Days of Mankind,’” 131, Vergil sets some of his *Eclogues* in the evening and Sannazaro also describes certain scenes as taking place in the evening or at night. Also see Marcel G. Roethlisberger, “The Dimension of Time in the Art of Claude Lorrain,” *Artibus et Historiae* 10, no. 20 (1989): 73-92.

\textsuperscript{245} Pace, “‘The Golden Age . . . The First and Last Days of Mankind,’” 131-32

\textsuperscript{246} Roethlisberger, “The Dimension of Time in the Art of Claude Lorrain,” 80. Roethlisberger later connects this attention to the theme of passing time to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, 89. Interestingly, he also proposes that some of Claude’s pastoral scenes may represent specific passages from poems such as the *Idylls, Eclogues*, or *Arcadia*, but the generality of the descriptions provided in the text make this supposition difficult to determine, 85. Certainly though, the allusion to pastoral literature is an intentional on both the part of the artist and the patron. Roethlisberger dismisses this aspect of passing time in the landscapes of Dughet, only mentioning the examples of the storm landscapes, which include an obvious sense of time, and neglecting the multiple examples with winding roads and travelers and waterfalls., 80.
\end{justify}
waterfall as in the *Ponte Lucano* (fig. 2.13). His cycles of friezes for the Palazzo Muti-Bussi (fig. 2.21) from the late 1630s, the Palazzo Pamphilj (fig. 2.22) a decade later, and for the Palazzo Borghese (fig. 2.23) in the late 1660s include multiple scenes based around waterfalls and running water.\(^{247}\) Not only are Dughet and his patrons aspiring to depict a naturalistic view of the Roman Campagna, but the inclusion of such motifs encourages viewers to contemplate the passage of time and the transience of life. As noted by Arnold Witte, landscape painting, and the repetitive motifs within the images, were infused with religious significance, inspiring the viewer to think of God as the creator.\(^{248}\) This is particularly true of Innocent X, who commissioned multiple landscape friezes from artists including Agostino Tassi and Herman van Swanevelt (c.1604-1655) as decoration for the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona beginning in the 1630s.\(^{249}\) As Giovanni Battista Pamphilj, the future pope was educated in the circle of the Oratorians, who also influenced Federico Borromeo’s understanding of landscape painting and the spiritual aspect of nature.

In addition to the passage of time, there is a remarkable elegiac quality that appears in some pastoral poems, including Vergil’s *Eclogue* 5, where the shepherds gather around the tomb of Daphnis and in Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, when the herdsmen visit the tomb of Ergasto’s mother, Massilia.\(^{250}\) It was through Sannazaro’s description that the

---

\(^{247}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 49, fig. 71, 180-81; cat. no. 104, fig. 144, 201-03; and cat. no. 377, fig. 414, 284.


pastoral landscape became associated with the nostalgic and mournful yearning for the idealized past. The longing for a return to the Golden Age carries through into pastoral painting of the seventeen century, particularly in the work of Claude, Poussin, and Dughet. Claire Pace has connected Claude’s, and by extension, his patrons’ interest in representing the passage of time to the theme of death and nostalgia that is often present in pastoral literature. The most apparent example of this elegiac quality is the theme of *Et in Arcadia Ego*, first represented by Guercino around 1621-23 (fig. 2.24). The phrase inscribed on the block at lower right, which Erwin Panofsky translates as “Even in Arcady, there am I,” relates to the presence of Death in the idealized pastoral landscape, rather than a specific person speaking from a tomb. Guercino’s painting, with the figures pushed to the foreground and only a small landscape extending behind the skull and masonry, is closer to a moralistic *memento mori* image than an elegiac pastoral. The specific phrase, however, is picked up by Poussin in one of his most famous works, *Et in Arcadia Ego* (fig. 2.25) of around 1637, painted for Giulio Rospigliosi, the future Clement IX, who also commissioned *Dance to the Music of Time* from the artist. As described by Panofsky, the painting shows “a contemplative absorption in the idea of mortality,” rather than “a dramatic encounter with death.” The shepherds are

---

251 Pace, “‘The Golden Age . . . The First and Last Days of Mankind,’” 134 and 144, compares the sense of foreboding present in some paintings to the passages from Vergil and Sannazaro.

252 See Panofsky, “*Et in Arcadia Ego*,” 304-05, for more on the painting.

253 Panofsky, “*Et in Arcadia Ego*,” 307. Additional elements hinting at the passage of time and mortal decay are the fly and mouse resting on the skull.

254 Blunt, *The Paintings of Nicolas Poussin*, cat. no. 120; and Wright, *Poussin Paintings*, cat. no. 104.

255 Panofsky, “*Et in Arcadia Ego*,” 313. The tomb is closer to the Classical sarcophagus of Daphnis in Vergil’s Fifth *Eclogue* and the tomb in Sannazaro’s *Arcadia* and the shocking and bold presence of the
contemplating the tomb and the inscription rather than being confronted with the skull representing Death, tying the phrase to the body contained within the tomb. The phrase then becomes, “I, too, lived in Arcady,” as the shepherds reflect on the memory of the person who once resided in their pastoral world and the idealized past, rather than the inevitability of death.\footnote{Panofsky, “Et in Arcadia Ego,” 314-317.}

The inclusion of a tomb structure specifically alludes to the passage of time and mortality, but the presence of architecture in the form of ruins further reinforces the theme. Claude’s works generally incorporate architecture, but in a number of paintings, some of the structures are in a state of decay and paired with idealized imaginary antique buildings. In paintings such as the later Pastoral Landscape (fig. 2.10), with crumbling temples at both left and right, the “ruins of humanity’s past glory emerge as a potent visual foil to the present perfections of the pastoral scene.”\footnote{William L. MacDonald and John A. Pinto, Hadrian’s Villa and Its Legacy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 267.} The decaying remnants of a past age contrast with the shepherds in the foreground, who epitomize living in harmony with nature. Poussin also incorporates ruins to refer to the passage of time and collapse of antiquity. Compared to Poussin and Claude, Dughet usually avoids representing recognizable ruins. While a few paintings expressly allude to ancient buildings in Tivoli, Dughet’s paintings generally include only a hint of civilization in the backgrounds.\footnote{For more on the representation of actual ruins in landscape paintings, see Denis Ribouillaut, “Landscape ‘All’antica’ and Topographical Anachronism in Roman Fresco Painting of the Sixteenth Century,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 71 (2008): 211-37. On seemingly anachronistic images of ancient monuments taken out of their original context, which have been described in the past as merely decorative, Ribouillaut asserts that “rather than aspiring to the status of ontological representation-an objective 'truth' of such monuments in the context of the modern world.”} In
the *Valley After a Storm* (fig. 2.26) of around 1655 done for Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna, Dughet depicts a small city or town with mostly contemporary architecture in the distance, divided from the figures in the foreground by a lake.\(^{259}\) The inclusion of the far-off, isolated cityscape serves as a contrast with the pastoral scene in the front. As in the *Eclogues* of Vergil or the *Arcadia* of Sannazaro, Dughet’s characters reside in the idealized bucolic realm, living in harmony with nature, even after a storm, away from the detrimental atmosphere of the cultured world. Beyond the theme of mortality, the landscape paintings of Poussin often encourage meditation on the cycle of life and renewal in nature. Poussin’s *The Realm of Flora* of 1631 (fig. 2.27) contains a sarcophagus at left covered with flowers, likely representing the abundance of spring and relating to the figures in the painting.\(^{260}\) The figures around the goddess Flora are all characters from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* who were transformed into flowers upon their death, including Narcissus, Hyacinthus, Adonis, Crocus, and Clytie.\(^{261}\) Poussin presents the cycle of life in the painting as the dead mythological characters will be reborn as part of nature, “for out of death comes life and renewal,” as described by Paul Barolsky.\(^{262}\)

---


\(^{261}\) For a recent interpretation of the painting, see Paul Barolsky, “Poussin’s Ovidian Stoicism,” *Arion* 6, no. 2 (Fall-Winter 1998): 4-10 and Troy Thomas, “‘Un fior vano e fragile’: The Symbolism of Poussin’s *Realm of Flora*,” *The Art Bulletin* 68, no. 2 (June 1986): 225-236, which both address the elegiac nature and allegory of life and death in the painting.

\(^{262}\) Barolsky, “Poussin’s Ovidian Stoicism,” 6.
Instead of the more overt images of sarcophagi or tombs, Dughet chose to present the cycle of life through nature itself, in the form of dead or dying trees. The trope of the dying tree did not originate with Dughet, but is present in landscape paintings by Northern and Italian artists from the early history of the genre, often incorporated into landscapes with moral messages. Most of Dughet’s paintings contain a variation of this element, whether a dead tree or stump on which his herdsmen rest (fig. 1.31 and 2.26), or a tree devoid of foliage that is clearly dying (fig. 1.23, 1.30, 1.34, 2.11, 2.12, and 2.23). Poussin incorporates this symbol as well in his early Death of Eurydice of around 1625-26 (fig. 2.28), painted for Cassiano dal Pozzo. In the painting, Eurydice’s pale body is placed next to a tree stump, just to the left of a grove of trees. Unlike Poussin’s painting, which includes an identifiable subject, Dughet’s works represent generic herdsmen in the landscape; yet still contain a tree that is dead or dying. In the Valley After a Storm (2.26), the shepherd is resting on the remains of a tree, indicating to the viewer that death is always present, even in the realm of Arcadia. Dughet, however, also suggests the renewal

---

263 See the brief history recounted in Patricia Emison, “The Paysage Moralisé,” Artibus et Historiae 16, no. 31 (1995): 125-137, where the author argues against the symbolic interpretation of the landscape first proposed by Erwin Panofsky and instead refutes any moralizing reading imposed on the landscape itself. Although Panofsky’s analysis often imposes a purely negative connotation on the landscape, it is important to stress that the symbolism of landscape elements should not be entirely dismissed. Emison does, however, rightly emphasize that the interpretation of genre of landscape cannot be limited to a “complex formulae of hidden symbolism” with a simple dichotomy of realism versus symbolism, 134-35. Also see Josua Bruyn, “Towards a Scriptural Reading of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Landscape Paintings,” in Peter C. Sutton, Masters of 17th-Century Dutch Landscape Painting (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1987), 89-103, for more on the Northern tradition of dead or dying trees in relation to mortality and the cyclical nature of landscape. Jan van Goyen in particular employs trees as vanitas symbols, 96. Bruyn also connects the presence of waterfalls or flowing water to St. Augustine’s reading of Psalm 109, where the moving water is linked to the passage of life, 99. For a recent discussion of the religious content in Northern landscape, see Boudewijn Bakker, Landscape and Religion from Van Eyck to Rembrandt, trans. Diane Webb (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012). Bakker contextualizes Dutch landscapes within discussions of nature as “the first Book of God.”

264 Poussin and Nature: Arcadian Visions, ed. Pierre Rosenberg and Keith Christiansen (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998), cat. no. 2. 130-35. The painting is not mentioned in any of the Poussin catalogue raisonnés, but Pierre Rosenberg, who identifies dal Pozzo as the patron based on inscriptions on the verso of the canvas, supports the attribution, as does Denis Mahon and Timothy Standring.
of life through the presence of living trees, flourishing alongside the dying or rotting stumps and through the inclusion of water, often in the form of a waterfall (figs. 2.23 and 2.26). His landscapes, set within the idealized Roman countryside, standing in for Arcadia, and populated by figures in antique dress, suggest the passage and cyclical nature of time and the persistence of the Golden Age.265

Conclusion

Although ranked below history paintings in the hierarchy of genres, landscapes were increasingly popular throughout the seventeenth century and a number of patrons commissioned pastoral images for their city palaces as well as villas. The works of Dughet fulfilled an important objective for his noble patrons by referencing the Golden Age of Vergil filtered through the lens of Christian thought on God and nature. Working for both newly established papal families like the Borghese and Pamphilj, and Roman nobility whose wealth and status had declined since the sixteenth century, such as the Massimo and Colonna families, Dughet’s paintings of the Campagna managed to serve differing agendas, but all expressed a similar theme – the power of nature and man’s place within the landscape.

Dughet’s landscape paintings align perfectly with the humanist discourse on art of the seventeenth century and the development of the pastoral genre. The paintings of herdsmen working or relaxing in the countryside are the embodiment of pastoral literature, exemplifying the conjunction of painting and poetry, connecting the artist’s work with antiquity. Beyond the connection to literature, Dughet’s paintings reflect the

contemporary interest in antiquity, particularly the discussion of ancient frescoes and paintings unearthed in Rome in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. His work then combines both earlier literature and art in an innovative way, which will be explored in the following chapters.
Chapter 3: Antiquarian Culture and Scholarly Circles in Seventeenth-Century Rome

Introduction

Dughet’s engagement with ancient Rome extended beyond the representation of pastoral themes and a command of Vergil and the literature that followed. This chapter and the next explore the artist’s association with antiquarian scholars and his interest in ancient frescoes. The appreciation and adaptation of classical sculpture and architecture in contemporary art was a major development of humanism and the Renaissance, but the use and documentation of ancient painting is often overlooked. This chapter and the next address this lacuna, considering the interpretation of ancient painting by both scholars and artists, focusing, of course, on Dughet. By placing the artist within the context of scholarly discussions and interpretations on ancient art in Rome in the middle of the seventeenth century, his stylistic choices and the further levels of meaning within his paintings for elite Roman patrons can be recognized and better understood.

Beginning with a brief historical overview of the early history of archaeological excavations and the perception of the past, this chapter surveys the development of antiquarianism, the study of past cultures, particularly Greek and Roman. The chapter then covers antiquarian culture in the seventeenth century, providing an in depth analysis

---

266. This is in contrast to the more restricted definition of today, where an antiquarian is associated only with the study of material culture and art. See Peter N. Miller, “Major Trends in European Antiquarianism, Petrarch to Peiresc,” in The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Vol. 3, ed. José Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 244-260 and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, “Antiquarianism, the History of Objects, and the History of Art before Winckelmann,” Journal of the History of Ideas 62, no. 3 (July 2001): 523-41, who argues that, in fact, the analysis and inclusion of objects for understanding cultural history began in the seventeenth century rather than with Johann Joachim Winckelmann as is generally accepted. Kaufmann focuses on the artist Joachim von Sandrart’s contributions to the history of art and antiquarian study, which are closely linked through the approach to the study of objects.
of major scholars and their connection to Poussin and Dughet. This progresses to a consideration of the various intellectual circles in Rome with which Dughet was associated, including the Aldobrandini household where Francesco Angeloni served as secretary to Cardinal Ippolito. Angeloni’s heir was Giovanni Pietro Bellori, who despite being recognized today primarily for his biographies of contemporary artists and theories on art, was one of the most prolific antiquarian scholars of the seventeenth century. His collaborations with the artist Pietro Santi Bartoli produced some of the most important documentation and interpretation of ancient painting and laid the groundwork for later studies. An extended discussion follows on Cassiano dal Pozzo and his Museo Cartaceo, a collection of prints and drawings of works and objects in the physical and ancient worlds. Dal Pozzo was a member of the Accademia dei Lincei, the academy of science founded in Rome in the early seventeenth century. Understanding how the academy studied and documented nature and antiquity provides a foundation for how artists, particularly Dughet, interpreted the past.

The chapter then progresses to a detailed examination of Dughet’s major patrons in order to fully elucidate how his viewers processed and deciphered his art. The chapter concludes with the scholars associated with the household of Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the nephew of Pope Urban VIII, and the importance of the Republic of Letters, the network of scholars from across Europe, including Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and Peter Paul Rubens, who exchanged ideas on all topics, including antiquity. The following chapter directly addresses Dughet’s engagement with the best-known examples of ancient painting in the seventeenth century.
The Rise of the Antiquarian in the Renaissance

The Birth of Antiquarianism

The concept and study of archaeology as it is defined in contemporary society did not exist in the seventeenth century. For scholars and collectors, the material culture of the past, including Roman frescoes, was viewed mainly as supplementary verification of the knowledge and perception of the world portrayed by classical authors. Artifacts were collected mostly for their aesthetic value and possible correlation to ancient texts, although the status of objects and architectural remains as primary sources for knowledge did emerge in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Prior to the advancement of humanism, the majority of excavations were campaigns to retrieve relics of saints for churches or to salvage building materials. In the fourteenth century, scholars established the dividing line between ancient and modern, which was defined as the beginning of the

267 This view of the subordinate role of antiquarianism is a common theme in most studies of the history of archaeology beginning in the 1980s. The focused studies on ancient dress or furniture were seen as frivolous and arcane, as well as fragmentary. For more on this see Jaroslav Malina and Zdeněk Vašíček, *Archaeology yesterday and today: The development of archaeology in the sciences*, trans. Marek Zvelebil (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); William H. Stiebing, Jr., *Uncovering the Past: A History of Archaeology* (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1993); Bruce Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); and Tim Murray, *Milestones in Archaeology: A Chronological Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC Clio, 2007). A more nuanced view on the importance of antiquarian studies is found in Alain Schnapp, *The Discovery of the Past*, trans. Ian Kinnes and Gilliam Varndell (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), in which the author argues that, in fact, antiquarians were not slavish followers of texts and argued for the value of collecting and its relationship to archaeology. “From the moment an object or monument is perceived not just as a symbol of power but as an element of history, archaeology begins,” 27. Humanist scholars began to see the material remains as “direct, tangible and indisputable source[s],” 36. Schnapp’s study relies heavily on the work of Arnaldo Momigliano, whose research brought the study of antiquarianism into the spotlight. His pivotal essay, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13, no. 3/4 (1950): 285-315, was the first major study on the history of antiquarian culture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. His contributions to the field were acknowledged in *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, ed. Peter N. Miller (Toronto: University of Toronto Press in association with the UCLA Center for Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Studies and the William Andrew Clark Memorial Library, 2007). The study by Leonard Barkin, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), also presents a distinctive interpretation on the discovery and incorporation of ancient material into Renaissance art theory, discussing the relationship between ancient statues and contemporary poetry.
rise of Christianity in Rome. With the renewed interest in Greek and Roman antiquity as a model for the contemporary world and the search for origins, scholars, beginning with Petrarch, according to Alain Schnapp “laid down the foundations of a historiography based upon a theory of knowledge,” focusing on not only texts, “but also the systematic comparison of monument and text.”268 Works of art, from medals and coins to relief sculptures, and material objects, such as fragments of inscriptions and household items, pulled from the ground were subject to thorough analysis in order to determine what they could tell scholars about life in the ancient world, particularly for the reconstruction of rituals.269 The study of the material remains of the Classical world provided context for

---

268 Schnapp The Discovery of the Past, 108; see also Ingrid D. Rowland, “The Place of Antiquity,” in The Place of the Antique in Early Modern Europe, ed. Ingrid D. Rowland (Chicago: The David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art, University of Chicago, 1999), 1-4. Salvatore Settis, “Collecting Ancient Sculpture: The Beginnings,” in Collecting Sculpture in Early Modern Europe, eds. Nicolas Penny and Eike D. Schmidt (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 2008), 14-28, discusses the slow and important transformation that took place in the early Renaissance, when ancient ruins shifted from being merely depictions of the triumph of Christianity over paganism into exalted objects for artists and collectors alike. Settis attributes this conversion to when the papacy returned to Rome from Avignon and Roman citizens began “to reassert their pride in being Romani naturali (Romans by nature), whether they belonged to the old aristocracy or to a new class of merchants, attorneys, physicians, notaries, apothecaries, and tax collectors,” 21. Roman families began incorporating ancient fragments into their collections to assert their heritage and ancestry. Also see Kathleen Wren Christian, Empire Without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), where the author also argues for the creation of Republican ancestry as the primary motivation for collecting. Additionally, she also stresses the importance of the relationship between poetry and sculpture, with the latter serving as inspiration for artists and authors alike.

269 See Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” Roberto Weiss, The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969), Francis Haskell, History and Its Images (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), and Peter Burke, “Images as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe,” Journal of the History of Ideas 64, no. 2 (April 2003): 273-296. Images became objects of study in their own right, providing the clearest and most objective vision of the past. As Burke notes, the rise of illustrations in treatises on the ancient world coincided with the expansion of collecting, 279. Also see Gisella Cantino Wataghi, “Archeologia e ‘archeologie’: Il rapport con l’antico fra mito, arte e ricerca,” in Memoria dell’antico nell’arte italiana, Vol. 1, ed. Salvatore Settis (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1984), 171-217, which provides a brief and clear historical overview of antiquaries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as well as excavations. For a thorough analysis on the rising importance of epigraphy, see William Stenhouse, Reading Inscriptions and Writing Ancient History: Historical Scholarship in the Late Renaissance (London: The Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2005), which focuses on Onofrio Panvinio’s (1529-1568) work as an exploration of the methodologies and theories employed by scholars in the mid to late sixteenth century.
ancient text, allowing scholars to better understand the references and institutions discussed in literature.

*The First Antiquarians*

The main protagonists of the impetus for widespread interest in excavation and the study of objects were the dilettantes, the wealthy scholars who were often attached to noble households, serving as secretaries and librarians. Three of the earliest and most influential historians were Flavio Biondo (1392-1463), whose methodical survey of ancient Roman topography and monuments, *De Roma instaurata*, first appeared in 1446, Cyriacus of Ancona (1391-1453/55), whose travels around the Mediterranean and into the East were recorded in notebooks, and discussed in humanist circles, and Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459), who served as Apostolic Secretary to five popes and wrote *De Varietate Fortuna*, in which the first book took the reader through a tour of Rome based on the author’s study of inscriptions.

Biondo’s texts also included the *Italia illustrata* (1453), an overview of the history and geography of various provinces of Italy, the *De Roma triumphante* (1459), the political history of Rome from the Republic to the fall of the Empire, divided into sections on the military, religion, administration, and daily life, and the *Historiarum ab inclinatione Romani imperii decades* (1483), which chronicled Italy from the fall of the Roman empire until the year 1441. Biondo’s historical works “defined antiquarian practice,” focusing on three features for study: topography, geography, and texts, and insisted on the methodical questioning of each proposed by the Roman scholar Varro in
his *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*. Biondo’s treatment of objects and ruins was based on his discussions with Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472), who accompanied him on excavations around and outside of Rome. Biondo recorded their underwater excavation of Roman ships sunken in Lake Nemi in Book II of the *Italia illustrata*, describing in detail the methods used to examine the ships and Alberti’s assessment of their construction.

Cyriacus, a merchant, documented his voyages by making detailed drawings of the ruins he encountered and by recording inscriptions. Because of his work, he is widely regarded as the founder of epigraphy. Unfortunately a number of his

---


manuscripts were lost in the early sixteenth century, but his efforts had been preserved in copies. Even into the seventeenth century, his work as an epigrapher was considered pivotal and Lucas Holstenius, whose important contributions will be discussed in depth below and in the following chapter, seems to have begun an edited volume of Cyriacus’ inscriptions, which was never completed. As for Bracciolini, whose work was focused more closely on the history of the church, his methodical study and cooperation with other scholars has been credited by Anthony Grafton as the model for the Republic of Letters, which will be covered in the final section of this chapter.

**Antiquarians in Sixteenth-Century Rome**

**Scholars and Patrons**

The rising interest in a more methodical investigation of the past culminated in the Renaissance, and the first antiquarian society was established in Rome around 1460. Groups of scholars in noble households devoted a great deal of time to the study of ancient Rome, using both texts and material remains and who was an avid collector. In 1468, Leto and his fellow scholars were actually charged with conspiracy against Pope Paul II, who was suspicious of their fascination with ancient Roman religion and republicanism. The charges were eventually dropped and Leto was allowed to reform the academy in 1478 under Sixtus IV. Susanna de Beer, “The Roman ‘Academy’ of Pomponio Leto: From an Informal Humanist Network to the Institution of a Literary Society,” in *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* Vol 1, ed. Arjan van Dixhoorn and Susie Speakman Sutch (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 181-218, analyzes the network of scholars and the nature of the meetings that took place within Leto’s academy, arguing that their activities were not anti-clerical, but in line with their study of ancient Rome, interest in Roman religion, and desire to “live all’antica.” At the time, however, academy could be used to describe a meeting of scholars. Also, Kathleen Wren Christian, “Poetry and ‘spirited’ ancient sculpture in Renaissance Rome: Pomponio Leto’s Academy to the sixteenth-century sculpture garden,” in
of the past and a particularly important circle developed around Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589), the grandson of Pope Paul III, who amassed one of the largest and most significant collections of ancient sculpture in the sixteenth century. The scholars employed in the Farnese household included Onofrio Panvío (1529-1568), who worked as the Cardinal’s librarian and published key works on ancient Rome and church history, Girolamo Mercuriale (1530-1606), a physician who wrote on ancient medicine, and Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600), a member of one of the oldest Roman noble families, who served as a librarian for Cardinal Ranuncio and then later Alessandro.\footnote{277} Orsini wrote treatises on coins and medals and amassed an important collection of books that he donated to the Vatican Library on his death.\footnote{278} The Farnese were exceptionally important supporters of antiquarian studies as Pope Paul III, soon after his election to the papacy, created the office of the Papal Antiquarian, or Commissario delle Antichità, whose duties included protecting the monuments in the city of Rome, supervising all excavations in the Papal States, and monitoring the export of antiquities.\footnote{279} After the papacy returned to

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Aeolian Winds and the Spirit in Renaissance Architecture: Academia Eolia Revisited}, ed. Barbara Kenda (New York: Routledge, 2006), 103-124, provides a brief historical overview of the academy and the discussions on ancient sculpture and poetry that took place.
\end{flushright}

\footnote{277}{Other scholars associated with the Farnese household, but not directly employed, included Alfonso Chacón (1530-1599), a Spanish Dominican who worked on epigraphy and medieval manuscripts and Pedro Chacón (1526-1581), a mathematician and antiquarian who wrote a study on ancient table manners. Alfonso conducted research on early Christian catacombs, compiling a number of manuscripts with notes and copies after paintings in the tombs. His work on the Catacombs of Priscilla is preserved in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV Vat. Lat. 5409) and contains detailed drawings of the paintings in the catacombs, discovered in 1578. Both Panvinio and Orsini studied under Antonio Agustin (1517-1586), a Spanish nobleman and scholar, who collected and studied coins and inscriptions.}

\footnote{278}{Orsini’s contributions to antiquarian culture are discussed in Giuseppina Alessandra Cellini, \textit{Il contributo di Fulvio Orsini alla ricerca antiquaria} (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 2004), especially Chapter 1 on his life and the formation of his library.}

\footnote{279}{The most complete overview of the history of Papal Antiquarian is the article by Ronald T. Ridley, “To protect the Monuments: the Papal Antiquarian (1534-1870),” \textit{Xenia Antiqua} I (1992): 117-154, which provides a summary of the office and biographical sketches of all who held the title. The official decree
Rome from Avignon in 1420, there came an upsurge in the number of excavations, first to hunt for treasures and, above all, to plunder ancient monuments for materials, such as expensive marble and bronze, which could be used in constructing new buildings, both for the papacy and for private patrons. In response, the office of the Papal Antiquarian was established to regulate and control such excavations in an effort to preserve the history of the entire built environment of ancient Rome.

**Pirro Ligorio and the Position of Artists**

Artists played a major role in the rediscovery and recording of the past by documenting finds and participating in the restoration of monuments and sculptures.
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280 Ian Campbell, “Rescue Archaeology in the Renaissance,” in *Archives and Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Ilaria Bignamini (London: The British School at Rome, 2004), 14. The papacy granted excavation licenses that were recorded in account books, generally relating to gathering materials for building, but still trying to preserve the original monuments. The rising number of so-called “foragers,” men who worked as intermediaries between the peasants who usually excavated materials and either the merchants or collectors who sought the works is explored in Barbara Furlotti, “Connecting People, Connecting Places: Antiquarians as Mediators in 16th-century Rome,” *Urban History* 37 (December 2010): 386-398. The author defines different categories of antiquarians including scholars in noble households, artists who worked as advisors for collectors of antiquities, and merchants who specialized in ancient objects. All required extensive study of texts, engagement with objects, and the ability to evaluate finds.

281 For a general overview of drawings after ancient art and monuments, see Antonio Giuliano, “La tradizione del disegno dall’antico prima del Museo Cartaceo di Cassiano dal Pozzo,” in *I segreti di un collezionista: le straordinarie raccolte di Cassiano dal Pozzo 1588-1657*, ed. Francesco Solinas (Rome: Edizione de Luca), 79-84, exhibition catalogue from Biella. The earliest example of a codex of copies after the antique dates from the late fourteenth century and is today found in the library in Fermo. The images are Imperial Roman portraits based on coins and medals. In the sixteenth century, most artists kept books of copies in their studios. Collectors also gathered together albums of drawings after monuments and sculpture. Also, Amanda Claridge and Ian Jenkins, “Cassiano and the Tradition of Drawing from the Antique,” in *The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo* (Ivrea: Olivetti, 1993), 13-26, gives a more complete survey, beginning with the notebooks of Cyriacus. Vasari attributed the start of the tradition of
Pirro Ligorio (c. 1510-1583), artist and antiquary to Cardinal Ippolito d’Este, produced extensive notebooks, which were never published, documenting the buildings and objects, from everyday household wares to elaborate sculptures, that were unearthed in Rome and its surrounding environs. He oversaw the construction at his patron’s estate in Tivoli beginning in 1560 and recorded excavations both at the Villa and those conducted at the nearby Villa of Hadrian, some of the materials from which were employed by Ligorio within the new d’Este home and gardens. Biondo had first identified the site as an imperial villa in 1461 during an excursion to Tivoli with Pope Pius II, but Ligorio’s work was the first major exploration of the Villa. He oversaw a number of excavations from 1550 to 1568 and created a measured plan of the site, which had become a destination for artists and antiquarians from Rome. Artists visited the Villa in the

copying antique monuments to Filippo Brunelleschi, ignoring earlier examples. One of the best-known artists working after antiquity was Maarten van Heemskerck (1498-1574), who arrived in Rome in 1532. His drawings depict ruins in their original locations and objects and sculptures within contemporary collections. For more on Heemskerck’s representation of antiquity, see Arthur J. DiFuria, “Heemskerck’s Rome: Antiquity, Memory, and the Berlin Sketchbooks” (PhD diss., University of Delaware, 2008).

Ligorio’s importance as an antiquarian, despite his lack of training in Latin and Greek, is thoroughly discussed in David R. Coffin, Pirro Ligorio: The Renaissance Artist, Architect, and Antiquarian, with a checklist of drawings (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004). Also see the collection of essays from a 1983 conference, Pirro Ligorio, Artist and Antiquarian, ed. Robert W. Gastón (Milan: Silvana, 1988). Although often dismissed by early scholars as a forger who relied too heavily on his imagination for his observations and reconstructions, his reputation is steadily on the rise. See both Thomas Ashby, “The Bodelian MS of Pirro Ligorio,” The Journal of Roman Studies 9 (1919): 170-201, which states, “Pirro Ligorio’s Neapolitan mind, it would seem, could hardly distinguish between the evidence of his eyes and the figments of his too fertile brain: and the result is, that it is a very difficult task to distinguish the wheat from the chaff in any portion of his voluminous works,” 170 and Susan Russell, “Pirro Ligorio, Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Republic of Letters,” Papers of the British School at Rome 75 (2007): 239-74. Russell argues that in the seventeenth century, Ligorio’s work was regarded as an important contribution to the study of antiquity. Poussin used a number of his drawings as models for architecture in the background of several paintings.

Ligorio’s excavations were, of course, to gather materials such marble and sculptures for Cardinal d’Este’s villa and elaborate garden, 216-17. Ligorio’s work as an antiquarian was a fundamental influence on his designs as an architect, especially the gardens and fountains of the Villa d’Este.
sixteenth century, including Raphael, Bramante, and Baldassare Peruzzi for which a number of drawings have survived, but no drawings by earlier fifteenth-century artists have been identified today. The Villa of Hadrian inspired a number of architects as well, who employed organizational arrangements, architectural forms, decorative motifs, and waterworks based on the study of the extensive remains.  

By the end of the sixteenth century, the study of material remains had risen to prominence and, rather than simply augmenting knowledge gained through texts, objects like coins and inscriptions were analyzed on their own and were the subjects of major treatises. Ligorio’s rigorous documentation and meticulous analysis of such objects, in addition to his architectural studies, served as a model for scholars in the later sixteenth and into the seventeenth century and, although he was neglected for years in modern scholarship, he was, nevertheless, one of the most respected antiquarians of his time. Collections of printed images of antiquities, like the Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae, published by Antonio Lafreri beginning around 1540, also became more popular and widespread toward the end of the century, allowing scholars and artists to study remains of the past without firsthand observation. A number of published prints represent

---

284 See MacDonald and Pinto, Hadrian’s Villa and Its Legacy for a fuller account of the influence of the Villa on art and architecture.

285 Fulvio Orsini owned copies of some of Ligorio’s manuscripts and had Panvinio produce drawings after other manuscripts, both of which later came into the collection of the Vatican Library (BAV Vat. Lat. 3439, which contains a diverse group of drawings after monuments, relief sculpture, Egyptian artifacts, architectural plans, and household objects). Cardinal Francesco Barberini undertook the laborious task of trying to publish Ligorio’s manuscripts around 1642, appointing scholars in his circle as editors, Russell, “Pirro Ligorio, Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Republic of Letters,” 245-47.

reconstructed architecture and sculpture based on proposals offered by antiquarians, providing viewers a more complete picture of works in their original rather than their current state. The surfeit of images of reconstructed monuments and sculptures also offered scholars the chance to compare and contrast the history of stylistic development within the art and architecture of ancient Greece and Rome, a debate in which Poussin, and by extension, Dughet, participated in the seventeenth century.

*Dughet, Poussin, and Antiquarian Culture in Seventeenth-Century Rome*

*Between the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*

In the last decades of the sixteenth century, the term antiquarian developed into a separate, recognized profession. While once merely another topic in the humanists’ course of study, the subject had become its own occupation, with wealthy households often employing their own specialists.287 As in the sixteenth century, antiquarians did not generally organize excavations or record findings, but instead focused on elucidating the objects and connecting them to ancient texts. For these seventeenth-century antiquarians, artistic patronage was an important part of their pursuits. They commissioned paintings and sculptures from artists whose admiration for antiquity was a driving force in their work. Rather than distilling the notion of classical art into a simple stylistic classification,

---

the “immersion in antiquarian activities . . . distinguishes these artists and scholars and gave direction to their thought and practice.”

For antiquarians and artists, including Dughet, there was no division between theory and practice – the emulation of ancient models was merged with artistic training and incorporated seamlessly into both style and iconography.

When Dughet entered Poussin’s household in 1631, the older artist had already established his reputation within the antiquarian circle surrounding Francesco Angeloni (1587-1652), who served as secretary to Cardinal Ippolito Aldobrandini. The group of scholars included Giovanni Battista Agucchi (1570-1632), Giovanni Pietro Bellori (1613-1696), Vincenzo Giustiniani (1564-1637), Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657), and Camillo Massimo (1620-1677), as well as the artists Domenichino (1581-1641) and his pupil, Giovanni Angelo Canini (1617-1666). Massimo and dal Pozzo both admired Poussin’s style and innovative ability to process ancient art into a contemporary manner. Massimo in particular also recognized Dughet’s talent, commissioning at least ten paintings from the artist.

Through dal Pozzo and his connections to the Barberini family, Poussin and Dughet also met other members of the Barberini household, including Lucas Holstenius (1596-1661), Cardinal Francesco’s librarian, who wrote treatises and letters on the interpretation of ancient art. Both Poussin and Dughet worked for Cardinal Francesco Barberini, likely through the recommendation of dal Pozzo. Dal Pozzo was inducted as a


289 Additional scholars whose work and contributions are beyond the scope of this dissertation include Francesco Cameli and Giovanni Antonio Massani (Agucchi’s secretary).

290 The following chapter more fully elucidates Dughet’s paintings for Massimo.
member of the Accademia dei Lincei in 1622 and involved Poussin in some of the commissions for the group, designing prints for various publications. Outside of Italy, antiquarian scholars shared their ideas and interpretations through the Republic of Letters, a network that included such notable intellectuals as Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637), a French jurist, and the artist Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), who visited Rome in the early seventeenth century. Dughet would have learned of various commentaries put forth by these scholars and others through either his noble patrons or through Poussin. The scholarly interpretation of particular works of ancient painting will be covered in the following chapter, but it is first necessary to understand the various groups working on the analysis of ancient objects and culture and Dughet’s relationship to these scholars.

**Francesco Angeloni, Giovanni Pietro Bellori, and the Aldobrandini Circle**

Angeloni was an avid collector of ancient coins and medals, using them as a primary source for his treatise on Imperial Rome, published in 1641. During his lifetime, his extensive collection, displayed in his house on the Pincian Hill, functioned as a sort of museum of Roman antiquities, open to artists and scholars.292 He was close to Agucchi, who lived in Rome as secretary (and artistic advisor) to Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini until 1623 when Urban VIII appointed him the papal nuncio to the

---

291 La Historia augusta, da Giulio Cesare insino a Costantino il magno, illustrata con la verità delle antiche medaglie was published in Rome with a frontispiece designed by Giovanni Lanfranco and was dedicated to both Louis XIII of France and Queen Christina of Sweden. Artists from the group working on the Galleria Giustiniani (discussed below) provided the prints after the medals and coins, supervised by Canini, Pompeo De Angelis, “La vita e le opere di Francesco Angeloni, ternano ed europeo,” in Francesco Angeloni nella cultura del Seicento, ed. Pompeo De Angelis (Arrone: Edizioni Thyrus, 2007), 27.

292 See De Angelis, “La vita e le opere di Francesco Angeloni,” 25-26, which briefly covers Angeloni’s work as an antiquarian.
Through this connection, Angeloni became involved with the Carracci studio and amassed a collection of drawings by Annibale and his pupils. In his writings, he promoted the classical ideal of art as advocated by the Carracci, which was based on meticulous study of ancient sculpture as well as the work of artists like Raphael.

Bellori was Angeloni’s nephew, heir, and protégé who served as the Papal Antiquarian from 1670 until his death in 1694. His *Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects* has, however, far eclipsed the fame of his antiquarian studies. The relationship between Bellori’s theory of art and his interest in antiquity are inextricably linked. His conception of the ideal artist was grounded in his training as a painter in Domenichino’s studio and his interactions with Agucchi and Angeloni. The meticulous descriptions of paintings in the *Lives of the Modern Painters*, moving from formal analysis of composition toward iconography and style, is based on his discussions with Angeloni and knowledge of antiquarian treatises on the interpretation of art and artifacts, which centered on understanding the figures and actions before proceeding to an interpretation.

Bellori stressed the importance of the study of ancient painting, both

---

293 For Agucchi’s influential contributions to the history of art, in particular landscape painting, see the discussion in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

294 Discussed by Anne Summerscale in Carlo Cesare Malvasia, *Malvasia’s Life of the Carracci: Commentary and Translation*, trans. Anne Summerscale (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 361-362. In the *Historia Augusta*, Angeloni often thanks collectors who allowed him access to their ancient medals during his research and then mentions their contemporary art collections, then praising the work of the Carracci, Annibale in particular.


296 Margaret Daly Davis, “Giovanni Pietro Bellori and the "Nota della musei, librerie, galerie, et ornamenti di statue e pitture ne' palazzi, nelle case, e ne' giardini di Roma" (1664): Modern libraries and ancient painting
decorative and figurative, in his writings, arguing that the greatest painters were those who relied on ancient models, such as Raphael.297

Bellori published a number of texts on ancient art, particularly on painting, stressing the prominence of these frescoes as models for contemporary artists.298 His work as an antiquarian did not follow the systematic approach of earlier scholars such as Biondo. Instead, he preferred a rather “cornucopian digressiveness,” in which he often began discussion of a single object as a pathway to exploring a larger question, such as using a single figure as a way to investigate ancient dress.299 Later in his career, Bellori in Seicento Rome,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 68, no. 2 (2005): 227-28, where she argues that Bellori would have learned these methods from Angeloni, who employed the same approach to the study of coins and medals.

297 In his “Delli Vestigi delle Pitture antiche dal buon secolo de’ Romani,” an addendum to the Nota delli musei, libbre, galerie, et ornamenti di statue e pitture ne’ palazzi, nelle case, e ne’ giardini di Roma (Roma: Appresso Biagio Deuersin, e Felice Cesaretti nella Stamperia del Falco, 1664), while discussing the much damaged ancient paintings and stucco decoration from the Villa of Hadrian, he states “chi desidera vedere pitture antiche, le ammiri pure ne gli ornamenti delle loggie del palazzo Vaticano condotta da Giouanni da Udine, e da gli altri discopoli di Rafaèlle l’Apelle modern,” (those who wish to see ancient painting, can also see them in the ornaments of the Loggias of the Vatican palace executed by Giovanni da Udine, and from the other students of Raphael, the modern Apelles), 65. The Nota delli musei was published in the same year as Bellori’s address on L’Idea to the Accademia di San Luca and eight years before the appearance of the Lives of the Modern Painters.

298 Bellori’s best known text on ancient painting is Le pitture antiche del sepolcro de’Nasoni nella via Flaminia designate ed intagliate alla similitudine degli antichi originale da Pietro Santi Bartoli, descritte ed illustrate da Gio: Pietro Bellori (Rome, 1680), which surveys the ancient paintings found in 1674 in a tomb once believed to belong to the family of Ovid and provides detailed ekphrastic descriptions along with beautifully executed prints by Bartoli. The discovery of the important frescoes is beyond the discussion in this dissertation as Dughet died in 1675. For more on this text, see Hetty Joyce, “From Darkness to Light: Annibale Carracci, Bellori, and Ancient Painting,” in Art History in the Age of Bellori: Scholarship and Cultural Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome, ed. Janis Bell and Thomas Willette (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 182-88. Bellori’s first foray into a discussion and catalogue of ancient painting was the “Delli Vestigi delle Pitture antiche,” in the Nota delli musei of 1664. This short text listed known frescoes in Roman collections. The entire Nota delli musei was originally attributed to Bellori by Giovanni Mercati in Note per la storia di alcune biblioteche romane nei secoli XVI-XIX (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1952), 147-64. The authorship of the Nota delli musei has been questioned by Daly Davis, “Giovan Pietro Bellori and the ”Nota delli musei,” 191-233, however, Daly does accept Bellori as author of the “Delli Vestigi delle Pitture antiche.” Bellori and Bartoli also published illustrated studies of the Column of Trajan and of the Column of Marcus Aurelius.

worked extensively with the artist Pietro Santi Bartoli (1635-1700), a printmaker who specialized in reproductions after ancient works. Bellori and Bartoli collaborated on treatises that covered recently discovered ancient frescoes in tombs and grottoes, the Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, and prints after Raphael’s paintings. Bartoli studied first with the artist Pierre Lemaire from 1651-54 and then with Poussin, who, like Domenichino and then Bellori, also urged his pupils to copy ancient sculptures and the work of earlier masters like Raphael. Although Bartoli began his training after Dughet had already left the studio, the two artists would have met through Poussin and their shared patrons and fellow antiquarians.

_Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Museo Cartaceo_

The most prominent antiquarian of the group was dal Pozzo, a nobleman from Turin, who, after earning a degree in civil and ecclesiastical law from the University of Pisa, settled in Rome in 1612, quickly integrating himself in the circle of scholars around Angeloni, then entering the Barberini household in 1623. He was first appointed as secretary to Cardinal Francesco Barberini and then maestro di camera. After he first

---

300 The most comprehensive summary of Bartoli’s life and work is by Massimo Pomponi, “Alcune precisazioni sulla vita e la produzione artistica di Pietro Santi Bartoli,” _Storia dell’arte_ 75 (1992): 195-225. Bartoli’s biography appears in Lione Pascoli’s _Vite de’ pittori, scultori ed architetti perugini_ (Rome, 1732), 228-233. Interestingly, Bartoli’s father-in-law was Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi (1605/6-1680), the important Bolognese landscape painter who was first in charge of the commission for San Martino ai Monti. Bartoli also worked as a painter and designer for Roman families – his stuccoes for the Palazzo Borghese, dating to around 1671-1676 are covered in Danuta Batorska, “Pietro Santi Bartoli’s Designs for the Chapel in Palazzo Borghese a Ripetta in Rome,” _Arte Cristiana_ 85, 783 (November-December 1997): 441-48.

301 The literature on dal Pozzo is extensive. Some of the most important sources are Ingo Herklotz _Cassiano Dal Pozzo und di Archäologie des 17. Jahrhunderts_ (Munich: Himer Verlag, 1999), which is the first full monograph and biography on dal Pozzo since Carlo Dati’s _Delle lodi del commendatore Cassiano dal Pozzo_ (Florence, 1664). Herklotz’s text is divided into two sections, first on dal Pozzo’s life and intellectual circle and then on the _Museo Cartaceo_ and antiquarian culture. Other major studies include _Cassiano dal Pozzo: Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Studi_, ed. Francesco Solinas (Rome: De Luca, 1989), the
arrived in Rome, dal Pozzo embarked on an ambitious project to document, in visual form, a vast array of human knowledge. The *Museo Cartaceo*, or “Paper Museum,” encompassed over 7,000 drawings and prints after ancient art and architecture and the natural world, with sections on botany, zoology, ornithology, and geology. Dal Pozzo’s model for the *Museo* was the “theater of nature” organized by Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605), an important Bolognese scholar who wrote on both natural history and ancient art and collected drawings after objects and artifacts. Dal Pozzo employed a number of proceedings of a colloquium held two years earlier, which was the first publication devoted to dal Pozzo since the nineteenth century and the exhibition organized by Francesco Solinas, shown in Rome and in Biella, *I segreti di un collezionista: le straordinarie raccolte di Cassiano dal Pozzo 1588-1657*, ed. Francesco Solinas (Rome: Edizione de Luca), which is divided into two catalogues, one for each show with different introductory essays, but with nearly the same catalogue.


For more on Aldrovandi and his relationship to Archbishop Gabriele Paleotti’s writings on art, see Giuseppe Olmi and Paolo Prodi, “Art, Science, and Nature in Bologna Circa 1600,” in *The Age of...*
artists for this immense project, which he continued expanding until his death.\textsuperscript{304} He and Poussin were close friends and dal Pozzo commissioned a number of paintings from the artist, with subjects ranging from Biblical to obscure mythological themes.\textsuperscript{305} Poussin also executed drawings for the \textit{Museo Cartaceo}, which soon developed into an important source for artists, who profited from the extraordinary collection of images that served as models, and for scholars, who would conduct research from the collection.\textsuperscript{306} From the extensive and wide-ranging subjects, artists could study not only ancient sculpture, but also household and sacred objects, as well as costume and architecture. Over one hundred drawings of ancient paintings and mosaics were compiled in an album with a group of


\textsuperscript{304} The majority of the drawings and prints that make up the \textit{Museo Cartaceo} are now in the collection of the Royal Library at Windsor Castle. For a brief history on the purchase by George III, see Henrietta McBurney, “History and contents of the dal Pozzo collection in the Royal Library, Windsor Castle,” in \textit{Cassiano dal Pozzo: Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Studi}, 75-81. See Nicolas Turner, “Some of the Copyists after the Antique Employed by Cassiano,” \textit{The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo}, 27-37, for biographies of five of the artists from the \textit{Museo}: Bernardino Capitelli (1590-1639), Poussin, Pietro da Cortona, Testa, and Vincenzo Leonardi (fl. 1621-c.1646). Leonardi was the primary artist for the beautifully executed natural history watercolors. Turner estimates that Testa executed over five hundred drawings for the \textit{Museo}. Other artists included François Duquesnoy, Francesco Villamena (c. 1565-1624), Giovanni Battista Ruggieri (1606-1640), Giovanni Angelo Canini, Jean Lemaire (1597/98-1659), Jean Saillant (fl. c. 1620-1635), Claude Menestrier (briefly discussed below in relation to the Barberini circle of scholars), and Claude Mellan (1598-1688).

\textsuperscript{305} Dal Pozzo met Poussin soon after the artist arrived in Rome in 1624 and his first commission from him was in 1626. From that time until the death of his patron, Poussin executed over fifty paintings for dal Pozzo. Dal Pozzo also aided the artist in securing his only papal commission, the \textit{Martyrdom of St. Erasmus} of 1628-29, for an altar in the right transept of San Pietro. An inventory written around 1741 of the dal Pozzo collection of paintings is published in \textit{I segreti di un collezionista}, 205-224. Several of the landscapes are identified only as “Pusino” and may possibly be paintings by Dughet rather than Nicolas. See Francis Haskell and Shelia Rinehart, “The Dal Pozzo Collection, Some New Evidence. Part I,” \textit{The Burlington Magazine} 12, nol 688 (July 1960): 320. The authors publish a list of an exhibition of works from the dal Pozzo collection held in the cloister of San Salvatore in Lauro in 1715. They note that several of the paintings are listed as landscapes by Poussin and suggest that a few may be by Dughet.

\textsuperscript{306} Herklotz, \textit{Cassiano dal Pozzo}, 151-240 covers the various scholars who made use the \textit{Museo Cartaceo} in their work, which ranges from treatises on costume to religion.
architectural drawings. Through Poussin, Dughet gained access to this collection, studying the copies of paintings and almost certainly visiting the original works found in collections around Rome.

Dal Pozzo’s contributions extended far beyond the Museo Cartaceo as he also conducted research for publications ranging from botany and ornithology to color theory and perspective. He was actively involved in treatises on flowers and citrus fruit written by Giovanni Battista Ferrari (1584-1655), who was a professor of Hebrew and rhetoric and served as a horticulturist for the Barberini during the papacy of Urban VIII. Dal Pozzo also contributed to another treatise on ornithology by Giovanni Pietro Olina, and he undertook a project to publish treatises by Leonardo da Vinci. Nevertheless for dal

---

307 Helen Whitehouse, “Copies of Roman Paintings and Mosaics in the Paper Museum and Their Value as Archaeological Evidence,” in Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Paper Museum, Vol. I, 105-06. Many of the drawings are copies of the same painting and the part on mosaics includes the nineteen watercolors of sections of the Palestrina Mosaic. The total number of paintings represented actually numbers twenty-six. See also McBurney, “History and contents of the dal Pozzo collection,” 82-85, in which she examines the arrangement of the albums as they are today. She concludes that the majority of the copies of paintings and mosaics were in the volume that still has its seventeenth-century binding, while others are interspersed in a group of loose sheets in what was once called the “Albani Elephant” portfolio. The drawings are often quite close to their original sources, but do exhibit some flourishes and have been modernized. See Whitehouse, “Copies of Roman Paintings,” 110-12. Filipo Baldinucci recorded the arrangement of five of the albums, whose drawings he attributes to Pietro Testa. Divided by subject, they included the following topics: Roman gods and religious rituals, wedding rites, dress, inscriptions, funerary rites, public spectacles, country life, baths, scenes from triumphal arches, events from Roman history, vases, sculptures, household objects, copies after the Vatican Vergil and Terence manuscripts, and the Palestrina Mosaic (the former and the latter will be discussed in the next chapter), see Claridge and Jenkins, “Cassiano and the Tradition of Drawing after the Antique,” 20. This system of classification by subject allowed for ease of research as scholars or artists need only flip through the album on funerary rites to find sources for a treatise on Roman funerals or a painting of the subject.

308 The texts by Ferrari are the De Florum Cultura, first published in 1633 and the Hesperides, sive De Malorum Aureorum Cultura et Usu Libri Quattuor of 1646. Little is known about Olina, author of the Uccelliera overo discorso della natura, e proprietà di diversi uccelli, e in particolare di que’ che cantano, con il modo di predergli, conoscergli, allevargli, e mantenergli, which was published in 1622, the same year dal Pozzo was admitted into the Accademia dei Lincei. Dal Pozzo organized the illustrations and conducted research for the text. See David Freedberg, The Eye of the Lynx: Galileo, His Friends, and the Beginnings of Modern Natural History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 38-59 and also Freedberg, “From Hebrew and gardens to oranges and lemons: Giovanni Battista Ferrari and Cassiano dal Pozzo,” in Cassiano dal Pozzo: Atti del Seminarid Internazionale di Studi, 37-73. Both of Ferrari’s treatises included allegorical prints designed by famous artists such as Andrea Sacchi, Guido Reni, Domenichino, Pietro da Cortona, and Poussin.
Pozzo, merely gathering a substantial compendium of copies and documentation after ancient art, architecture, and curiosities as research aids was insufficient. In addition to his collection of antiquities and natural history specimens, he outfitted a laboratory in his home on the Via dei Chiavari, where he conducted experiments and anatomical studies. In this way, he sought to fully clarify the historical or scientific significance of each work, which aligned with the push towards the empirical study of the ancient past and of the natural world that occurred in the seventeenth century with the founding of the Accademia dei Lincei. The academy of science based in Rome, to which dal Pozzo was a frequent contributor, was at the forefront of the connection between antiquarian study and the scientific study of the natural world.

The Accademia dei Lincei and the Study of Nature

In 1603, nobleman Federico Cesi (1585-1630), along with three other young scholars, founded the Accademia dei Lincei, dedicated to the study of the natural sciences, particularly botany, physics, biology, and astronomy, which were the focus of the Academy’s earliest publications. The members of the Academy, following on the

---

309 Contemporary accounts by visitors to the collection, such as the British antiquarian John Evelyn (1620-1706), leave the impression that the palace was a chaotic and disorderly mess of diverse objects, but there was certainly some sense of organization in terms of the drawing collection. See both Herklotz, Cassiano dal Pozzo, 138 and Freedberg, The Eye of the Lynx, 16-17.

310 The most comprehensive source in English is Freedberg, The Eye of the Lynx, but the literature on the Academy is vast. For a historiographical overview and bibliography, see Paula Findlen, “Science, Art, and Knowledge in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” Metascience (2003): 275-302. The other founders included two other noblemen, Anastasio de Filiis (1577-1608), Francesco Stelluti (1577-1652), and the Dutch physician Johannes van Heeck (1579-1630), also known as Johannes Eckius. There was little activity in first seven years of the Academy’s existence, mostly letters between the four scholars. In 1610-11, both Giambattista della Porta (1535?-1615) and Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) were admitted and by 1624, there were thirty-two members. The Academy, which was based in the Cesi family palace, slowly died out after the death of Federico, but was revived in the mid-eighteenth century and became a national academy in 1870. Cesi promoted the spread of knowledge and encouraged the publication of the results of the Academy’s various studies, although very little of their massive oeuvre ever made it past manuscript form.
developments in the study of natural history in the past century, stressed the importance of observation, particularly the analyses made possibly by the newly developed microscope. They chose the lynx as their emblem, which was a symbol of the sharp sight that was needed for a sharp mind; the selection illustrated the main purpose of the Academy, which was to investigate the natural world through actual experience.³¹¹ This focus on firsthand observation and careful recording of minutiae extended beyond the study of plants and insects under the microscope: it was the foundation of antiquarian study and also artistic practice. The relationship between scholars of antiquity and natural history was closely linked because of the perceived connection between art and nature. As noted by Horst Bredekamp, “The idea that works of art, in particular the art of antiquity, could mediate between human beings and nature was a basic tenet of both the natural sciences and aesthetics.”³¹² Aldrovandi, the Bolognese naturalist whose work inspired dal Pozzo as well as Cesi and his fellow academicians, wrote a catalogue of ancient art in Rome, the Delle statue antiche, che per tutte Roma, in diversi luoghi e case si veggono, published in 1562. Although the Accademia dei Lincei was founded as an academy of science to study nature and its processes, members also addressed philosophy and antiquity, incorporating ancient objects and authors into their work.³¹³ The German

---


³¹³ As Baldriga, “Reading the Universal Book of Nature,” 379, notes, the Academy “probably represents the very first attempt to focus the activity of an intellectual circle on the matter of scientific observation.” But the experience and erudition of the members expanded far beyond natural history, “spanning from archaeology to literature, to medicine, botany, astrology, and so forth.” Based on research on Italian academies in the seventeenth century conducted by Amadeo Quondam, “L’Accademia,” in La letteratura Italiana: Il letterato e le istituzioni Vol. I, ed. Alberto Asor Rosa (Turin: Einaudi, 1982), 823-898, Baldriga
chancellor of the Academy, Johannes Faber (1574-1629), who specialized in botany and medicine, was an avid collector of antiquities and contemporary art.\footnote{Baldriga, L’occhio della lince. I primi lincei, tra arte, scienza e collezionismo (1603-1630) (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2002), 171-233, concentrates more on the contributions of Faber rather than dal Pozzo, whose work is at the core of Freedberg’s study, The Eye of the Lynx. Faber was close to Adam Elsheimer, and owned a few works by the artist, 175-183. As a scholar of antiquity, in 1606 he published an edited edition of Orsini’s selection of images from the Farnese collection, the Illustrium Imagines.} He corresponded with the artist and diplomat, Rubens, whose contributions to antiquarian culture will be discussed below.

In addition to the focus on objects of art, the Academy also stressed the value of images as aids in learning, again based on the work of Aldrovandi. The Bolognese scholar had employed a number of artists to execute drawings for his “theater of nature,” which were used as models for the illustrations in his treatises.\footnote{For more on Aldrovandi, see Paula Findlen, Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 17-31.} He sought to provide his audience with accurate representations of the plants and animals described in his work. Cesi developed a new concept that he termed “philosophical painting,” defined as a “branch of painting and its study, not just aimed at pure enjoyment, which is just a vain abuse, but meant to be a vivid and efficacious discipline and fruit of deep utility.”\footnote{Baldriga, L’occhio della lince, 14, the definition is given by Cesi in a note, and translated by Baldriga, “Reading the Universal Book of Nature,” 371. Baldriga observes that this “utilitarian conception of the visual arts” is likely based on ideas of the Counter Reformation, best expressed in the treatise by Paleotti, 372. The problem of the overall usefulness of images for Cesi culminated in the most ambitious publication undertaken by the Academy, the Rerum Medicarum Novae Hispaniae Thesaurus, better known as the Tesoro Messicano (eventually fully published in 1651), an encyclopedia of flora and fauna of the New World, as detailed images could not express Cesi’s desire for order and systematization, see Freedberg, The Eye of the Lynx, 349-416. Baldriga, L’occhio della lince, 123-135, however, states that the classification system does not conflict with the illustrations, connecting the two impulses to the mnemotechnics, the art of memory.} For Cesi, images were purely didactic, created in the service of learning and conveying

---

provides a breakdown on types, stating that 77.2% of the 568 academies (or humanistic circles) had no particular specialization, 381-82.
knowledge. Artists were not allowed into the Academy, but they played an important role in designing and executing illustrations for treatises.

Dal Pozzo, a close friend of Cesi, worked as intermediary between the Academy and the Barberini family after the election of Urban VIII to the papacy in 1623. Although dedicated to the “universal reformation of knowledge” in a multitude of disciplines, as described by Paula Findlen, the academicians were committed to the Catholic Church and worked “in the service of faith as much as knowledge.” In the Jubilee year of 1625, the Academy published three separate works on bees, the emblem of the Barberini family: the *Melissographica*, an engraved broadsheet showing a bee from three angles under magnification that represented unprecedented anatomical details, the *Apes Dianiae*, an elegiac poem on the representation of bees on ancient coins and gems, and the *Apiarium*, an enormous broadsheet that contains a thorough discussion of the archaeology,

317 Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx* and Baldriga, *L’occhio della lincei*, reach different conclusions on the overall place of the Academy within history. Freedberg argues that the academicians were entirely original in their approach to natural history in terms of illustration, believing that earlier artists and scholars were not as diligent or meticulous as Cesi and his followers. Also important to note is Freedberg’s dismissal of the academicians as entirely anti-Aristotelian, a problem noted by Findlen, “Science, Art, and Knowledge in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” 287, in her review of Freedberg’s text. The concept of Aristotelianism was not a hard and fixed worldview in the seventeenth century although a number of conclusions on the natural world reached by Aristotle were proven invalid.

318 Findlen, “Science, Art, and Knowledge in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” 278. Findlen’s essay contrasts the conclusions reached by Freedberg and Baldriga in their competing studies of the Academy, both published in 2002 – while Freedberg argues that the academicians’ relationship with the Church was fraught, Baldriga reconstructs a more convoluted and yet complimentary connection. For Freedberg, the Academy emerges as the hero in the Galileo affair, promoting a thoroughly modern understanding of science and philosophy that was in conflict with the ideals of the Church. Baldriga’s more complex picture has gained acceptance as closer to reality. In fact, beyond the Barberini patronage, the academicians actually corresponded with Cardinal Federico Borromeo, whose contributions to the concept of landscape painting were discussed in Chapter 2, among other religious figures. See Giovanni Baffetti, “Federico Borromeo e i Lincei: La spiritualità della nuova scienza,” in *Mappe e letture: studi in onore di Ezio Raimondi*, ed. Andrea Battistini (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994), 85-102 and Baldriga, *L’occhio della lincei*, 15-31.
literature, history, and science of bees.\textsuperscript{319} The two prints and the poem epitomize the approach to learning within the Academy where texts, particularly ancient sources, were considered together with empirical observation. Cesi and his fellow academicians would assess the writings of past scholars against their own firsthand examination. Upon his early death in 1630, Cesi had acquired an extensive library and collection of drawings and scientific instruments, which dal Pozzo purchased from his widow three years later. The drawings were incorporated into the \textit{Museo Cartaceo}.\textsuperscript{320}

For an artist like Dughet whose connection to the Academy was filtered through Poussin and dal Pozzo, the benefits of the work of the scholars were their illustrated texts detailing the diversity of the natural world, which allowed him to study not only local and exotic plants, but to read about their history. Because Dughet had spent his formative years in grammar school, he had learned Latin and read Classical texts, which permitted him to read the treatises published by the Academy and incorporate their interpretations and allegorical concepts into his paintings.\textsuperscript{321}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{319} The works are discussed extensively in Freedberg, \textit{The Eye of the Lynx}, 160-173. The \textit{Melissographia} was the first print created with the use of a microscope. The \textit{Apes Dianiae} focuses particularly on the chastity of Urban VIII compared to that of bees, which naturalists at the time believed reproduced through autogenesis, based on the description in Pliny the Elder’s \textit{Natural History} (Book XI, Chapter 16). Finally, the \textit{Apiarium}, consisting of four separate sheets joined together, is a large and complex print that comprises a number of different short texts on bees. A number of the sections address the belief that the king bee (the actual structure of a bee hive was not understood at the time) never uses its stinger and was therefore beneficent, much like the new pope. As Freedberg notes, this was an appeal to Urban VIII’s benevolence in regards to the Academy and their publication of Galileo’s work.
\item\textsuperscript{320} Freedberg, \textit{The Eye of the Lynx}, 59-62. The works included a massive volume on fossils and others on plants and herbals.
\item\textsuperscript{321} Baldriga, “Reading the Universal Book of Nature,” 368-371, covers Cesi’s preference for Latin, although he tolerated Galileo’s desire to publish his works in Italian.
\end{itemize}
Patrons and Collectors of Ancient Paintings

Vincenzo Giustiniani, the Galleria Giustiniana, and the Discussion of Style

Beyond the intellectuals discussed above, the circle of scholars who were interested in antiquarian culture included noble patrons with a particular awareness of ancient art and monuments. The connection to Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, afforded by Poussin’s friendship with dal Pozzo and also with the artist Joachim van Sandrart (1606-1688), was particularly fruitful for Poussin, who worked for the wealthy nobleman on the Galleria Giustiniana, a collection of engravings after ancient works owned by the Giustiniani family, which was put together around 1631-37. Sandrart served as the overall supervisor for the ambitious project from 1632. The tome, according to a postscript included in the first volume, was meant to inspire the study of ancient sculpture, allowing all collectors and artists to appreciate the excellence of the vast collection.


323 Cropper and Dempsey, Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting, 72. Cropper, “Vincenzo Giustiniani’s ‘Galleria:’ The Pygmalion Effect,” in Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Paper Museum, Vol II, 112-17, analyzes the motives behind the publication, arguing that Giustiniani, like the poet Giambattista Marino in his Galeria of poems about specific works of art, did not aspire to “compose a universal museum about all subjects that can be represented in Painting and Sculpture, but to play with a few, according to the poetic motifs that came into his fantasy each day,” quoted and translated from Marino, La Galeria Vol I, ed. Marzio Pieri (Padua: Liviana Editrice, 1979). A gallery mirrors the collector’s taste while a museum is encyclopedic and complete. Cropper states that Giustiniani sought to bring his collection of ancient sculptures to life on the page. For the differences between Giustiniani’s Galeria and dal Pozzo’s Museo,
Giustinani’s palace near Sant’Eustachio served as a sort of “free academy” where artists could gather to discuss and copy the ancient marvels owned by the family. In this lively atmosphere, Poussin would debate the concept of style of ancient art. Prior to the seventeenth century, the differences between Greek and Roman art were not fully recognized; both cultures were just classified as ancient. For Poussin and his friends, artists like Pietro Testa (1611-1650) and the Flemish François Duquesnoy (1597-1643), these differences in terms of style and form between the two became an important point of contention. They distinguished figures as Greek or Roman based not only on costume and attributes, but also on proportion and expression. The Greek manner, in terms of sculpted figures, was defined as softer than the Roman, with more subtle contours, and as having a greater sense of nobility. Both Poussin and Duquesnoy incorporated this

---


326 Beaven, *An Ardent Patron*, 52. For more on Sandrart’s understanding of the stylistic qualities of Greek and Roman, filtered through his connection to the naturalism of Peter Paul Rubens, see Giulia Fusconi,
concept into their work, choosing appropriate figure types based on the subject matter. Testa executed copies of ancient sculptures and monuments for both Giustiniani and for dal Pozzo’s *Museo Cartaceo*, which allowed him further study of ancient customs, dress, and iconography. For Poussin, this thorough analysis continued in his interactions with dal Pozzo and the examination of drawings from the *Museo Cartaceo*. Dughet certainly absorbed these lessons, incorporating material from the *Museo* and employing Poussin’s understanding of past cultures as well as with another major patron of Poussin and collector of ancient art.

*Camillo Massimo, the Casino Bel Respiro, and the Collecting of Ancient Painting*

Cardinal Camillo Massimo first met Poussin in the 1630s thanks to Giustiniani. The ancestry of the Massimo family could be traced back to the Roman Republic and they were proud of their ancient heritage. The family fortune, as previously mentioned,

---

327 See Herklotz, “Pietro Testa and the ‘Museo cartaceo,’” *The Burlington Magazine* 153, no. 1302 (October 2011): 657-61, which sums up recent scholarship on Testa’s contributions to the *Galleria Giustiniana* (recorded in payments published by Gallottini, *Le sculture della collezione Giustiniani*, 64-78) and brings to light an unpublished letter of August 1658 from Carlo Antonio dal Pozzo (Cassiano’s younger brother who continued the collection after his death) to Dati, Cassiano’s biographer. Dati was composing a eulogy for Cassiano, which would be included in his biography of 1664. The letter, which accompanied a table of the volumes of the *Museo Cartaceo*, includes the following reference, “the first five [volumes] . . . by the hand of Pietro Testa from Lucca, who was most excellent in the profession of drawing after the antique,” 658 (translation Herklotz). Testa’s contributions to the *Museo* include drawings after reliefs and sculptures of ancient gods, myths, and rituals, reliefs from triumphal arches, and copies after ancient manuscripts.

328 In his thoughtful review of *Camillo Massimo collezionista di antichità. Fonti e materiali* in *The Burlington Magazine* 140, no. 1145 (August 1998): 563, Ingo Herklotz calls attention to the important, yet overlooked contribution to the study of painting on the seventeenth century conception of style.

329 Beaven, *An Ardent Patron*, 46-47, Massimo’s grandfather was Clarice Giustiniani and his cousin Camillo I lived in Vincenzo’s palazzo. Massimo’s given name at birth was Carlo, but he took his cousin’s name when he inherited his estate in 1640.
fluctuated during the seventeenth century, but Cardinal Camillo remained an enthusiastic collector and patron. A self-portrait drawing by Poussin, dated to the end of the 1630s, contains an inscription stating that Massimo, in fact, took drawing lessons with Poussin.\textsuperscript{330} Even without further documentation of his training as Poussin’s student, Massimo’s skill as an artist was attested to by his inclusion as a designer for prints in the second volume of the \textit{Galleria Giustiniani}.\textsuperscript{331} The introduction to artists like Poussin and Duquesnoy and to dal Pozzo further incited his fascination with antiquity. The collecting and documenting of ancient painting was a topic of exceptional interest to Massimo, who not only sought out mosaics and frescoes for his gallery, but also employed artists, in particular Pietro Bartoli and his son, Francesco (1675-1730), to produce copies of known works.\textsuperscript{332}

Massimo’s abilities and his expertise as a scholar of the past were quickly recognized and he was invited to participate in the formation of the collection of ancient sculptures for the Pamphilj family’s Casino Bel Respiro from 1644-52, located on the Janiculum Hill, just outside the Porta San Pancrazio in Rome.\textsuperscript{333} A number of scholars were involved in the Bel Respiro project, including the sculptor Alessandro Algardi,

\textsuperscript{330} Beaven, \textit{An Ardent Patron}, 53-55, acknowledges that the attribution to the drawing has been questioned, but the style and facial features do resemble Poussin. The stern expression likely relates to an illness he suffered around 1639, which was probably related to his contracting syphilis in the late 1620s. She agrees with Nicholas Turner that the inscription likely dates to the time the drawing was owned by Francesco Maria Niccolò Gabburri (1676-1742).


\textsuperscript{333} Beaven, \textit{An Ardent Patron}, 89-94.
Angeloni, Bellori, and the landscape painter Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi.\textsuperscript{334} For the construction of the Villa, Camillo Pamphilj brought together an impressive group of scholars to create an innovative project that involved architecture, garden design, sculpture, and decorative arts, all relating to the past within a contemporary setting. The group spent a great deal of time exploring the remains of the Villa of Hadrian at Tivoli, employing the architectural remains and stucco decoration as models for the construction of the Bel Respiro.\textsuperscript{335} Dughet must have participated in such discussions as a favorite artist of Camillo Pamphilj. He executed a number of works for multiple Pamphilj properties, including at least one documented landscape for the Villa in 1649.\textsuperscript{336} He was also a frequent visitor to Tivoli, incorporating the landscape and monuments of the town into his work.

\textsuperscript{334} For a detailed analysis of Angeloni’s contributions in particular, see Carla Benocci, “Dimensione europea di Francesco Angeloni: La Historia Augusta e il programma politico della Villa Doria Pamphilj,” in Francesco Angeloni nella cultura del Seicento, 35-74. Images from Angeloni’s treatise were employed in the stucco decoration of the Villa and the political commentaries from the treatise relate directly to the ambitions of the Pamphilj family. Benocci traces the course proscribed for visitors to the Villa Bel Respiro, discussing the relationship between the stucco decoration, designed by Algardi, and the images and events discussed in Angeloni’s La Historia Augusta, 41-47. The choice of imagery relates to Angeloni’s assertion that the Imperial age of Rome began with Julius Caesar and not Augustus. Pamphilj’s intent was to connect the reign of his uncle the pope to the peace of the early Empire, “La scelta dei soggetti non è affatto casuale, ma allude alla continuità stabilita fra Giulio Cesare e Augusto e alla concordia imperiale esaltata dagli altri due imperatori: evidente è l’allusione alle figure dei committenti, zio e nipote, Innocenzo X e Camillo, entrambi in sinergia nell’assicurare la pace universal e un buon governo della Chiesa.” (The selection of subjects is not random, but alludes to the continuity established between Julius Caesar and Augustus and to the imperial harmony enhanced by the other two emperors: the allusion is clear to the figures of the commissioners, uncle and nephew, Innocent X and Camillo, bound together in synergy in assuring universal peace and good governing from the Church), 46.

\textsuperscript{335} MacDonald and Pinto, Hadrian’s Villa and Its Legacy, 278, which notes a few instances of direct correlation between the architecture and decoration of the two villas. The primary text on the Bel Respiro remains Carla, \textit{Villa Doria Pamphilj} (Rome: Editalia, 1996). Also see Alessandra Mercanti, “Il Casino ‘delle Molte Statue’ o ‘del Bel Respiro; a Villa Pamphilj,” in Caravaggio e la Fuga: La pittura di paesaggio nelle ville Doria Pamphilj, ed. Alessandra Mercanti and Laura Stagno (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2010), 79-91, for the later history of the Casino and its collection. Other seventeenth-century architects, particularly Francesco Borromini, were inspired by the Villa of Hadrian and used a number of motifs and architectural elements from various buildings in his designs, see MacDonald and Pinto, Hadrian’s Villa and Its Legacy, 224-228.

\textsuperscript{336} Marie Nicole Boisclair, \textit{Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre} (1615-1675) (Paris: Arthéna, 1986), cat. no. 99, fig. 140. The \textit{Rest on the Flight into Egypt} is recorded in a 1666 inventory of the Villa Bel Respiro. It was one of the earliest landscapes commissioned by the Pamphilj family.
in a number of his works. The temples of Tivoli are often the only securely identifiable ruins present in the middle and backgrounds of Dughet’s pastoral landscapes.

**The Barberini Circle and the Republic of Letters**

**Scholars in the Barberini Household**

After the election of Pope Urban VIII, the major locus of scholarship shifted to the Barberini palace and the intellectuals employed by Cardinal Francesco.\(^{337}\) Lucas Holstenius, the Cardinal’s librarian, was at the center. Other scholars who resided in the Barberini household were Girolamo Aleandro (1574-1629), who founded the Accademia degli Umoristi, a literary and musical society (and some of whose contributions to antiquarian culture will be discussed in depth in the following chapter), Claude Menestrier (d. 1639), originally from Bourgogne, who settled in Rome in the early seventeenth century and took over Aleandro’s position as antiquarian to the Cardinal on the latter’s death, Bishop Jose Maria Suarès (1599-1677), who composed a treatise on ancient Praeneste, Leonardo Agostini (1594-1675), who served as Cardinal Francesco’s antiquarian, and Cesi.\(^{338}\) Additionally, this circle extended beyond the boundaries of Rome through the Republic of Letters, a collection of noted scholars from across Europe,

---

\(^{337}\) At least three paintings by Dughet, all listed simply as landscapes, are recorded in the Barberini inventories in the seventeenth century; see Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, *Seventeenth-Century Barberini Documents and Inventories of Art* (New York: New York University Press, 1975), 433-38. The paintings have not been traced today.


Holstenius, a German scholar, had come to Rome in 1627 and entered the Barberini household in 1636.\footnote{Although his given name was Holste, he is better known by the Latinized version, Holstenius. Despite his contributions to antiquarian study, little scholarly attention has been devoted to Holstenius. See Peter J.A.N. Rietbergen, “Lucas Holstenius (1596-1661), Seventeenth-Century Scholar, Librarian and Book-Collector. A Preliminary Note,” \textit{Querendo} 17, no. 3 & 4 (1987): 205-31, as well as Russell, “Pirro Ligorio, Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Republic of Letters,” 247-48, and Herklotz, \textit{Cassiano dal Pozzo}, 41-42. Just before the death of Cesi in 1630, preparations were in order to admit Holstenius as a member of the Accademia dei Lincei, Findlen, “Science, Art, and Knowledge in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” 277. There is a more recent publication, Lucas Holstenius (1596-1661). Ein Hamburger Humanist im Rom des Barock. Material zur Geschichte seiner Handschriftenankunft an die Stadtbibliothek Hamburg, ed. Hans-Walter Stork (Husum, Germany: Matthiesen, 2008), which includes essays on Holstenius’ library and correspondence with Cardinal Barberini as well as a list of his scholarship and publications.} He was employed there as librarian until 1653, when he was appointed head of the Vatican Library. Holstenius was a prolific writer, producing a number of treatises, although many were not published until after his death. His extensive writings, in the form of letters and manuscripts, on ancient paintings, including the \textit{Aldobrandini Wedding} and the \textit{Barberini Landscape}, influenced Dughet’s interpretation of such images, a debt that will be discussed in depth in the next chapter. As a scholar of ancient history and culture, Holstenius’ most important letters were exchanged with the French jurist, Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc.
Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc

Peiresc, who resided in Aix-en-Provence, was at the center of the group of scholars in the Republic of Letters. After finishing his law degree, he traveled across France and to Switzerland and Italy, where his interest in the study of the past was fully ignited. He returned to Aix, earning a doctorate in civil law and then serving as a counselor in the Parlement of Provence. Peiresc never actively published his work, but wrote and received thousands of letters from other scholars, beginning in the 1610s. His opinion on each new discovery was often sought and he contributed insightful observations and assessments on ancient Greek and Roman culture and art. Peiresc was an avid collector of contemporary prints and drawings after antiquity, as well as ancient coins, medals, and gems, writing extensive letters to other antiquarians on both

341 The recent excellent biography by Miller, Peiresc’s Europe, provides the fullest overview of Peiresc’s life and career, as well as his contributions to various fields of knowledge. Pierre Gasendi (1592-1655), whose work as a philosopher and astronomer was supported by Peiresc, wrote the earliest biography, The Mirror of True Nobility and Gentility, in 1641. The text remains a major source of knowledge on Peiresc’s life and studies.

342 While in Padua, Peiresc met Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601), the noted humanist whose extensive library was one of the largest in Italy at the time. The intellectual circle surrounding Pinelli included Lorenzo Pignoria (1571-1631) and Girolamo Aleandro the Younger (1574-1629), both of whom became Peiresc’s correspondents upon his return to France and greatly influenced his understanding of antiquity. For more on Peiresc’s relationship with Pinelli, see both Angela Nuovo, “Ritratto di collezionista da giovane: Peiresc a casa Pinelli,” in Peiresc et l’Italie: Actes du colloque international, eds. Marc Fumaroli and Francesco Solinas (Paris: Alain Baudry et Cie, 2009), 1-17 and Anna Maria Raugei, “Amor libri. Peiresc e la biblioteca di Gian Vincenzo Pinelli,” in Peiresc et l’Italie, 19-29, which stress the importance of Pinelli’s library for Peiresc’s intellectual development and of Pinelli as a role model and exemplum for Peiresc.

343 Peiresc’s reputation declined in the eighteenth century, likely as a result of the lack of publications, see Miller, Peiresc’s Europe and also Russell, “Pirro Ligorio, Cassiano dal Pozzo and the Republic of Letters,” 243. Generally, scholars state that Peiresc never published a single treatise, but Miller, “From Anjou to Algiers: Peiresc and the Lost History of the French Mediterranean,” in Peiresc et l’Italie, 281-84, reveals that Peiresc wrote a response to a discourse by Thierry Piespord on the genealogy the French and Spanish kings, which was published anonymously as Origines murensis monasterii in 1618. The research on the treatise is recorded in Peiresc’s manuscript register.
iconography and typology.\textsuperscript{344} His rigorous method was based on empirical observation combined with the study of texts and ancient objects.\textsuperscript{345} Dal Pozzo and Peiresc met in person during the former’s voyage to France in 1625 when he brought a gift of drawings after antiquities.\textsuperscript{346} Peiresc, dal Pozzo, and Holstenius engaged in particularly lively discussions on the interpretation of the past through a number of letters that have been preserved in various European collections.

\textit{Peter Paul Rubens: Artist and Antiquarian}

Outside of Peiresc’s letters written to dal Pozzo and Holstenius, he corresponded with artists, including Poussin and Peter Paul Rubens. Rubens and Peiresc had begun exchanging letters in 1619, but first met face-to-face in Paris in 1622 during the artist’s visit while working on the commission for Marie de’Medici at the Luxembourg Palace.\textsuperscript{347}

\textsuperscript{344} Peiresc was particularly influenced by the collection of the antiquarian Natalizio Benedetti (1559-1614), whom he met in Foligno in 1601 and continued to correspond with until the latter’s death, see Veronica Carpita, “Natalizio Benedetti e Nicolas de Peiresc: Dal gusto per le ‘anticaglie’ agli esordi dell’archeologia,” in \textit{Peiresc et l’Italie}, 105-156. He owned a set of prints from Lafreri’s \textit{Speculum Romanae Magnificentae} as well as prints by Etienne Duperac (1520-1607) and a large group of drawings of antiquities by French artists. For more on Peiresc’s collection, see Frédérique Lemerle, “Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc et les ruines romaines,” in \textit{Peiresc et l’Italie}, 210-11.

\textsuperscript{345} A particularly interesting example of Peiresc’s method is discussed by Henri Lavagne, “Peiresc et la peinture romaine antique,” in \textit{Peiresc et l’Italie}, 190-93, in his study of the ears of elephants. Evaluating and verifying both ancient texts, such as Procopius’ \textit{The Gothic War}, and paintings of wild animals from thermal rooms (reproduced in engravings in Lafreri’s \textit{Speculum} in 1577), contemporary studies, including a dissertation by the natural historian Pierre Gilles (1490-1555), and direct observation of actual elephants, Peiresc deduced that African elephants have larger ears than Indian elephants, a fact that would be confirmed much later by the zoologist Georges Cuvier (1769-1832).


\textsuperscript{347} \textit{The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens}, trans. and ed. Ruth Saunders Magurn (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 82-84, The French scholar briefly lived in the city from 1616 to 1623, but then returned to his native Provence. While in Paris, he worked as a contact between Rubens and the Abbé de St. Ambroise, who supervised the artist’s work for the Queen.
Beyond his skills as an artist and diplomat, Rubens enthusiastically pursued knowledge of the past as a means to establish the reputation of his work as intellectually grounded in the study of ancient Greece and Rome.\(^{348}\) He became the favorite artist of Franciscus Junius (1591-1677), who wrote *De pictura veterum (On the painting of the ancients)*, first published in 1637, which sought to explain the ancient theories of art.\(^{349}\) Junius attempted to define the nature of art in the first book of his treatise, privileging works that are naturalistic, but also employ imagination. As Philipp P. Fehl explains, “What matters in a picture is the worth and the dignity of what it represents and in the representation advocates, not the material or even . . . the aesthetic reality of the work.”\(^{350}\) Junius argues

\(^{348}\) See Marjon van der Meulen, *Rubens Copies after the Antique* Vol. 1 (London: Harvey Miller, 1994).

\(^{349}\) For a brief biography of Junius, see C.S.M. Rademaker, “Young Franciscus Junius: 1591-1621,” in *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*, ed. Rolf H. Bremer, Jr. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), 1-17 and Philipp P. Fehl et al., “Franciscus Junius and the Defense of Art,” *Artibus et Historiae* 2, no. 3 (1981): 9-55. Junius was the son of a Protestant theologian and studied in Leiden. He settled in England in 1621 and was appointed librarian to Thomas Howard, the Earl of Arundel. Arundel, a major patron of the arts, believed that “public works of a proper dignity would set the stage for the transformation of England from a feudal kingdom to a true republic,” Fehl et al., “Franciscus Junius,” 15. He commissioned works from Rubens and van Dyck. In 1628, Junius commenced composing the treatise *Catalogus for Arundel* as a guide for studying and evaluating antiques as the Earl had begun importing works from Greece and Asia Minor to establish a collection. The *Catalogus* remained unpublished until after the death of Junius. *De pictura* started as the collection of notes on lives of the artists that Junius assembled for his patron. Divided into three books, it addressed the definition of art, the history, including important artists, and the perfection of art. The English edition was written by Junius himself and published in 1638. The primary differences between the two editions are the addition of quotations from English poets in the second and that the translated Latin excerpts better reflect Junius’ commentary, see Judith Dundas, “Franciscus Junius’s *The Painting of the Ancients* and the Painted Poetry of Ovid,” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3, no. 2 (Fall 1996): 160. For more on Arundel, see Ernest B. Gilman, *Recollecting the Arundel Circle: Discovering the Past, Recovering the Future* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002).

for clarity of composition for ease of understanding the narrative and reading the painting, which aligns with other Counter-Reformation theories on images.351

Not only must artists employ their creative powers and not merely copy the natural world, but the viewer must also look beyond what is represented, resulting in the complete union of painting and poetry. Junius advocated Horace’s analogy of *ut pictura poesis*, encouraging viewers to allow “one’s mind [to] enter into a lively consideration of what we see expressed: not otherwise then if we were present, and saw not the counterfeit image but the real performance of the thing.”352 The treatise then embodies “a noble academy of art in which theory and practice are joined in the service of *Pictura*, and *Pictura* in turn inspires a knowledge of truth and beauty.”353 Art was nature perfected for Junius, as artists could extract their ideas from nature and then invent ideal images that embody beauty. The *De pictura veterum* became enormously popular outside of Amsterdam, where it was originally published, and London, where the English edition

---


353 Fehl et al, “Franciscus Junius and the Defense of Art,” 29. The authors then provide the history of the critical fortune of the *De pictura veterum*, which was considered an invaluable resource until the later eighteenth century, when scholars like Gotthold Ephraim Lessing took issue with the uncritical acceptance of the theory of *ut pictora poesis*.
appeared a year later. Bellori employed Junius as his primary source for ancient texts while composing the *Lives of the Modern Painters*.\textsuperscript{354}

For Rubens, the *De pictura veterum* represented the ideal discourse on the perfection of ancient painting, even though few works from antiquity had survived.\textsuperscript{355} Using Junius and other sources, Rubens dedicated himself to the study of the past and sought to recreate and then surpass the glory of the ancients. In his paintings, he employed ancient sources, particularly sculptures, as the basis for a number of figures, but he would adapt the models to his own style, rendering the ancient marble into convincing painted flesh.\textsuperscript{356} Ancient paintings also served this purpose, as will be covered in the next chapter. Rubens’ expertise on ancient material culture and customs was recognized and respected by other participants in the Republic of Letters. These scholars

\textsuperscript{354} For more on Bellori’s use of Junius, see the introduction to *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, 10 and Colette Nativel, “A Plea for Franciscus Junius as an Art Theorician,” in *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*, 30. Nativel speculates that the book was read by scholars in dal Pozzo’s circle. Dal Pozzo’s biographer, Dati, used *De pictura veterum* extensively in his *Vite de pittori antichi* of 1667.

\textsuperscript{355} See Fehl et al., “Franciscus Junius and the Defense of Art,” 32, where the authors argue that previous scholarship calling Rubens’ letter on the *De pictura veterum* a condemnation of Junius is actually incorrect and the letter, written in Latin, is an endorsement of the treatise and a call to compose a companion text on artists like Raphael, Titian, and Michelangelo, who were able to embody Classical art in their work. Rubens’ praise of Junius is best expressed by Fehl, “Touchstones of Art and Art Criticism,” 18 as, “the desideratum that Rubens posits is a study of art that, on the one hand, serves a knowledge of the arts that, like the arts of the ancients themselves, transcends history; and on the other explores history so that we may be as correctly informed as possible about the particular works of art that are the exempla in a timeless system of art in which ancient and Renaissance art are united.”

\textsuperscript{356} See Victoria Sancho Lobis, “Rubens, the Antique, and Originality Redrawn,” in *Das Originale der Kopie: Kopien als Produkte und Medien der Transformation von Antike*, ed. Tatjana Bartsch et al (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 260-65. “Rubens appreciated the sensitive negotiation between demonstrating knowledge of the antique and becoming enslaved by the desire – on the part of artists, critics, and collectors alike – to see their learning reflected in the art of the day. Rubens’ solution manifested itself as an unmitigated devotion to producing copies, a devotion that came second only to the elevation of his distinct pictorial style,” 265. Also see Philipp Fehl, “Access to the Ancients: Junius, Rubens, and Van Dyck,” in *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*, 46-47. Rubens encouraged the study of ancient sculpture, but not if limited an artist’s ability to create naturalistic figures. The importance of experience and understanding the natural world outranked slavish imitation of antique statues. Finally, see Jeffrey M. Muller, “Rubens’s Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art,” *Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (June 1982): 229-247, which further discusses Rubens’s writings on the imitation of ancient art and his adherence to the theory of selective imitation as espoused by Agucchi.
from across Europe participated in an active and erudite discourse on all aspects of ancient culture, including ancient painting. Rubens’ views on antiquity are confirmed by his correspondence and other writings, but the beliefs and comprehension of the past by an artist such as Dughet, who wrote little, must be deduced from his paintings and the interpretations of his patrons.

Conclusion

Through a more comprehensive overview of the scholarly circles into which Dughet entered when he began his training in Poussin’s studio, the artist’s background and development can be better understood. As a student of Poussin, Dughet came into contact with the most learned patrons and the intellectuals who worked and resided in their palaces. The following chapter examines how these connections affected his art through his engagement with ancient frescoes unearthed in Rome and discussed by these patrons and scholars.
Chapter 4: Gaspard Dughet and Ancient Painting in Seventeenth-Century Rome

Introduction

Antiquarian and artistic interest in ancient Roman fresco paintings reached a pinnacle in the seventeenth century, as new discoveries were unearthed during excavations around the city. Scholars and artists dissected every new fresco, producing treatises and volumes cataloguing each work and its possible meanings. While the interpretation of Greek and Roman sculpture and its use by artists is, of course, well-documented, scholars have devoted less time and effort to how artists employed ancient paintings in the seventeenth century, except in a few specialized cases.357 In particular, Poussin’s connection to, and fascination with, antiquity has been thoroughly analyzed and debated, as briefly discussed in the previous chapter.358 Using both ancient paintings and mosaics, Poussin incorporated motifs from such works into subjects that ranged from Biblical to mythological to historical, re-interpreting the history of Rome and its art into

357 The bibliography on the influence of ancient Greek and Roman sculpture on art from the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries is exceptionally vast. One of the best studies remains the classic text by Francis Haskell and Nicolas Penny, Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981). Also important is Phyllis Pray Bober and Ruth Rubinstein, Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources, 2nd Edition (London: Harvey Miller, 2010). Studying and copying ancient sculpture was also a crucial part of artistic training as described in the early and still important book by Nicolas Pevsner, Academies of Art: Past and Present (New York: Da Capo Press, 1973).

contemporary thought and culture. Following the rhetorical models discussed in the introduction, Poussin blended classical themes into his highly innovative and modern paintings. His patrons and audience recognized his novel imitations, noting how Poussin was able to rival the glory of the ancients.

Gaspard Dughet, however, has been neglected in this regard as no scholarship has been dedicated to his encounters with ancient frescoes. In this chapter, I argue that in fact, Dughet’s engagement with ancient frescoes surpasses that of his master. Beyond the integration of ancient motifs, Dughet understood the mechanical aspects of the frescos. His work relates to ancient paintings through technical analysis as he strove to replicate the surface texture and finish, and through iconographical assimilation as he employed motifs in ways that evidence his understanding of the scholarly discussion of various ancient paintings. Dughet’s noble patrons, whose background and interest in antiquity were covered in the preceding chapter, specifically chose the artist for his aptitude in recreating and re-contextualizing frescoes from pagan Rome within a new Christian setting to produce landscapes all’antica. His pastoral pictures of the Roman countryside, closely related the work of Vergil and other poets as covered in Chapter 2,

---

359 See analysis of the work of Franciscus Junius in the previous chapter and the models described by G.W. Pigman III in the introduction to this dissertation.

360 As stated by Cropper and Dempsey, “Poussin provided the French model for a revival of painting because he combined the study of nature and the art of antiquity in an original way that simultaneously revivified the past and signified a ‘living’ tradition,” Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting, 8.

361 My understanding of Dughet’s interest in ancient painting is based on formal analysis of his work as well as the context of artistic production and patronage in the seventeenth century as no written evidence from the artist exists that directly reveals his relationship to these works.

362 Luba Freedman, “Titian and the Classical Heritage,” in The Cambridge Companion to Titian, ed. Patricia Meilman (New York: The Cambridge University Press, 2004), 183, provides a clear definition of art all’antica, which “went beyond merely imitating works of classical art. It involved a deliberation over the use of skills learned from the works of the ancients and their application to the representation of religious and secular subjects in art.”
blend ancient and contemporary, Christian and Roman imagery within works seemingly without true subjects, just as other artists were able to do with classical sculpture. Following up on humanistic theories of imitation and emulation, Dughet was able to assimilate ancient prototypes seamlessly into his landscape paintings, drawing upon the relationship between painting and poetry to create his expressive works.

The chapter begins with the discovery of antique frescoes in the late fifteenth and into the sixteenth centuries. In this section, I address how both artists and antiquarians interpreted and absorbed the paintings into their art and writings. Although few known examples from this period exist today, some have been recorded for posterity in drawn and painted copies. The proliferation of such copies were known to artists and incorporated into finished works, often as quotations of single figures or particular elements. Following up on the use and knowledge of ancient painting in the Renaissance, the chapter then explores ancient paintings in the seventeenth century. Commencing with the *Aldobrandini Wedding*, excavated around 1600, I survey the history of interpretations of the work and, most importantly, how both Poussin and Dughet integrated stylistic elements of the fresco into their paintings. Continuing with this technical analysis, the chapter then centers on the famous illuminated Vergil manuscripts, whose relationship to landscape painting in the early modern period has not been fully addressed. Examining the work through the lens of the rhetorical conceit of imitation allows a deeper understanding of how artists and their patrons would have viewed classical landscapes of the seventeenth century, particularly the work of Dughet. A brief exploration of the *Palestrina Mosaic* and Poussin’s understanding of antiquity establishes a basis for recognizing how Dughet processed ancient works, such as the *Barberini Landscape*, a
now lost Roman fresco that was believed to represent a nymphaeum, or sacred grotto. This well-documented ancient landscape painting provides the best example of how Dughet understood and interpreted antiquity in his own work.

The Discovery of Ancient Painting in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

The revival of antique wall decoration began in the later fifteenth century and was primarily driven by the rediscovery of Nero’s Domus Aurea (fig. 4.1) around 1480. The grotesque decorations served as models for a number of artists, including Raphael and Pinturicchio, who quickly arrived to copy the motifs. The term grotesque was derived from “grotto,” referring to the underground chambers in which the paintings were found. As the first fully documented paintings from antiquity that were widely reproduced and publicized, the frescoes presented artists and scholars with actual examples of ancient paintings, rather than just theoretical discussions from authors such as Pliny the Elder and the ekphrases of Philostratus the Elder and the Younger. From the early Renaissance, Pliny’s chapter on painting in his Natural History had provided a

---

363 Nicole Dacos, *La découverte de la Domus Aurea et la formation des grotesques à la Renaissance*, (London: Warburg Institute 1969) and Ingrid D. Rowland, *The Culture of the High Renaissance: Ancients and Moderns in Sixteenth-Century Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), provide the best overview of the discovery of the Domus Aurea. The location was originally believed to have been the site of the Baths of Titus and this was accepted until the eighteenth century. The date of discovery has recently been questioned by Claudia La Malfa in her article “The Chapel of San Girolamo in Santa Maria del Popolo in Rome. New Evidence for the Discovery of the Domus Aurea,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 63 (2000): 259-270, in which she argues Pinturicchio’s grotesque decorations for the chapel, based on the artist’s study of the ancient frescoes, were actually executed in 1478-79.


365 Artificial grottos, resembling rocky caves and usually paired with fountains, became a fixture in Italian garden design in the sixteenth century. For more on the history of the garden grotto, see Naomi Miller, *Heavenly Caves: Reflections on the Garden Grotto* (New York: Braziller, 1982).
technical analysis and historical overview on the development of art from ancient Egypt to Rome.\footnote{366} The texts by Philostratus the Elder and Younger, on the other hand, offered iconographical and rhetorical models for both artists and writers, illustrating the relationship between painting and poetry.\footnote{367} For Philostratus, paintings were illustrations of poetry that could move authors to create new poetical works in their own words.\footnote{368} Pliny’s assertion that art should be based on nature and that the best work appeared to be a realistic rendering that could trick the viewer presented readers, both artists and scholars, with a clear objective and idealized view of the form of ancient painting.\footnote{369}

\footnote{366} Pliny’s text is divided by materials - the chapter on painting is Book 35, while Book 33 is on gold and silver, Book 34 on bronze, Book 36 on marble and architecture, and Book 37 on gems. The only major study focusing solely on Pliny’s chapters on art remains Jacob Isager, \textit{Pliny on Art and Society: The Elder Pliny’s Chapters on the History of Art}, trans. Henrik Rosenmeier (New York: Routledge, 1991), in which the author discusses Pliny’s work in context, examining his motivations and audience. Isager explores the political context of the work, dedicated to the emperor Titus, and the moralizing tone, an argument against “excessive consumption,” exemplified by Nero, 223. Although Pliny states that the \textit{Natural History} is utilitarian in nature and intended for those who have not had “opportunity to acquire through knowledge of the world that surrounds them,” the text is written for the erudite upper class, as evidenced by the “criticism of the state of moral decay,” 25.


\footnote{368} Fehl, “Touchstones of Art and Art Criticism,” 16.

\footnote{369} Pliny’s stories of the early Greek painters Zeuxis, Parrhasius, and Apelles serve as impeccable examples, particularly the rivalry between two of the artists that resulted in Zeuxis being tricked by the painted curtain of Parrhasius, see Pliny the Elder, \textit{Natural History}, trans. John Bostock (London: Taylor and Francis, 1855), accessed November 15, 2012, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/, Book 35, Chapter 36. The tale of Zeuxis and his selection of the best attributes of beautiful young women in creating his Helen of Troy became a model for artists in creating idealized beauty. In Chapter 37, Pliny lays out a hierarchy of genres, rating the pictures of gods by the artists listed in Chapter 36 as superior to the comic, genre-type
Artists, driven by the renewed fascination with the art of ancient Greece and Rome, were captivated by the paintings from the Domus Aurea. These twisted and strange figures interwoven with vegetal and floral imagery became a fundamental decorative theme from the sixteenth century onward, allowing artists the opportunity to freely express their inventiveness.\footnote{Dacos, \textit{La découverte de la Domus Aurea}, still provides the primary overview of the reception and influence of the frescoes on artists in the sixteenth century. Dacos presents a brief survey of the history of the Domus Aurea as well as a history of the term grotesque and then explores, in detail, how artists employed the motifs in their work. For more, see the useful reviews of the book by Toby Yuen in \textit{The Art Bulletin} 55, no. 2 (June 1973): 301-303; Katharine Shepard in the \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 76, no. 3 (Jul 1972): 344-45; Juergen Schulz in \textit{Renaissance Quarterly} 24, no. 4 (Winter 1971): 541-43; and Hanno-Walter Kruft in \textit{The Burlington Magazine} 114, no. 827 (February 1972): 100-02. According to Dacos, the most distinguished grotesque painter was Giovanni da Udine (1487–1564), who worked in Raphael’s studio as a decorative specialist, and whose bold interpretation of the motifs resulted in a new vision for his frescoes at the Villa Farnesina and the Villa Madama, 101-14. Giovanni’s grotesques became the model for artists in the later sixteenth century. Schulz’s review notes that it was the efforts of Raphael’s studio that “led to the true revival of antique grotesques,” 543. Also see Guiseppe M. Carpaneto, Giulia Caneva, Angelo Merrante, “Gli elementi fantastici nelle grottesche e negli stucchi,” in \textit{Raffaello e l'immagine della natura: La raffigurazione del mondo naturale nelle decorazioni dell Logge vaticane}, ed. Giulia Caneva and Giuseppe M. Carpaneto (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2010), 209-231, for an overview of the interpretation and manipulation of the various motifs in the paintings in Vatican Logge. It is critical to note that the paintings in the Domus Aurea include figurative works as well as the grotesque decorative schemes. These frescoes were documented in drawn copies and served as models for artists, but they have not received as much scholarly attention. One example is the so-called Coriolanus fresco in the Volta degli Stucchi, which Annibale Carracci copied in a drawing dating from soon after his arrival in Rome (now in the collection of the Royal Library at Windsor Castle), see Dacos \textit{La découverte de la Domus Aurea}, 18-19, figs. 7-8; Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 228-29 (fig. 14); Joyce, “From Darkness to Light,” 172-74, and Joyce, “Giovanni Pietro Bellori and the Loss and Restoration of (Ancient) Painting in Rome,” in \textit{Memory and Oblivion: Proceedings of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art held in Amsterdam 1-7 September 1996}, ed. Wessel Reinink and Jeroen Stumpel (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999), 317-23. The drawing was owned by Bellori, who eventually commissioned an engraving after the drawing from Bartoli. Fulvio Orsini likely misidentified the scene, interpreting it as an image of Roman virtue. Winckelmann later identified the fresco as Hector and Andromache. In “From Darkness to Light,” Joyce argues that Annibale was simply imitating Raphael, who studied in the Domus Aurea, rather than taking an actual antiquarian interest in the painting. Joyce dismisses a significant part of the drawing, however, as Annibale recorded not only the composition, but also the original location of the painting within the decorative scheme of the room. He then employed the fresco as a model for his \textit{Choice of Hercules} for the Farnese family, which was, of course, an image of virtue.}
Scholarly interest in grotesques focused on their relationship to art, rather than to Roman culture and customs. Theorists on art debated the merits or faults of the bizarre and fantastical imagery, which had been dismissed by Vitruvius as trivial and irrational. Little attention was paid to actual iconographic interpretation of the pictures, as artists instead focused on copying and reinterpreting the motifs, eventually creating entire rooms and vaults based around grotesque designs. Writers, such as Anton Francesco Doni (1513-1574), Francisco de Hollanda (1517-1585), Pirro Ligorio, Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo (1538-1592), and Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597), either celebrated the freedom and creativity that grotesques allowed painters or decried the motifs as completely artificial and in contradiction of the naturalistic and classical objectives of art.

371 Vitruvius, *The Ten Books on Architecture*, trans. Morris Hicky Morgan. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914), Book VII, chap. 5, sect. 3, “We now have fresco paintings of monstrosities, rather than truthful representations of definite things. For instance, reeds are put in the place of columns, fluted appendages with curly leaves and volutes, instead of pediments, candelabra supporting representations of shrines, and on top of their pediments numerous tender stalks and volutes growing up from the roots and having human figures senselessly seated upon them; sometimes stalks having only half-length figures, some with human heads, others with the heads of animals.”

372 The scholarly reception is discussed by Dacos, *La découverte de la Domus Aurea*, 121-135, and also by Philippe Morel, “Il funzionamento simbolico e la critica delle grottesche nella seconda metà del Cinquecento,” in *Roma e l’antico nell’arte e nella cultura del Cinquecento*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1985), 149-178. Doni was somewhat critical of the bizarre nature of grotesques in his treatises, *Disegno* (1549) and *Le Pitture* (1564). De Hollanda, in his *Quattro dialogos da pintura antigua* (1548) with Michelangelo, states that the illustrious artist defended the right of painters to represent their fantastical inventions through grotesque decoration, so long as the creator was competent. Ligorio’s unpublished text, the entry on grotesques for his encyclopedia, the *Libro dell’antichità*, argues that while artists do have some license, grotesques need to follow logical rules in order to have some function and addresses their symbolic value. Lomazzo’s treatise, the *Trattato dell’arte della pittura, scultura et architettura* (1584) also celebrates the freedom of artists and poets to invent grotesque imagery. Paleotti’s *Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane* (1582), states that grotesque figures are completely unnatural, having been invented for underground chambers, belong in private spaces and are too often employed only to flaunt the cleverness of artists.
Questions on the Survival of Material

Current scholars have debated whether artists would have had access to other images before the discovery of the Domus Aurea despite the lack of recorded evidence. Ingvar Bergstörm has argued that artists must have seen illusionistic wall decorations of the Second Style in addition to the *grotteschi* of Nero’s Golden House. Baldassare Peruzzi’s *Sala delle Prospettive* of 1515-17 (fig. 2.19) for instance, bears an uncanny resemblance to such paintings (fig. 4.2). Hetty Joyce, however, argues that literary evidence and the revival of ancient drama, complete with incorporation of stage sets, could have served as models for artists such as Peruzzi. Joyce also dismisses the influence of ancient paintings, stating that the lack of copies and definitive appropriations indicate that such works were only admired amongst a small group of artists and scholars.

---

373 Ingvar Bergström, *Revival of Antique Illusionistic Wall-Painting in Renaissance Art* (Stockholm: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1957), 25, asserts that artists must have had examples and cites copies after ancient frescoes made in the later seventeenth century that have no annotations on original location. Toby Yuen, “The ‘Bibliotheca Graeca’: Castagno, Alberti, and Ancient Sources,” *The Burlington Magazine* 112, no. 812 (November 1970): 724-736, argues that Alberti and other artists had access to ancient paintings and that the lack of records is merely a lack of actually recording, rather than their being non-existent. Mariette de Vos, “La ricezione della pittura antica fino alla scoperta di Ercolano e Pompei,” *Memoria dell’antico nell’arte italiana*, Vol 2, ed. Salvatore Settis (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1985), 351-377, also concludes that artists must have had access to more material than is presently known. She makes a number of comparisons between sixteenth century paintings and prints and ancient frescoes and mosaics from later finds, including the decoration of Clement VII’s stufetta in Castel Sant’Angelo by Giovanni da Udine, three examples of mythological subjects, and mosaic decorations for floors and ceilings. For more on the general history and development of Roman painting, see Roger Ling, *Roman Painting* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Second Style decoration began in the first century BCE and was characterized by “the imitation of architectural forms by purely pictorial means,” 23.

374 Yuen, “The ‘Bibliotheca Graeca,’” argues that Alberti and other artists had access to ancient paintings and that the lack of records is merely a lack of actually recording, rather than their being non-existent. Additionally, the incorporation of a cortile design in the continuous frescoes at the Villa Farnesina (then the Villa Chigi) can be traced back to the renewed interest in villa life, which began in the fifteenth century as discussed in Chapter 2.

375 Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 220-222.
in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{376} Determining precisely what ancient paintings were known without written or recorded evidence from the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries is almost impossible, but the relationships discussed by both Bergstörm and Toby Yuen are nearly incontrovertible. There is a clear connection between the fantastic architectural settings of Peruzzi and Castagno and Roman wall paintings, but no drawings after such ancient frescoes or written records exist today. If any such paintings with illusionistic architecture were found, they were likely lost almost immediately upon discovery and exposure to light and air. Artists may have quickly copied the paintings and the drawings have not survived or are unidentified.\textsuperscript{377}

Although Joyce’s research on the reception of ancient painting remains a fundamental study of the subject, her assessment of surviving material does not take into

\textsuperscript{376} Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 245, “By this time, ancient painting-the names and personalities of the ancient masters, the subjects and manner of their work-had been the object of intense study for over two hundred years. This knowledge had been thoroughly assimilated by those noble spirits, Raphael, Annibale Carracci, and Poussin, who, through study of the ancient literature on art and of the remains of ancient painting and, finally, through natural affinity, most nearly embodied the perfection of the ancients. It was, therefore, because ancient painting had already been reborn that actual examples of this art could be complacently regarded as mere footnotes—however precious—to a history of ancient painting that had already been written.” In contrast to this assessment, see Dempsey, “The Classical Perception of Nature in Poussin’s Earlier Works,” in which the author analyzes the artist’s blending of both ancient iconography and scholarly interpretation of paintings and texts.

\textsuperscript{377} Numerous manuscripts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries provide records of various excavations, particularly in Rome, and even include mentions of paintings, but no descriptions. For example, the sculptor Flamino Vecca’s letter to his patron Anastasio Simonetti of Perugia on the discovery of ruins dated November 1594 in the Biblioteca Casanatense (MSS. Miscellanea 2096 (X.V.24), fols. 346-419) mentions “quadri,” yet gives no other information other than vague locations. Sculptures were the major interest for scholars and collectors at the time, see Ingo Herklotz, “Excavations, Collectors and Scholars in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” in Archives and Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century, ed. Ilaria Bignamini (London: The British School at Rome, 2004), 55-88. Paintings from around Naples had certainly been discovered by the end of the sixteenth century, but no graphic documentation appears to have survived and little artistic interest was paid to these frescoes. Peiresc visited painted and stuccoed tombs in Pozzuoli during his trip around Italy in 1601 and wrote about the rich colors (but little else) in later letters to Claude Menestrier, see Henri Lavagne, “Peiresc et la peinture romaine antique,” in Peiresc et l’Italie: Actes du colloque international, eds. Marc Fumaroli and Francesco Solinas (Paris: Alain Baudry et Cie, 2009), 187-88 and also Italo M. Iasiello, Il collezionismo di antichità nella Napoli dei Viceré (Naples: Liguori Editore, 2003), 31-36, where some of the discoveries are briefly discussed.
consideration that some drawn copies may not have survived or have yet to be discovered, nor does she address the nuanced approaches to the understanding of ancient painting. These discussions appear in the scholarship on works discovered in the seventeenth century, beginning with the *Aldobrandini Wedding* and continuing with the *Palestrina Mosaic* and the *Barberini Landscape*. Scholars and artists devoted a great deal of time and effort on the interpretation of these three works. Beyond the simple appropriation of motifs or direct formal imitation, artists at the time, including Dughet, incorporated and emulated these well-known ancient works, exploiting their knowledge of such images as a means to compete with, and triumph over, ancient artists.

*Ancient Frescoes, Mosaics, and Manuscripts in Seventeenth-Century Rome*

*The Aldobrandini Wedding*

The grotesques on the walls of the Domus Aurea fell out of favor towards the end of the sixteenth century, but a renewed interest in ancient painting occurred with a number of important discoveries. Around 1601, the *Aldobrandini Wedding* was unearthed on the Esquiline, near Santa Maria Maggiore (fig. 4.3). The widely popular fresco was copied by artists from across Europe, from Anthony van Dyck to Pietro da Cortona.

Antiquarian and artistic interest in the fresco focused primarily on the iconography and

---

378 Francesca Cappelletti and Caterina Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the *Nozze Aldobrandini*,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 56 (1993): 274-280, published documents and letters demonstrating that the fresco was known by 1601, pushing back the commonly held assumption that the work was found in 1604-05. The documents include payments from the Aldobrandini family in 1601 to a Geronimo Bolina for excavating a painting at San Giuliano (now destroyed) as well as a papal *avviso* of January 24, 1601 acclaiming the discovery of frescoes on the Esquiline Hill that rival the works of Raphael and Michelangelo, 275-76.
the various elements in the painting, as well as the gestures of the figures, as a means to properly understand Roman wedding rites rather than the style or composition.\footnote{Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 226-227, Peiresc was especially interested in the fresco in relation to his work on Roman weddings, which will discussed below.}

The fresco was found close to the Arch of Gallienus, possibly within the limits of the Horti Maecenatis, and has been dated to between 20 BCE and 40 CE.\footnote{The primary contemporary and ancient analyses of the fresco can be found in Frank G.J.M. Müller, The Aldobrandini Wedding: Iconological Studies in Roman Art, III (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1994) and Giuliana Fusconi, La fortuna delle “Nozze Aldobrandini”: dall’Esquilino alla Biblioteca Vaticana (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1994). Fusconi’s extensive treatment brings together all previous documentary evidence on the fresco from reception to interpretation, including a complete catalogue of known copies and drawings of the motifs, but does not propose any new interpretation. Müller relies primarily on the early study by Bartolomeo Nogara, Le Nozze Aldobrandini, I Paesaggi con scene dell’Odissea e le altre pitture murali antiche conservate nella biblioteca vaticana e nei musei pontifici (Milan: Enrico Hoepli, 1907), 1-2, for the location and discovery of the fresco. The area that formed the Horti was once a burial ground that was transformed into a pleasure garden by C. Cilnius Maecenas, the famed arts patron. The area became popular among the nobility of Rome. It is likely that the fresco once graced the walls of a villa. According to Federico Zuccaro, another fresco was found with the Aldobrandini Wedding, an image of vines, which was also installed in a noble villa. Zuccaro writes that the owner included verses of poetry beneath the painting (See Zuccaro, L’idea de’pittori, scultori, e architetti II (Turin: Agostino Disserolio, 1607), 37-38 and also Nogara Le Nozze Aldobrandini, I for the verses). Importantly, for the avviso published by Cappelletti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the Nozze Aldobrandini,” 276, the anonymous author records the painting of vines. Müller, The Aldobrandini Wedding, 11-13, recounts the history of agreement on the dating of the fresco, which is accepted by nearly all as Third Style based on the wall used as a background, the cooler colors, and the carefully depicted, rigid figure. He emphasizes the close stylistic relationship between the Aldobrandini Wedding and a fresco of Apollo found on the Palatine in 1950. Since the work was part of a complex commissioned by Augustus, he suggests that the two works were from the same studio and the patron for the Wedding was part of the imperial court. This then dates the fresco to closer to the beginning of the Third Style during the reign of Augustus, 14-15.} Federico Zuccaro was present during the excavation, asserting “I, who by chance was one of the first to see it, and carefully to wash and clean it with my own hand, saw it as well preserved and as fresh as if it had just been painted, so that it gave me great delight and I was the cause of having it brought to light.”\footnote{Zuccaro, L’idea de’pittori, II 37, “io che fui per sorte uno di quelli primi a vederla, e lavarla, & netarla di mia mano diligentemente, la viddi così ben conservata, e fresca, come se fusse fatta pur all’hora, che n’hebbi un gusto singolare, e fui causa di farla portare alla luce.” Translation from Cappelletti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the Nozze Aldobrandini,” 274-75.} Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini claimed
ownership of the painting, which he installed in a loggetta in the garden of his Roman villa on the Quirinal Hill, and where it stayed until it was sold to Pope Pius VII in 1818.

The scene, composed of ten figures arranged in a shallow space on a single line reads, as Frank G.J.M. Müller states, as a theatrical setting, with actors and “stage attributes.” Based on shadows at the right edge of the painting and evidence of a garland, Müller surmises that the fresco was once part of a long frieze. Earlier scholars have understood the Aldobrandini Wedding as a whole, rather than a fragment of a larger scene, interpreting the array of figures as balanced and symmetrical. Whoever first decoded the fresco as depicting a wedding rite has not been identified, but the acceptance of this theory is demonstrated in Anthony van Dyck’s drawing of around 1622-23, on which he writes, “Sposalitio de gli Romani antighi [sic]” (fig. 4.4). The general assumption is that the painting shows a wedding ceremony – the woman seated on the bed at left center is counseled by Venus, who sits beside her, as her bridegroom, the half-

---

382 Müller, *The Aldobrandini Wedding*, 4-8, provides a detailed formal analysis of the fresco, including a better reading of some of the objects, especially the writing tablet that rests against the column at the far left of the scene. Müller notes that such tablets are common in sacro--idyllic landscape paintings (the importance of which will be discussed in relation to the Barberini Landscape below).

383 Müller, *The Aldobrandini Wedding*, 8-10, the beginning of the garland is visible on the capital beneath the figure to the far right holding a lyre. The fresco of vines recounted by Zuccaro was probably originally placed above and below the scene with figures. Müller reads Zuccaro’s description of the excavation (“una stanza, ove era rimasto un pezzo di muro in piedi,” 37) as the fresco being part of a single wall “still standing,” meaning that the rest of the room was not intact when the Aldobrandini Wedding was found.

384 In a letter to Pignoria, which Cappelletti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the Nozze Aldobrandini,” date to 1601 and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (MS 5172, fol. 100), Peiresc analyzes the formal qualities of the fresco and concludes “Vogliono alcuni che siano le cerimonie che si soleano fare nelle nozze et che la figura sentata in terra sia d’Imeneo,” (Some people think that these are the ceremonies which people performed at weddings, and that the figure seated on the ground is Hymen).” 277 (translation by Cappelletti and Volpi). Cappelletti and Volpi mention that David Jaffè, in personal correspondence, supports the dating of the letter. Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 226, notes that Van Dyck devoted little time to the study of antiquities during his time in Rome as evidenced by the general lack of copies in his sketchbook. It is thus remarkable that he carefully records some of the groups from the painting and makes color notations. Joyce proposes that he saw the painting as a chance “to capture an event in the lives of the ancient Romans, just as his sketchbook records many scenes of contemporary Italian life.”
naked, garlanded young man to the right, awaits.\textsuperscript{385} One of the three Graces stands next to Venus and “will add to the bride’s charms by sprinkling fragrant essences,” while the bride’s mother is at left, priming a ritual bath with assistance, and the three women at the far right play the bridal hymn.\textsuperscript{386} The preparation of the bath has been connected to the \textit{aqua et igni accipi}, which was a ceremony receiving the bride into her new home using fire and water.\textsuperscript{387} The acceptance of the scene as a customary wedding ceremony with only two allegorical or mythical figures (Venus and one of the Graces) did have detractors even in the seventeenth century as a letter from Holstenius to Peiresc calls into question the identification of the male bridegroom figure as Hymen, the god of the marriage ceremony.\textsuperscript{388} Pignoria’s treatise of 1630 classifies the scene as the historical marriage between Arruntius Stella and Violentilla as commemorated by Statius.\textsuperscript{389} Müller instead proposes that the fresco represents a variation on the myth of Phaedra and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{385} Müller, \textit{The Aldobrandini Wedding}, 26, provides the clearest overview.
\item \textsuperscript{386} Müller, \textit{The Aldobrandini Wedding}, 26.
\item \textsuperscript{387} The ritual is discussed by Ernst Samter, \textit{Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer} (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1901), 14 - 20, and Kurt Latte, \textit{Römische Religionsgeschichte} (Munich: Beck, 1960), 96-97.
\item \textsuperscript{388} Nogara \textit{Le Nozze Aldobrandini}, 28 and Müller, \textit{The Aldobrandini Wedding}, 29, reprint part of the letter, which dates from 1629, “Nam quod figuram humi procumbentem et lectuli pedi applicatam Hymenaeum esse volunt, nullam ego rationem video cur non Comum pari vel meliori ratione esse existimem” or “For those that want that figure seated on the ground and at the foot of the bed to be Hymen, I see no rational reason for not supposing that Comus is an equal or better choice.” Comus, the god of revelry, was often shown wearing a garland of flowers. Holstenius continues by noting how the figure is closely related to Philostratus the Elder’s description of Comus (for more, see \textit{Imagines} 1.2)
\item \textsuperscript{389} Pignoria’s treatise is \textit{Antiquissimae picturae quae Romae visiture typus a Laurentio Pignorio accurate explicatus} (Padua, 1630) and the particular poem by Statius is from \textit{Silvae} I, 2. The entire text is written in the form of a letter to dal Pozzo and first published in 1629. His work was not well received by his peers as dal Pozzo even refused to send him another print of the painting for the second edition of the text. See the discussion in Cappelletti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the \textit{Nozze Aldobrandini},” 278 for more.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Hippolytus, based on the tragedy by Euripides. The young man, rather than a bridegroom or a deity, is instead Hippolytus, the stepson of Phaedra, the veiled woman seated on the bed. Certainly the supposed bride does appear to be a middle-aged woman, rather than a girl of the same age as the hypothetical groom. In one scene in the play, Phaedra, overcome with illicit desire for her stepson, asks that her sickbed be carried outside so that she can be closer to Hippolytus, who was an enthusiastic hunter. The figure seated beside her is identified as Aphrodite/Venus, who encouraged Phaedra’s infatuation; the group on the left is attendants to the ailing queen of Athens, preparing her a tonic; and Artemis/Diana, to whom Hippolytus was devoted, stands at the right, between two of her nymphs. The missing section at the right of the fresco must have included more of Hippolytus’ companions. According to Müller, the painting does not depict an actual scene from the play, as Hippolytus and Phaedra are never actually represented together, but instead “suggestively expresses the fundamental conflict

---

390 Müller, *The Aldobrandini Wedding*, 160-166. His assumptions have been questioned in at least one review of the book. See John Elsner, “Iconography,” *The Classical Review*, New Series 46, no. 1 (1996): 139-40, who states that while questioning that the subject is a wedding is valid, the final interpretation is “less convincing.” Indeed, Müller’s thorough evaluation of previous interpretations notes the contrast between the *Aldobrandini Wedding* and typical depictions of both Roman and Greek marriage rites. Whereas the standard visual representation of a Roman wedding includes only the *dextrarum iunctio*, where the bride and groom join hands, no other images of the *aqua et igni accipi* have survived, 36. As for Greek ceremonies, there are no illustrations of Aphrodite consoling the worried bride or of the couple about to be joined on their wedding night, 37. Additionally, Müller rightly points out the odd setting – the scene takes place out of doors as evidenced by the blue sky of the background and the wall behind the figures to the left, 39-41. He also persuasively discounts earlier theories of the scene being the wedding of mythological figures through careful iconographical analysis, 42-46.

391 The full title of the play is *Hippolytos Stephanephoros* – the epithet translates to “the Garlanded,” 160. Müller notes that the garland the figure wears can refer to the chastity of Hippolytus.

392 Müller, *The Aldobrandini Wedding*, 160-162 summarizes his detailed breakdown of each figure and their attributes.
between the two main characters.” Prior to this innovative reading, as demonstrated by the thorough evidence in both Bartolommeo Nogara and Giuliana Fusconi’s monographs on the Aldobrandini Wedding, the fresco was accepted as an illustration of Roman marriage rites. Beginning in the 1620s, however, the painting became the center of a lively discourse between many of the major antiquarian scholars and a favorite subject for aspiring artists.

Cassiano dal Pozzo’s copy of the drawing for his *Museo Cartaceo* was executed by Pietro da Cortona in 1623-24 (fig. 4.5) and then engraved by Bernardino Capitelli (1590-1639) on the occasion of the wedding of Taddeo Barberini and Anna Colonna in 1627 (fig. 4.6). It was this publication of the image that led to further renewed antiquarian interest in the fresco, including the commission of multiple painted and

---


394 Cappelletti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the *Nozze Aldobrandini*,” 279 argue that, in fact, the painting remained out of view until at least 1611 when Cardinal Aldobrandini returned to Rome after years of diplomatic missions. Pignoria was unable to see it between 1606 and 1608 when he was composing his treatise. The earliest known copy is of the group of figures at the far left, painted by Domenico Fetti in 1611, see Fusconi, *La fortuna delle “Nozze Aldobrandini,”* 31-34. Certainly some artists and scholars must have had earlier access to the fresco as Zuccaro oversaw the excavation and Rubens was able to recall it from memory.

drawn copies for different patrons, as well as study by Poussin, and I am arguing, by
Dughet. Rubens, who likely saw the original during his sojourns to Rome in 1601-03
and from 1606-08, discussed the painting with Peiresc in a letter dated May 19, 1628,
calling the male figure just to the right of the center the bridegroom, as was the
established reading by contemporary scholars. Peiresc and Holstenius engaged in a
lengthy correspondence on the meaning of the painting as both the French jurist and the
German scholar questioned whether the subject was clearly a wedding. Holstenius,

396 For an inventory of the various copies, see both Nogara, Le Nozze Aldobrandini, I Paesaggi and
Fusconi, La fortuna delle “Nozze Aldobrandini,” Appendix I. The proliferation of printed copies continued
until well into the eighteenth century. Bartoli executed two drawings for Cardinal Massimo’s collection and
an engraving for his and Bellori’s Admiranda Romanarum antiquitatum ac veteris sculpturae vestige, first
published in 1693. The fame of the painting spread beyond Italy as Sandrart mentioned the fresco in his
1679 German edition of the Teutsche Akademie and reproduced in print in the 1680 Latin edition of the
text.

397 Cited by Müller, The Aldobrandini Wedding, 24, who reprints only part of the letter. The full
(translated) text can be found in The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, trans. and ed. Ruth Saunders Magurn
(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 263-64, no 167. Rubens describes the figural groupings of
the painting from memory, calling the bride “pensive and melancholy,” identifying the woman seated next
to her as the “maid-of-honor,” and the half-naked man as the groom, 264. The figures to the left of the bed
are labeled as deities who offer sacrifices. Rubens does not discuss the three women to the right, stating
that he covered the subject in a previous letter. He asks that Peiresc send him a drawing of the fresco in
color so that he can provide a more in depth explanation, 264. The original letter has been lost, but a copy
survives at the Bibliothèque Méjanès, Aix. The letter is clearly a follow up to a previous correspondence
where Rubens began his description of the fresco. Müller also notes that Rubens could not have been in
Rome during the discovery of the fresco, which he places in late 1604 or early 1605. This has, as noted
above, been disproven by the documents published by Cappelletti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning
the Discovery and Early History of the Nozze Aldobrandini,” which Müller does acknowledge in an
Addendum to his text. In a later letter to Peiresc, dated September 4, 1636 and published in translation in
Magurn The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, 404-06, no. 239, Rubens thanks his friend for sending a color
drawing after the Aldobrandini Wedding, which he says “was discovered in Rome in my youth, and being
unique, was admired and adored by all lovers of painting and antiquity.” Peiresec also wrote to dal Pozzo,
requesting copies of the fresco and noting that painted copy owned by Ambassador Béthune was of much
lesser quality than the print done by Capitelli. See Jaffé, “The Barberini Circle: Some Exchanges between
Lavagne, “Peiresc et la peinture romaine antique,” 195, also notes that Peiresc likely saw the fresco during
his trip to Italy as he was in Rome from the fall of 1600 until late spring of 1601.

398 Nogara, Le Nozze Aldobrandini, reproduces all seventeenth-century correspondence and documentation
on the Aldobrandini Wedding known in the early twentieth century in the Appendices, 27-31. Peiresc
writes to Holstenius in September of 1628, “car il me tard fort d’apprendre ce qui sera de votre avis sur un
si noble subject et de si difficile interpretation” (for I wish to learn of your opinion on a subject so noble
and of such difficult interpretation). Holstenius responded in November of the same year: “quid de tota illa
pictura sentiam paucis significabo, quamvis ad ejus explicationem Oedipo non sit opus: ita res ipsa
who at first declined to weigh in on the matter, finally wrote that the scene was either a nuptiale sacrum (sacred wedding) or a comessatio (Bacchanalian revelry) in a letter dated from February 1629. Other scholarly contributions from the late 1620s include a treatise now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris that has been attributed to Girolamo Aleandro the Younger and a thesis attributed to Marzio Milesi in the Vatican Library, both of which were written at the request of dal Pozzo. Although they vary in their analysis of the individual figures, both authors agree that the fresco depicts an ancient marriage rite. Debate on the fresco continued into the later half of the seventeenth century, as theories such as Pignoria’s were dismissed.

In addition to deliberating on loquitur.” (What I think about the whole picture, I will later signify in a few words, even though it is a difficult explanation even for Oedipus, and speaks for itself). Peiresc had to write three additional letters asking for Holstenius’ full conclusions on the painting before the latter eventually wrote to him with a more detailed response.

399 See Nogara, Le Nozze Aldobrandini, 28. Holstenius refused to write a treatise on the Aldobrandini Wedding, stating in his next letter in May of 1629 that “We are shortly expecting the extensive account of the nuptial painting by Lorenzo Pignoria, which he has written at the request of [Cassiano dal Pozzo]; and since Aleandro the blessed has also submitted his ideas to the same person, it would not be appropriate for me to use my scythe on someone else’s harvest, especially as I do not have the necessary books for such a study.” (De pictura γαµησίων expectamus in dies Laurentii Pignorii copiosam declarationem, quam rogatu D. N. Equitis suscepit; eidem quoque cl. Alexander o µακαρίτης suas observationes submisit, ita ut mihi non libeat falcem in alienam mes-sem mittere, praesertim cum libris ad eam rem neces-sariis destituat), translated by Cappelliti and Volpi, “New Documents concerning the Discovery and Early History of the Nozze Aldobrandini,” 278.

400 Dupuy 5, fol. 75 and Vat. Lat. 10486, fol. 39; Both are reprinted in Nogara, Le Nozze Aldobrandini, 28-31. Nogara believed that Aleandro was the author of the Dupuy manuscript, but this assessment was refuted in Peiresc, Lettres à Cassiano dal Pozzo: 1626-1637, ed. Jean-François Lhote and Danielle Joyal (Clermont-Ferrand: Adora, 1989), 57-58. Lhote and Joyal argue that the discussion of the crown worn by the figure of the central female musician of the right hand group differs from the accepted conclusion of scholars in the Barberini circle, whose assumptions were clearly based on the interpretation proposed by Aleandro, as evidenced by letters written by Holstenius and Peiresc in 1628 and 1629. Both scholars note that the figure is wearing a vegetal crown, while the dissertation states that the woman is crowned like a queen (“ché'è coronata a modo di Regina”), Nogara, Le Nozze Aldobrandini, 29. The other thesis, possibly by Milesi, is an assessment of the coloring and state of the fresco, tied to the reading of Pliny’s Natural History, Book 35, which discusses various colors, their origins, and application in painting. Fusconi, La fortuna delle “Nozze Aldobrandini,” 44, believes that the text is by Giovan Battista Doni (1594-1647), a musicologist in the Barberini circle who specialized in the study of ancient music.

401 Bellori, in his Delli Vestigi delle Pitture antiche dal buon secolo de’Romani,” in the Nota delle musei, librerie, galerie, et ornamenti di statue e piture ne’Palazzi, nelle Case, e ne’Giardini di Roma (Roma:
the possible subject, scholars focused on the details of the painting, including the furniture and hairstyles, while collectors commissioned copies of the fresco to adorn the walls of their homes.\footnote{Peiresc in fact composed a discourse on tripods, the "Dissertation sur un trépied par M. de Peiresc," in Continuation des mémoires de littérature et d'histoire X, ed. Pierre Nicolas Desmolets (Paris: Simart, 1731), 243-277. Also, the artist Guglielmo Cortese (or Guillaume Courtouis), who collaborated with Dughet on paintings for the Palazzo Pamphilj, produced studies after the fresco, which are reproduced in Joyce, "Grasping at Shadows," 228, figs. 12 and 13 and in Fusconi, La fortuna delle "Nozze Aldobrandini," 84-85, figs. 26 and 27.}

Poussin made a number of studies after the \textit{Aldobrandini Wedding} (fig. 4.7), incorporating the motifs into his classical and biblical subjects, including \textit{The Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh's Crown} (c.1645-47), which was commissioned by Cardinal Camillio Massimo (fig. 4.8).\footnote{Anthony Blunt, \textit{The Paintings of Nicolas Poussin: A Critical Catalogue} (London: Phaidon Press, 1966), cat. no. 15 and Christopher Wright, \textit{Poussin Paintings: A Catalogue Raisonné} (London: Jupiter Books, 1984), cat. no. 136. The painted copy of the \textit{Aldobrandini Wedding}, now in the collection of the Galleria Doria-Pamphilj, was attributed to Poussin since at least the early eighteenth century. See Nogara, \textit{Le Nozze Aldobrandini}, 7 for more on the painting, which was still believed to be by Poussin until the mid-twentieth century. Massimo later commissioned a drawn copy of the fresco in the 1670s from Pietro Santi Bartoli, which was included in his set of copies after the Vatican Vergil (discussed below), Nogara, \textit{Le Nozze Aldobrandini}, 9.}

In the painting for Massimo, the female figure at left, her arm resting on a column, is quoted from the figure to the left of the seated women in the fresco. Poussin’s attention to the \textit{Aldobrandini Wedding} reflects his study of antiquity and meticulous search to incorporate accurate details from the past, including dress and furnishings.\footnote{J.H. Whitfield, “Even the Furniture: Poussin and the \textit{Aldobrandini Wedding},” \textit{Apollo} 141, no. 400 (June 1995): 40-43, notes that few scholars have addressed Poussin’s interest in the fresco beyond vague references to antique sources for some figure groupings, 41-42. Other paintings that include references to the fresco noted by the author include \textit{The Nurture of Jupiter} (c. 1636-37) and \textit{The Inspiration of the Poet} (c. 1630). Whitfield points out that Mario Praz, in his work \textit{On Neoclassicism}, trans. Angus Davidson (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969): 11-39 (originally published as \textit{Gusto neoclassico} in 1940), illustrated a number of paintings by the artist that incorporated various motifs and figures lifted from the \textit{Aldobrandini Wedding}.}

Stylistically, however, his paintings are grounded in the

\begin{flushleft}
Appresso Biagio Deuersin, e Felice Cesaretti nella Stamperia del Falco, 1664), describes the fresco as a wedding scene with sacrifices taking place, 61-63.
\end{flushleft}
seventeenth century, as discussed in Chapter 1. In terms of color contrasts, glazed finish, and overall tone, Poussin’s paintings reflect his training as a history painter. His compositions though, with the figures generally arranged on a plane in the foreground with the background serving almost like a stage setting, demonstrate his absorption of the *Aldobrandini Wedding* and possibly other Roman frescoes. As Jacques Thuillier has observed, a shift in Poussin’s style began around 1630, as he moved from crowded, diagonal compositions such as the *Martyrdom of St. Erasmus* of 1628 (fig. 4.9), toward horizontal arrangements with mostly profile figures (fig. 4.8). These planar compositions are easily read by the viewer and allow for the clearest exposition of the story. Poussin’s interest in the figures and facial expressions, gestures, objects, and composition of the fresco, rather than on technique, including brushstroke and finish, was characteristic for artists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Conversely, Dughet’s oeuvre is, as a whole, closer to the style of ancient frescoes, such as the *Aldobrandini Wedding*. His works reflect his attentiveness to the visual qualities of ancient Roman paintings. Even early in his career, his paintings appear to have a drier finish with rough, thicker brushwork, fewer layers of paint, and a lighter

---

405 Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 239 notes that this phenomenon was common for artists and scholars as discourse on various paintings focused only on iconographical elements and subject rather than on style. She believes that antiquarians may not have had an understanding of “Roman” or “ancient” style until the very end of the century. See discussion above for more on how scholars and artists understood Greek and Roman styles.

406 For more on Poussin’s style and his working method, see Chapter 1.


408 See, for example, Dacos, *La découverte de la Domus Aurea*, 57-117, who notes the linear drawings of a number of artists after the motifs. Pinturicchio was one of the very few artists who tried to replicate not only the imagery, but also the style of the frescoes in the Domus Aurea.
palette, bearing a close resemblance to antique frescoes, for example in the *Landscape with Herdsmen and Goats* of around 1635 (fig. 4.10).\(^{409}\) Here, the vista at the left is created through rough patches of varying shades of green and brown. The small figures in classical garb, and his goats, are dwarfed by the scale of landscape. Dughet continued to produce works throughout his lifetime that bear these characteristics (figs. 1.24, 1.30, and 2.12), which, while clearly based on his training in Poussin’s studio, echo the stylistic qualities of ancient frescoes and the descriptions of Roman landscapes by Pliny the Elder in the *Natural History*.\(^{410}\) Dughet must have viewed frescoes like the *Aldobrandini Wedding* firsthand instead of just the drawn copies. While the drawings, including those for dal Pozzo’s *Museo Cartaceo*, certainly reproduce minute details often difficult to read in the frescoes, they are unable to imitate the texture and finish of the original paintings. From his earliest days in his master’s studio, Dughet would have accompanied Poussin on visits to the casino that housed the *Aldobrandini Wedding* and the Barberini palace, home of the *Barberini Landscape*, which will be discussed below.\(^{411}\) Rather than just the compositional arrangements favored by Poussin, Dughet’s landscapes replicate the style and finish of ancient works, with the sketchy brushwork and lack of contour lines

\(^{409}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no.11, fig. 15, 172.

\(^{410}\) Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, Book 35, Chapter 37. See Jacob Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society*, 132-33, for a detailed analysis of Pliny’s section on landscape painting, which the ancient author claims was invented by the artist Studius (or Ludius or S. Tadius as recorded in some manuscripts) during the reign of Augustus. Also see Roger Ling, “Studius and the Beginnings of Roman Landscape Painting,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977): 1-16.

\(^{411}\) The availability of other ancient frescoes besides the examples discussed in this chapter remains up for debate.
illustrated by Pliny. These paintings are the polar opposite of the more refined, polished and varnished look of Claude’s work, seen in the example of the *Landscape with Merchants* of c. 1630 (fig. 4.11).

Dughet’s patrons, particularly Camillo Massimo, the Barberini, Pamphilj, and Borghese families, and Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna, would have recognized this particular skill and chosen him based on his ability almost to recreate ancient painting, as it were, and thus compete with artists of the past. In fact, Lisa Beaven has recently argued that Massimo went so far as to pair ancient paintings that he had collected with contemporary landscapes that he commissioned. She has proposed a layout of his rooms and locations for the paintings based on the inventory taken immediately upon his death and descriptions of the extensive collection, as well as measurements of the spaces and pictures. In the plan of the *stanza ultima dei musaici* on the *piano nobile* in his Palazzo Massimo alle Quattro Fontane, landscapes by both Claude and Dughet, as well as other contemporary paintings, are placed in relation to the ancient frescoes (fig. 4.12). The small room was an extension of the larger library, just beyond the *galleria*, which was

---

412 Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, Book 35, Chapter 37. See Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society*, 132-33, for a detailed analysis of Pliny’s section on landscape painting, which he claims was invented by the artist Studius (or Ludi or S. Tadius as recorded in some manuscripts) during the reign of Augustus.


414 Beaven *An Ardent Patron*, 295-304; Massimo’s inventory from 1677 (BAV Capponian 280) reveals at least eleven paintings by Dughet that were hung in the *galleria*. See Massimo Pomponi, “La collezione del cardinale Massimo e l’inventario del 1677,” in Marco Buonocore et al., *Camillo Massimo collezionista di antichità: Fonti e materiali* (Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider), 99-138, for a transcription of the inventory, which records the works by room and then by wall.
renovated by Massimo soon after he purchased the palace.\textsuperscript{415} Beaven argues that the galleria functioned much like its title suggests – as a room for Massimo to display his “erudition” and his extensive collection of antiquities.\textsuperscript{416}

The stanza ultima dei musaici was designed specifically for the presentation of his collection of ancient paintings and mosaics.\textsuperscript{417} Unlike most collectors, who were able to obtain such works through excavations on their own properties, Massimo actively sought out works discovered around Rome and then exhibited them not as “individual curiosities,” but instead as part of a continuous history of art, considering the frescoes and mosaics as equal to contemporary paintings.\textsuperscript{418} Based on the reconstructions proposed by Beaven, one of Dughet’s landscapes was placed directly above an ancient landscape fresco (fig. 4.13), possibly the one later recorded in a drawing by Francesco Bartoli.

\textsuperscript{415} Lisa Beaven, “The Galleria of Cardinal Camillo Massimo in the Palazzo Massimo alle Quattro Fontane: Issues of Audience and Display,” in Galleries in a Comparative European Perspective (1400-1800), ed. Christina Strunck and Elisabeth Kieven (Munich: Hirmer, 2010), 383-400. The galleria was likely begun in 1670 after Massimo was made a cardinal. The inventory of 1677 and a sketchbook of drawings by Raymond Lafage of works in the galleria, dating to 1679, show that both ancient sculptures and contemporary paintings were displayed. Beaven, An Ardent Patron, 274, provides a breakdown of the paintings inventoried in the galleria. Of the 107 listed, 34 percent were religious subjects, 24 percent landscapes, 19 percent portraits, 14 percent mythologies, and 4 percent genre scenes.

\textsuperscript{416} Beaven, “The Galleria of Cardinal Camillo Massimo,” 397. As in other palaces, Massimo’s staff would have escorted guests and provided them with information on the works in the galleria. For more on the function of palaces in the seventeenth century, see the fundamental study by Patricia Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces: Use and Art of the Plan (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1990) and on the display of antiquities in particular, see William Stenhouse, “Visitors, Display, and Reception in the Antiquity Collections of Late-Renaissance Rome,” Renaissance Quarterly 58, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 397-434. Around the middle of the sixteenth century, there was a shift in the presentation of collections and displays of ancient sculptures began to function more like museums, stressing the importance of presenting material to a wider audience. This phenomenon is recorded in guidebooks of the city by a multitude of visitors. Stenhouse, 420-21, further discusses the development of the galleria, a room designed particularly for the display of art collections and easily accessible without entering private spaces, which became an important feature in the later part of the century.

\textsuperscript{417} Beaven, An Ardent Patron, 293-301, provides a detailed overview of the library and the stanza.

\textsuperscript{418} Beaven, An Ardent Patron, 297-298.
(c.1675-c.1730). Although none of Dughet’s commissioned paintings from Massimo’s collection have been traced today, they would have hung in the same room as his ancient frescoes and mosaics, serving as the center of discussions for the patron and his scholarly circle on the merits of contemporary artists who rivaled the ancients. Dughet certainly understood Massimo’s intentions, especially at this late stage of his career, and the resulting paintings must have perfectly fit with this objective, allowing guests the opportunity to compare contemporary and ancient landscapes in terms of style of subject matter.

*The Illustrated Vergil Manuscripts in the Collection of the Vatican Library*

Illustrated manuscripts of Vergil’s texts were common in late antiquity and two important examples in the collection of the Vatican Library were accessible to artists in the seventeenth century. The first, the Vergilius Vaticanus or Vatican Vergil (BAV Vat. Lat. 3225), although well-known in terms of its stylistic development and place within the canon of Early Christian art, has received little scholarly attention in regard to its relationship to the history of landscape painting in the seventeenth century. The manuscript is a fifth-century text that contains selections from the *Georgics* and the

---

419 Beaven, *An Ardent Patron*, 299, believes that the painting was a sacro-idyllic landscape copied by Francesco, the son of Pietro Santi Bartoli. Dughet’s painting for the *stanza* (listed as “Un Paesino di due palmi in quadro di Gasparo Posino”) can be found on folio 45v of BAV Cappon. 280, along with an ancient landscape fragment on the same wall (“Un Paesino antico in muro con diverse fabbriche longo palmi 1 ½ alto tre terzi,” fol 46r), see Pomponi, “La collezione del cardinale Massimo e l’inventario del 1677,” 99-138, which reproduces the entire inventory. At least nine other landscapes by Dughet, described only as “paesini” without particular subjects given, are recorded in the inventory in the *galleria*.

420 For more on the history of illustrated manuscripts of Vergil’s work, see Antoine Wlosok, “Illustrated Vergil Manuscripts: Reception and Exegis,” *The Classical Journal* 93, no 4 (April-May 1998): 355-382. The author notes that texts from only a few Latin authors from pagan Rome were accompanied by illuminated illustrations.
Aeneid, and is fully illustrated (fig. 4.14).\(^{421}\) The long and complex provenance of the manuscript, likely commissioned by a pagan nobleman in Rome, saw the codex travel from Rome to France sometime before the ninth century, where it remained until the early sixteenth century, when its illustrations where copied by artists working in Rome, including Raphael.\(^{422}\) David Wright, who has devoted much of his career to the study of the two Vergil manuscripts, rightly notes that the for artists in the sixteenth century, the “purpose of the copying was to borrow some authentic ancient motifs for creative reuse in a modern work presenting some aspect of ancient Rome,” analogous to the treatment of the grotesques from the Domus Aurea.\(^{423}\) Pietro Bembo acquired the book while it was in Rome and carried it with him to Padua in 1521. It was then purchased by Fulvio Orsini in 1579, who bequeathed it to the Vatican Library, along with his extensive collection, at his death in 1600. Scholars, including dal Pozzo, Peiresc, and Cardinal Massimo, studied the manuscript. Dal Pozzo commissioned copies of the illustrations for his Museo Cartaceo and Massimo also had drawings made that accurately replicate the manuscript.

---

\(^{421}\) The most extensive text on the manuscript in English is David Wright, *The Vatican Vergil: A Masterpiece of Late Antique Art* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993). Wright provides a historical overview of the manuscript, which is an early example of the codex-style book that was quickly replacing papyrus rolls. The small size (24 x 21 cm) confirms that it was intended to be held and read. In its original form, the codex would have included the Eclogues as well as the complete Aeneid. The artists likely based the Aeneid illustrations on earlier models from such papyrus rolls, but the images from the Georgics are wholly original, probably grounded in the study of bucolic paintings. The connection to fresco painting is further indicated by the fact that the images have painted borders.

\(^{422}\) Wright *The Vatican Vergil*, 3, provides a full overview of the provenance of the Vatican Vergil, which was likely in collection of Charlemagne before its transfer to the monastery of Saint-Martin in Tours. It probably left France sometime in the fifteenth-century when it was taken to Rome. Raphael used the illustration of the Penates appearing to Aeneas from Book III for his drawing Il Morbetto, which was engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi.

\(^{423}\) David H. Wright, “The Study of Ancient Vergil Illustrations from Raphael to Cardinal Massimi,” in *Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Paper Museum*, Vol. 1, Ian Jenkins et al. (Ivrea: Olivetti, 1992), 140. Wright also discusses an engraving and a set of pen and wash drawings at Princeton (Ms. 104) that are more faithful copies of the original illustrations, 140-41.
complete with text. The precise copies, executed by Bartoli, replicate the animated brushwork of the original paintings. Massimo also began a project for a printed reproduction, which was loosely based on the drawings.

The other manuscript, the Roman Vergil (BAV Vat. Lat. 3867), dates from slightly later, toward the end of the fifth century, and survives in a more complete form. It entered the collection of the Vatican Library in the fifteenth century. As opposed to the Vatican Vergil, which includes only part of the Georgics and the incomplete Aeneid over 76 folios, the Roman Vergil is 309 folios – the full Eclogues and Georgics, and twelve books from the Aeneid. Despite the more complete text, the Roman Vergil has only nineteen illustrations to the Vatican Vergil’s fifty. Additionally, the stylistic quality of the images is somewhat inferior compared to the originality of the

424 Dal Pozzo secured the special permission needed to borrow the manuscript from Francesco Barberini around 1632 and Massimo sought approval from Antonio Barberini in 1641-42, see José Ruysschaer, “Les dossiers dal Pozzo et Massimo des illustrations virgiliennes antiques de 1632 à 1782,” in Cassiano dal Pozzo: Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Studi, ed. Francesco Solinas (Rome: De Luca Edizioni d’Arte, 1989), 177-185, which reproduces some of the correspondence. Dal Pozzo was aggravated by Massimo’s request, but eventually relented, 182. Also see Beaven, An Ardent Patron, 87-88. David H. Wright, “From Copy to Facsimile: A Millennium of Studying the Vatican Vergil,” The Electronic British Library Journal (1991): 144, cites the various documents in the Vatican Archives showing that dal Pozzo planned for Pietro da Cortona and his studio to execute the copies. The copies for the Museo Cartaceo are now preserved in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle with the majority of the other albums. Massimo’s drawings after the manuscript are now in the British Library (Lansdowne MS 834). The first title page is dated 1642 and references the privilege granted by Pope Urban VIII, while the second, dedicated to Massimo, is dated 1677 and the intended full facsimile was left unfinished at his death. For more on stylistic analysis, particularly of the script, see Wright, “From Copy to Facsimile,” 12-35. Wright also suggests that all three sets of copies (the watercolor and pen and wash drawings at Windsor and the Lansdowne manuscript) were all executed for Massimo. He proposes that dal Pozzo’s copies were lost in the later seventeenth century and that Carlo Antonio dal Pozzo purchased Massimo’s early copies (those now at Windsor) to replace the missing drawings, 151.

425 Wright, “From Copy to Facsimile.” 29-30, the prints are much more modern than the closely replicated drawings by Bartoli based on the original manuscript. Wright concludes that the engravings were done by one of Bartoli’s pupils.

426 For more on the history of the text and its influence, see David H. Wright, The Roman Vergil and the Origins of Medieval Book Design (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001). The book is much larger than the Vatican Vergil (35 x 33.5 cm).
images in the earlier manuscript. The artists of the Roman Vergil appear to be, in general, less interested in setting and the depiction of the landscape than those for the Vatican Vergil (fig. 4.15). As noted by Wright, the landscape images in the Vatican Vergil closely parallel earlier fresco paintings that decorated wealthy homes.\footnote{Wright, \textit{The Vatican Vergil}, 70, compares the illustrations to the Odyssey landscapes now in the Vatican, which date from around 60-40 BCE.} The artists of these illuminations, particularly the illustrator for the \textit{Georgics}, clearly endeavored to portray depth and naturalistic backgrounds for the scenes using atmospheric perspective.

Dughet could have seen the original manuscripts while artists were copying them for both dal Pozzo and Massimo. His figures are often wearing a type of Greek garment called an \textit{exomis}, also common in ancient Roman culture, which was gathered at one shoulder and was commonly worn by laborers.\footnote{For more on the debate over dress in the circle of Poussin, see Cropper and Dempsey, \textit{Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting}, 123-138. Wright, “The Study of Ancient Vergil Illustrations,” 142-43 notes that the author Alonso Chacón (1530-1599) studied the Vergil manuscripts for his text on Early Christian costume. Claude Menestrier used Chacón’s notebooks as a source in the seventeenth century.} The same garment appears in both Vergil manuscripts, particularly for the images from the \textit{Georgics}. Artists, including Poussin and Dughet, depicted figures wearing the \textit{exomis} as a standard trope for representing laborers, herdsmen in particular. More interestingly, Wright discusses the use of what he terms a “didactic figure” in a number of the scenes in the Vatican Vergil (fig. 4.16).\footnote{Wright, \textit{The Vatican Vergil}, 12.} This figure stands in for the author, Vergil, directing the viewer’s attention to the meaning of each scene through gestures. In the image from Book IV of the \textit{Georgics} with the elderly former pirate from Corycus, who now owns a small tract of land and keeps bees, the figure at the far right guides our attention toward the old
gentleman. The gesturing figure signals that the audience should listen to, and abide by, the words of older man on the enjoyment of his garden.\textsuperscript{430}

Such figures are, of course, not uncommon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as numerous artists employed this technique to lead viewers toward the primary focus through gestures or characters that directly engage with the viewer.\textsuperscript{431}

These figures are, however, found only in works with identifiable narratives or subjects, such as Raphael’s \textit{Allegory (The Knight’s Dream)} of around 1504 (fig. 4.17), where the figure at left gestures toward the viewer and looks down toward the sleeping knight, and Annibale Carracci’s \textit{Madonna Enthroned with St. Matthew} of 1588 (fig. 4.18) in which the angel at the bottom gazes directly at the viewer and motions toward St. Francis who kisses the foot of the Christ child. As discussed in Chapter 2, Dughet’s paintings often embody the theme of the pastoral world in general or speak to an elegiac mood rather than a particular narrative. There is thus no true “subject” for these gesturing figures to point toward or direct the viewer’s attention. Instead, the figures in Dughet’s landscapes, nearly all shepherds or pastoral characters in classical dress, draw attention to various elements in the landscape, whether natural features, such as lakes, streams, waterfalls or trees, or other structures, like ruins or rock arches, which will be discussed in depth below. In comparison to Claude’s landscapes without Biblical or historical subjects,

\textsuperscript{430} Wright, \textit{The Vatican Vergil}, 15. Additionally, Claude may have been influenced by the treatment of the figures in the manuscripts. As scholars have noted, the figures in his later landscapes are often strangely elongated, which Marcel Roethlisberger, “Claude Lorrain: Some New Perspectives,” in \textit{Claude Lorrain 1600-1682: A Symposium}, ed. Pamela Askew (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1984), 62, notes may be related to antiquity, but he does not specifically link this to the Vergil manuscripts, copies of which Claude could have seen in the collection of Massimo, who was one of his most important patrons.

where the figures are generally absorbed entirely in the composition, seemingly unaware of the viewer, in Dughet’s paintings, the figures often actively engage the audience through gestures, inviting the patrons and their visitors to notice aspects of the landscape and discuss the meaning of these elements (figs. 1.31, 1.34, 2.12, and 2.18).\(^\text{432}\) Although the figures do not often look toward the viewer, they force the viewer’s attention toward various elements. In the *Landscape with Waterfalls* from the Palazzo Muti-Bussi (fig. 2.21), the single figure, accompanied only by his dog, points with his staff toward the waterfall at center, inviting the viewer to contemplate the constantly moving water, likely a reminder of the passage of time. Even in Dughet’s paintings with religious narratives, such as the *View of Tivoli with the Flight into Egypt* of around 1658-59 (fig. 4.19), a collaboration with Filippo Lauri for the Colonna family, Lauri’s standing angel looks down at the Holy Family, but gestures toward the waterfall in the distance, again calling the viewer’s attention to the landscape and its features.\(^\text{433}\)

A particularly close connection to the images in the Roman Vergil is demonstrated in the painting of *Dido and Aeneas in the Cave* (fig. 4.20).\(^\text{434}\) The work, with figures by Carlo Maratta and dated to 1664-68, was recorded in the Palazzo

\(^{432}\) For a discussion of the importance of waterfalls and trees, see Chapter 2. Beaven, *An Ardent Patron*, 108-110 does discuss the irrefutable connection between some of Claude’s mythological paintings for Massimo (particularly the *Landscape with Argus Guarding Io* of 1644, now in the Collection of the Earl of Leicester, Holkham Hall, Norfolk) and the tranquil mood of the pastoral scenes in the Vatican Vergil.

\(^{433}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 193, fig. 235, 230.

\(^{434}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 245, fig. 284, 247-48. The painting reveals a closer reading of the original text from Book IV, as Vergil only mentions Dido’s horse (“As the queen lingers in her bower, the Punic princes await her at the doorway; her prancing steed stands brilliant in purple and gold, and proudly champs the foaming bit. At last she comes forth, attended by a mighty throng, and clad in a Sidonian robe with embroidered border. Her quiver is of gold, her tresses are knotted into gold, a buckle of gold clasps her purple cloak. With her pace a Phrygian train and joyous Iulus. Aeneas himself, goodly beyond all others, advances to join her and unites his band with hers”), Vergil, *The Aeneid*, trans. H.R. Fairclough (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916), accessed March 28, 2013, http://www.theoi.com/Text/VirgilAeneid4.html.
Falconieri in an inventory of 1717. Here, the entire composition is based on the illumination in the later Vergil manuscript, including the intimate gesture between Aeneas and the Carthaginian queen, and the figure above the cave, with putti replacing the seated soldier (fig. 4.21). The final painting by Dughet and Maratta displays their awareness of not only the original manuscript, but also the drawn copies commissioned by dal Pozzo and Massimo, as the more naturalistic cave is closer to the later drawn copies, as seen here in an engraving by Bartoli (fig. 4.22).

Dughet was, however, not only concerned with basic technical analysis and borrowing the compositional elements of ancient paintings – he also studied the iconography and symbolism of such works, incorporating motifs in ways that promoted Christianity and trumpeted the dominance of the new modern age over the ancient world, much like Poussin’s use of the *Palestrina Mosaic*.

**The Palestrina Mosaic**

Another major ancient Roman work was the Nile Mosaic from Palestrina, or ancient Praeneste, which was discovered in the cellar of the Archbishop’s Palace at the site sometime before 1507 (fig. 4.23). Although recent scholarship has demonstrated

---

435 As noted by P.A. Tomory, “Passion, Imagination, and Intellect: Poussin, Claude, and Gaspard Dughet in the Roman Campagna,” in The Classical Temper in Western Europe, ed. John Hardy and Andrew McCredie (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 42, the story is set during the spring, which is described by Lucretius as a time between hot and cold and thus ripe for storms. In Dughet’s landscape, the windswept and darkened sky is a “storm of passion, or the poetic frenzy.” As Tomory describes the work, Dughet has ennobled the landscape – tied to myth and literature, his painting hits both the senses and intellect of the viewer.

436 A preliminary drawing of the figures with a simplified setting by Maratta (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) shows that both he and Dughet knew of the Vergil manuscript.

437 Until just a decade ago, it was accepted that the find date of the mosaic was sometime between 1588 and 1607, shortly before it was removed and sent to Rome. This date was based on the major treatise by Sante
that the mosaic was known and recorded in various texts in the sixteenth century, the first images of the work did not appear until the seventeenth century. The large mosaic shows Egypt and Ethiopia, the annual flooding of the Nile, and the carrying of body of the god Osiris to his tomb. The composition is likely a copy after a Hellenistic original and its

Peralisi, the Osservazioni sul Mosaico di Palestrina, published in 1858. Scholars, including Claudia La Malfa and Maurizio Calvesi, have demonstrated, however, that the mosaic was known since the late fifteenth century. See both La Malfa, “Reassessing the Renaissance of the Palestrina Mosaic,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 66 (2003): 267-271 and Calvesi, “Francesco Barberini e Prenest. Il mosaico del Nilo,” in I Barberini e la cultura Europea del Seicento: Atti del convegno internazionale, ed. Lorenza Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze, and Francesco Solinas (Rome: De Luca Editore, 2007), 83-86. La Malfa examines a manuscript in the British Library (MS. Harl. 5050), the De antiquitae Latit by Antonio Volso, which describes various sites and monuments in the region of Lazio. The text includes a passage, based on Pliny, describing the mosaic at Palestrina and indicating that it could still be seen in its original location. La Malfa dates Volso’s manuscript to between 1477 and 1507 based on its dedication to Cardinal Girolamo Basso della Rovere. Calvesi argues that the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili refers specifically to the mosaic and not just Pliny’s description. He cites the narrative recorded by Leandro Alberti during his visit to Palestrina in 1526 as well as drawings by Francesco da Sangallo. The reference to Francesco da Sangallo is possibly an error on Calvesi’s part. He does not cite the location of the drawings in the essay, but there are drawings by Giuliano da Sangallo of the room in which the mosaic was found that are preserved in the Barberini Codex in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV Barb. Lat. 4424), Sangallo’s massive volume of drawings after ancient monuments, architectural motifs, and plans of buildings. Additionally, Calvesi lists possible artistic references to the mosaic in works by Piero da Cosimo, Luca Signorelli, Jacopo Ripanda, and Pinturicchio. In an earlier study on the Hypnerotomachia, Calvesi contends that Francesco Colonna was a member of the Colonna family of Rome, who owned the palace that was built over the Temple or Sanctuary of Fortuna, the original location of the mosaic. It logically follows that Colonna had access to the actual work and was not simply reciting Pliny when describing the mosaic in the text. Pliny’s description of the mosaic is included in his chapter on ancient pavements in Natural History, Book 36. For more on this argument, see Calvesi, La ‘Pugna d’amore in sogno’ di Francesco Colonna Romano (Rome: Lithos Editrice, 1996), 304-308. Interestingly, there is no mention of the mosaic in studies of the Temple of Palestrina by authors Leon Battista Alberti, Palladio, and Pirro Ligorio.

438 For the early history of the Nile Mosaic, see the pivotal study by P.G.P. Meyboom, The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina: Early Evidence of Egyptian Religion in Italy (New York: EJ Brill, 1995). The mosaic was originally located in the floor of a nymphaeum, in the apse of a lower level at the Sanctuary of Fortuna in Praeneste (or Palestrina). The mosaic has been dated to around 120 to 110 BCE by Meyboom based on the composition and materials. Earlier scholars placed the work either during the reign of Augustus (see Klaus Parlasca, “Zur Problematic des Nilmosaiks von Palestrina,” in Fifth International Colloquium on Ancient Mosaics: Held at Bath on September 5-12, 1987, ed. Peter Johnson, Roger Ling, and David J. Smith (Ann Arbor, MI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1994-95), 41ff or from the time of Hadrian (see G. Weil- Goudchaux, “Une nouvelle lecture de la mosaique de Palestrina,” in Fifth International Congress of Egyptology: Abstracts of Papers (Cairo: International Association of Egyptologists, 1988), 287). The grotto in which the mosaic was found was not actually part of the religious complex, but was situated behind entrance court and the basilica below the sanctuary, an area that would have been open to the public. Lucius Cornelius Sulla (138-78 BCE), who reigned as dictator from 81 to 79 BCE, was primarily responsible for the building of the complex. Pliny dates the mosaic to the time of Sulla and suggested that the work was in fact given by Sulla. The mosaic represents a hunting scene in the upper half, set in Ethiopia. It is more barren and desolate than the lower half, which portrays Egypt during the flood and likely depicts a festival celebrating the rebirth of Osiris, when the mummy of the god was brought back up
unusual perspective, combining aerial and ground views, may relate to its place within the history of topographical and cartographical illustration.\textsuperscript{439} The primary seventeenth-century treatise on the mosaic was included in Joseph Maria Suáres’ \textit{Praenestes Antiquae} of 1655, which was based on the description of the mosaic written in 1614 by Federico Cesi of the Accademia dei Lincei, before the mosaic was broken apart for its sojourn to Rome.\textsuperscript{440} Cesi also produced drawings of details of the mosaic, which were engraved and illustrated in Suáres’ text.

the Nile to his tomb. All of the elements in the lower scene can be linked to this particular festival, which was a celebration of fertility. The semi-circular grotto that housed the mosaic was built into the mountainside and designed so that water could flow from the walls directly onto the floor, further stressing the connection between the flooding of the Nile and the fertility of the land of Egypt, see Meyboom, \textit{The Nile Mosaic}; 8. As noted by Caterina Napoleone, “A River of Stone,” \textit{F.M.R. 88} (October 1997): 64, the \textit{Nile Mosaic} was accompanied by another mosaic illustrating marine fauna, thus creating a correlation between the Nile and the Mediterranean Sea. She also underscores the link between water and fertility by arguing that the landscape depicts the marriage between Isis (who shared a syncretic bond to the goddess Fortuna), represented by the land of Egypt, and Osiris, symbolized by the Nile River. The flooding Nile “‘penetrated’ the arid earth and made it fertile, overwhelming and impregnating it.” 67. Antero Tammisto, “The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina Reconsidered: The Problematic Reconstruction, Identification and Dating of the So-Called Lower Complex with the Nile Mosaic and Fish Mosaic of Ancient Praeneste,” in \textit{La Mosaique Greco-Romaine IX}, Vol. 1, ed. Hélène Morlier (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2005), 3-24, discusses in depth the location of the grotto and the fish mosaic, which was located in another grottonymphaeum found at the opposite end of a hallway from the grotto with the Nile Mosaic. Following earlier studies by Gloria Ferrari, “The Geography of Time: The Nile Mosaic and the Library at Praeneste,” \textit{Ostraka} 2 (1999): 359-386, Tammisto proposes that the lower complex served as a library and was built by M. Terentius Varro Lucullus, a Sullan colonist whose name is recorded in an inscription at the site, 5. He then also proposes that the two mosaics relate to Cleopatra and her journey along the Nile with Julius Caesar. Problematically, Tammisto is unable to decide if the Nile Mosaic is a unique work and the inspiration for the genre of Nilotic landscapes or if it is one example from a rich history, 10-13.

\textsuperscript{439} John F. Moffitt, “The Palestrina Mosaic with a ‘Nile Scene’: Philostratus and Ekphrasis; Ptolemy and Chorographia,” \textit{Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte} 60 (1997): 227-247, notes that the landscape reads almost as a guide book with the viewer treated “to the splendors of a rampantly exotic landscape embellished with typical vignettes of everyday life in Roman Egypt.” Moffitt argues that the divide between the upper and lower halves of the composition show the disparity between the civilized foreground and the primitive, barren background populated by wild beasts, 228. He places the mosaic within the history of ancient map-making and pictorial imagery, categorizing it as an example of chorography, a type of cartography that is pictorial, showing particular places and detailed images, compared to the more general geography, 242. Napoleone, “A River of Stone,” 67, rightly points out that the strange perspective of the landscape would appear somewhat anamorphic when lying in its original position on the floor, as opposed to the current display, which is vertical.

\textsuperscript{440} For more on Cesi and Suáres, see Caterina Forni Montagna, “Nuovi contributi per la storia del mosaico di Palestrina,” \textit{Rendiconti dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e
The mosaic was brought in pieces to Rome between 1626 and 1637 at the order of Cardinal Andrea Baroni Peretti Montalto, the bishop of Palestrina, and eventually ended up in the collection of Cardinal Francesco Barberini, where dal Pozzo then had watercolor copies made after the work. 441 Francesco subsequently shipped the mosaic back to the baronial palace in Palestrina in 1645, which was now in the property of the family. 442 The Barberini had acquired the fiefdom of Palestrina from the Colonna family in 1627 as part of the marriage contract between Taddeo Barberini and Anna Colonna. Giovanni Battista Calandra, an important mosaic artist who served as the official restorer for the Fabbrica di San Pietro, repaired the mosaic before its journey home to

---

*filologiche* 9, II, 3 (1991), 227-232. The author cites a number of documents and letters from the Barberini collection at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana tracing the history of Suares’ treatise and his research.

441 Peretti was in charge of the building of the Archbishop’s Palace and likely decided that a pagan work had no place within the site, as discussed by Forni Montagna, “Nuovi contributi per la storia del mosaico di Palestrina,” 253-260. Some pieces of the mosaic were given as gifts to important noblemen, including the Grand Dukes of Tuscany. Francesco Barberini acquired nearly all of the pieces, except for those gifted to the Grand Dukes, as an inheritance from his uncle, Cardinal Lorenzo Magalotti, who received them as a gift from Peretti. The transfer of the mosaic to Rome and its subsequent return to Palestrina is recorded in the seventeenth century by both Carlo Dati in *Delle lodi del Commendatore Cassiano dal Pozzo* (Florence: All’inasega della Stella, 1664), 14 and by Athanasius Kircher in *Latium, id est nova et parallella Latii tum veteris tum novi descriptio* (Amsterdam: J. Janssonium, 1671), 94-100. For more on the history of dal Pozzo’s copies, see Helen Whitehouse, *The Dal Pozzo Copies of the Palestrina Mosaic* (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1976). Forni Montagna, “Nuovi contributi per la storia del mosaico di Palestrina,” 236, identifies the author of the copies as Vincenzo Manenti (1600-1674) from Orvinio, who studied with Cavalier Cesare d’Arpino and then Domenichino.

442 See Calvesi, “Francesco Barberini e Prenest,” 83, for Francesco’s efforts to acquire the various pieces of the mosaic and return them to Palestrina. Forni Montagna, “Nuovi contributi per la storia del mosaico di Palestrina,” 232-233, cites contemporary authors praising Francesco’s endeavor, especially his choice to relocate the mosaic from the “cold and humid subterranean room” to the upper floor of the palace. Unfortunately some of the pieces were lost during this process while others suffered damage and the mosaic could not be fully restored to its original appearance. As noted by Forni Montagna, the original shape fit into an elliptical niche and was shaped like a half circle with three projections, but the restoration (which is still the current form) was a rectangle with a curved top, 236. Reconstructions of the original form of the mosaic have been proposed by Whitehouse, *The Dal Pozzo Copies of the Palestrina Mosaic*, 75, fig. 20; Meyboom, *The Nile Mosaic*, fig. 8; Tammisto, “The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina Reconsidered,” figs. 9, 10, and 11. In all of the various interpretations, nearly half of the original mosaic has been lost and the apparent seamless relationship between the fragments is entirely the work of the early restorer.
Palestrina. Dal Pozzo’s copies were likely executed while the mosaic was in Calandra’s studio.

Poussin was certainly aware of the copies, if not the original itself, and used a number of motifs from the mosaic in his paintings. The best example of this is the *Holy Family in Egypt* of 1655-57 completed for Paul Fréart de Chantelou, now in the collection of the Hermitage (fig. 4.24), where the artist effortlessly incorporates imagery from the mosaic into his painting. The procession of priests bearing an ark or coffin as they pass through a temple, located at the lower right edge of the mosaic (fig. 4.25), becomes the center point of Poussin’s composition, placed directly above the Virgin and Child. An oddly shaped series of buildings surrounded by ibises, which is in the center of the mosaic, is transferred to the far right in the painting (fig. 4.26). Finally, a prostyle temple with two obelisks and a well at the front and a tower behind, found at the

---

443 Alvar González-Palacios, “Giovanni Battista Calandra, un mosaicista alla Corta dei Barberini,” *Ricerche di storia dell’arte* 1-2 (1976): 211-240 and also Henri Lavagne, “Poussin et la Mosaï du Nil à Palestrina,” in *Poussin et la construction de l’antique*, 435-436. Calandra’s contributions as an artist were important enough to warrant a place in Lione Pascoli’s *Vite de’pittori, scultori ed architette moderni*, first published in 1736. Dal Pozzo praised his work in his writings in the 1640s and Calandra even left mosaics to dal Pozzo in his will.

444 Lavagne, “Poussin et la Mosaï du Nil,” 436-437, argues that Poussin may have seen the work while Calandra was restoring it or that he travelled to see it newly replaced in situ at the Barberini Palace in Palestrina. The precise nature of some of Poussin’s drawings indicates that he was working from the original and not just the copies. The example cited by Lavagne is a sheet in the collection of Louis-Antoine Prat, published by Anthony Blunt, “Further newly identified drawings by Poussin and his followers,” *Master Drawings* 17 (1979): 134-136, pl. 12; also see Pierre Rosenberg and Louis-Antoine Prat, *Nicolas Poussin 1594-1665. Catalogue raisonné des dessins*, Vol. 1 (Milan: Leonardo, 1994), no. 131.

445 Blunt, *The Paintings of Nicolas Poussin*, cat. no. 65; and Wright, *Poussin Paintings*, cat. no. 189, the painting was commissioned by Chantelou for his future wife.

446 Lavagne, “Poussin et la Mosaï du Nil,” 440-441, notes that this section provides further evidence that Poussin saw the mosaic firsthand while it was in Calandra’s studio as the painting does not incorporate the bizarre candelabra added by the mosaicist, who appears to have misinterpreted the shadow on the interior column.

447 Meyboom, *The Nile Mosaic*, 30, identifies the complex as a farm, which also appears in other Roman Nilotic scenes. The round building is believed to be a granary.
left side of the mosaic at center, has been rotated and enlarged to occupy the entire left quarter of the canvas in the Holy Family (fig. 4.27). The tower is placed beside the temple, which Poussin changes from a small structure on a two-step podium with Doric columns into an expanded structure on a higher podium with Ionic capitals. He also positions the obelisks farther from the temple in the background, with one almost appearing to rise from the base of the statue of Anubis, which is directly in front of the procession of priests. The Holy Family’s donkey quenches his thirst at the well in the foreground while the shadow of the tower looms over him and St. Joseph.

The mosaic was interpreted even in the seventeenth century as a representation of the moral and natural history of Egypt and Ethiopia and the carrying of the body of the god Serapis (a Hellenistic variant of Osiris) to his tomb. Poussin states as much in a letter to his patron dated November 25, 1658, calling the mosaic “truly painted, the natural and moral history of Egypt and Ethiopia from a good hand.” Charles Dempsey has proposed a valid interpretation of Poussin’s painting as a blending of history and time, with the death of the pagan god and the rise of Christ—a rhetorical conceit that certainly fits in with Poussin’s theory of art. Dempsey’s pivotal article explores Poussin’s use of

---

448 Meyboom, The Nile Mosaic, 28, the well is likely a Nilometer, which had a scale used to measure the river during the annual flood.


antiquity at this later point in his career. Previous assessments of Poussin’s understanding of antiquity often attributed the errors and misconceptions in his paintings to a contemporary lack of knowledge.\textsuperscript{451} Instead, Dempsey proposes that such anachronisms and inconsistencies were deliberate choices on the part of the artist to enhance the meaning of his own work.\textsuperscript{452} Poussin’s literary source for the painting is likely the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, whose miraculous story of the Holy Family resting and taking refreshment on their flight has been altered “in favor of a more rationalizing interpretation.”\textsuperscript{453} Instead of the Christ child causing a tree to spring water from its roots and its abundant branches to bend within reach, the Holy Family takes rest near a well and Egyptian attendants provide a tray with dates.\textsuperscript{454} In Poussin’s reading of the story, the Egyptians serving the Family appear to recognize the Christ child and his true importance as the bearer of the new, and rightful, religious order. As Dempsey shows, the influence of antiquity on Poussin’s work extends beyond the mere incorporation of various motifs, but also integrates elements, both stylistic in terms of elegant, refined figures, and iconographic, to create paintings that transcend time. This full absorption and

worked extensively on Egypt. Kircher also read Egyptian gods and mythology as prefigurations of Christianity.


\textsuperscript{452} Dempsey, “Poussin and Egypt,” 109.

\textsuperscript{453} Dempsey, “Poussin and Egypt,” 111.

\textsuperscript{454} Lavagne, “Poussin et la \textit{Mosaï du Nil},” 442, notes that Dempsey does not fully elucidate the connection between the miracle depicted in Poussin’s painting and the yearly flooding of the Nile, which is referenced in the mosaic by the procession of figures carrying the body of Serapis.
reinterpretation of the past to create paintings that are both classical in spirit and contemporary in nature continues with Dughet.\textsuperscript{455}

\textit{The Barberini Landscape}

In 1627, a Roman landscape painting was uncovered during renovations to the gardens of the newly acquired Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane.\textsuperscript{456} The famous Barberini Landscape quickly inspired not only a treatise by Holstenius, but also a series of letters between Peiresc and Rubens debating the meaning of the enigmatic arch.\textsuperscript{457} The conclusion reached by these eminent scholars was that the fresco represented a nymphaeum, or a grotto sacred to nymphs, where the nature deities were believed to reside.\textsuperscript{458} Dal Pozzo commissioned not one, but two drawn copies of the painting for the Museo Cartaceo, including a pen and ink drawing by Testa (fig. 4.28) and a watercolor

\textsuperscript{455} The complexity of Poussin’s quotation and imitation of antiquity, which is much more than the simple repetition of figures discussed by Joyce in “Grasping at Shadows,” is well summarized in Christophe Henry, “Imitation, proportion, citation: La relation de Nicolas Poussin à l’antique,” in Poussin et la construction de l’antique, 495-529, which analyzes Poussin’s construction of figures through the lens of his understanding of rhetoric and poetry.

\textsuperscript{456} See Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 173-271, for a general overview of the renovations, begun to expand the former Palazzo Sforza into a suitable home to accommodate both Taddeo and Francesco Barberini. Also see Henri Lavagne, “Une peinture romaine oubliée: le paysage du nymphée découvert au palais Barberini en 1627,” Mélanges de l’École Français de Rome 105, no 2 (1993): 747-777, for a more thorough analysis of the discovery and interpretation of the fresco. Lavagne notes a letter from Peiresc to Cassiano dal Pozzo dated July 1, 1627 asking for a copy of the newly discovered painting to be sent, the “pitture antiche ritrovate di nuovo nelle muraglie del giardino del palazzo dell’Illustissimo Cardinale Padrone,” (ancient pictures newly found in the walls of the garden of the palace of the Illustrious Cardinal), quoted in Peiresc, Lettres à Cassiano dal Pozzo: 1626-1637, 51. Also see Lucia Faedo, “Vivere con gli antichi. Una pittura antica a Palazzo Barberini e la sua fruizione ra XVII e XVIII secolo,” in I Barberini e la cultura Europea del Seicento: Atti del convegno internazionale, ed. Lorenza Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze, and Francesco Solinas (Rome: De Luca Editore, 2007), 381-392.

\textsuperscript{457} The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, 402-405.

that is currently unattributed (fig. 4.29). Regrettably, the fresco did not survive for long after its excavation, as it was lost sometime in the eighteenth century. Dal Pozzo’s drawings, and the prints based on his copies, are the only surviving evidence of the original appearance of the painting. The fresco depicts a double arch – a smaller arch atop a larger one – with a small porticoed temple with a flat roof at the base to the left and a basin collecting water running down the arch in a cavern at right. On the other side of the grotto with the basin is a dying tree with only a few brown leaves remaining on one of its branches. The porticoed temple is crowned with a baetyl, a large stone monument, similar to a stele, draped in garlands of unidentifiable flowers. On the left column of the temple is a large insect, almost certainly a bee. Four white goats frolic or graze in the

---


460 Faedo, “Vivere con gli antichi,” 383, reprints part of the 1704 inventory (BAV Arch. Barb. Indice II 2454 c.116 and 2453 bis. c.284) that records both the original fresco and a copy kept within the palace, likely the one commissioned by the Barberini from the Flemish painter Giovanni Frangione. Based on the description of the rooms, Faedo concludes that the original fresco was placed in a basement room called the “stanza rustica,” which was near the chapel on the lower floor.

461 Lavagne, “Une peinture romaine oubliée,” 749, identifies the stone as a baetylus, which was symbolic of divinity. The term derives from the Semitic word meaning “House of God,” see Stephanie Lynn Budin, *The Ancient Greeks: New Perspectives* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2004), 293. The author further defines a baetyl as generally either not anthropomorphic or with only minimal features, such as a herm. Today, the term generally refers to aniconic stones found in a Levantine religious context.

462 Holstenius, in his treatise, *Vetus picture nymphaeum referens. Commentario explicate a Luca Holstenio. Accedunt alia quedam Eisdem Auctoris* (Rome: Typis Barberinis, Excudebat Michael Hercules, 1676), confirms this detail: “Caeterum nec Apes à Nympharum aede arcendas Pictor eruditus censuit, Homerum hac quoque parte religiose secutus. Cum enim Nympharum sacra non aliter constare scriret, aedis vestibulo Apiculam appinxit, velut Nympharum Flaminicam, sive aedituam, ad templi fores obsevatem. Quomodo enim Nymphae apiculas aversentur, quorum nomen ultro ambient; eoque, si Porphyrio credimus, peculiariter appellari gaudent?” (Also the learned Painter did not leave out the bees buzzing around the temple of the nymphs, having followed Homer even in this religious part. When, indeed, he would write in order not to deviate to other things than those sacred to the nymphs, he painted the apiary (beehive) in the vestibule of the temple, just as in the tide pools of the nymphs, also in their
foreground and a fifth stands on the stairs at the entrance to the temple, almost as if stepping out of the building. Atop the arch is the smaller formation, buttressed by large vertical rocks. To the left, a plant that resembles common ivy spills down the first level of the arch and up the back of the temple. At right is a circular building topped by a column and a statue group, possibly a satyr and nymph, appears in the gap between the secondary arch and the structure. A rocky cavern occupies the background, with three waterfalls spilling into a pool that runs into the foreground, underneath the large arch. Along the far right at center is yet another temple, this one with a gabled roof, that appears to house a cult statue.

The Jesuit priest Alessandro Donati (1584-1640) believed that the original site for the fresco was the location of the Capitolium Vetus, a temple dedicated by Numa, a legendary king of Rome, to Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva on the Quirinal Hill, next to the Temple of Flora. The actual location was likely once part of the Horti Salullustiani, temple, having observed flowers at the temples. In the same way, indeed, the nymphs were turned toward the beehives, they were near the name of those things beyond. And this thing, if we can believe Porphyry, even more strangely, they rejoiced to be called?). In Homer’s Odyssey, at the cave of the Naiads on Ithaca, the nymphs are described as weaving purple fabric and keeping bees (Book XIII). Porphyry, a Greek scholar who lived in Rome in the fourth century CE, wrote what is perhaps the earliest Western example of literary criticism, his essay on Homer’s Cave of the Nymphs, see the introduction to Porphyry, On the Cave of the Nymphs, trans. and ed. Robert Lamberton (Barrytown, NY: Station Hill Press, 1983), 5. The image of a bee on an ancient fresco found on Barberini property was especially prophetic as the family symbol was, of course, the bee, and the insect adorned all monuments commissioned by the family and on any restorations carried out under their largesse. For more on bee imagery in relation to the Barberini, see Louise Rice, “Apes philosophicae: Bees and the Divine Design in Barberini Thesis Prints,” in I Barberini e la cultura Europea del Seicento, 181-194 and also Faedo, “Vivere con gli antichi,” 388. Both copies and later prints of the fresco contain this detail.

---

463 Lavagne, “Une peinture romaine oubliée,” 749, notes that the statue is an ithyphallic male figure, thus likely a satyr, holding a female figure aloft. Bellori, “Delli vestigi delle pitture antiche,” 59, describes the group as a satyr embracing a nymph, “una statua d’un Satiro, che abbraccia una ninfa.”

464 Whitehouse, The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo, 200; Lavange, “Une peinture romaine oubliée,” 755, Donati’s treatise, Roma vetus ac recens utriusque aedificii ad eruditam cognitionem expositis (more generally known under the title De urbe Roma), was published in 1638 and focuses on Roman topography. The Capitolium Vetus is covered in Book II, which focuses on the Capitoline Hill. For more on Donati’s life and a full list of his writings, see Colin D. Pilney, “Alessandro Donati’s Roma vetus ac recens, Book
which were built by the historian Sallust in the first century BCE. Bellori, in the “Delli vestigi delle pitture antiche dal buon secolo de’ Romani,” first published in 1664, states that the painting was found in a subterranean grotto near the Circus of Flora, which was believed to be near the Temple of Flora, and was described as the location for the celebration of the annual Floralia festivities. Unfortunately, no record, either drawn or written, was made of the location and original context of the fresco, a fact lamented by scholars, especially as the entire room was probably decorated. Donati interpreted the scene, with the multitude of goats, as the infancy of Jupiter, who was nursed by the goat-

---


466 Hartwick, *The Gardens of Sallust*, 61-68, discusses this structure, which did not actually exist. The term is based on a fifteenth-century transcription that incorrectly added the words “and Circus” to a fourth century catalogue of monuments in the city of Rome in the listing for the Temple of Flora. Ligorio includes the structure in his perspective plans of ancient Rome. This idea persisted until the mid-twentieth century, when scholars realized that the oddly shaped area in the saddle of the Quirinal Hill was likely a stadium shaped garden.

467 Peirsec, in a letter of October of 1635 to dal Pozzo, writes “E stata gran ventura, che si sia trovata in si degno luogo, da esservi conservata con molto maggior reputazione che mai habbia havuto, rincrescendomi non poco della necessità che s’hebbe di far rovinare quella stanzietta intiera con quelli altri paesetti di rincontro al grande, et con quella volta dipinta di spugne all’antica che doveva riuscire molta vagga à mio parere, et meritava d’essere conservata intiera se fosse stato possibile per maggior veneration del Palazzo” (It was very lucky, that it was found in its worthy place, to be preserved with a much greater reputation that it had ever had, with me regretting not a little that it was necessary to destroy the entire little room with the other landscapes on the opposite [wall] to the large one, and with that painted ceiling [all] of *spugne all’antica* that had to turn out very beautiful in my opinion, and deserved to be preserved whole if possible for the greater veneration of the Palace), see *Lettres à Cassiano dal Pozzo: 1626-1637*, 211. As a dedicated scholar who realized the importance of context, Peiresc lamented the lack of care taken during the excavation, which could have enabled scholars in their interpretation of the scene. Lavagne, “Une peinture romaine oubliée,” 757, notes that *spugne* likely refers to the types of rocks (such as pumice) used to construct artificial grottos and nymphae at the end of the Republican period. He also remarks that several such grottos were known in the seventeenth century in both Rome and its environs, 759. For more on *spugne* and contemporary theoretical writing on stone, see Philippe Morel, “Mannerist Grottos in Sixteenth-Century Italy,” in *Sixteenth-Century Italian Art*, ed. Michael W. Cole (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 115-143.
nymph Amalthea.\textsuperscript{468} Despite the Barberini endorsement of such an interpretation, which placed their new family palace on the site of the original capitol of Rome, Holstensius disagreed with the reading. In his treatise, published in 1676, but certainly written soon after the discovery, he argued that the fresco represented a generic nymphaeum related to the Greek philosopher Porphyry’s interpretation of Homer’s Cave of the Nymphs.\textsuperscript{469} Holstensius sees the landscape as the origin of nymphs, a place of regeneration, where birth and death are joined, connected to Porphyry’s reading of nymphs as “moisture in nature and that souls delight in this moisture, which is essential to life.”\textsuperscript{470} Interestingly, Holstenius, Rubens, and Peiresc argued that the landscape was simply a nymphaeum, a type of sacred space, rather than, as Donati proposes, a particular narrative, the infancy of Jupiter. Rather than imposing an unconvincing and implausible interpretation that sought to merge the scene with an actual myth or event, these scholars were entirely secure in suggesting that the Barberini Landscape was a picture without a “subject,” simply representing a landscape, although one with religious connotations.

\textsuperscript{468} Donati does not directly refer to the fresco in his text, but discusses it as evidence of the original function of the site. His treatise was republished in volume III of Johann Georg Graevius, \textit{Thesaurus antiquitatum romanarum} (Leiden, 1694), 739-40 in the section on the \textit{Capitolium Vetus}. Bellori, “Delli vestigi delle pitture antiche,” 58-59, notes the bee on the column of the temple in the fresco, stating that, “quasi presagio, che l’Api Barberini dovevano tenere il seggio loro nel luogo dove’era situate la pittura” (almost an omen, that the Barberini bees would hold their seat in the place where the painting would be located).

\textsuperscript{469} Lucas Holstenius, \textit{Vetus picture nymphaeum referens}. Porphyry’s “On the Cave of the Nymphs” reads each element in Homer’s story – the cave, nymphs, bees, and looms – as symbolic of a place of birth and rebirth, and the entire \textit{Odyssey} as symbolizing “man passing through the successive stages of ‘genesis’ and so being restored to his place,” see Porphyry, \textit{On the Cave of the Nymphs}, 39. Holstenius was particularly suited to writing the text as he had published an edition of Porphyry’s analysis in 1630. Holstenius’ treatise also includes references to a number of other ancient authors addressing the full history and origin of nymphs.

\textsuperscript{470} McTighe, \textit{Nicolas Poussin’s Landscape Allegories}, 107.
The Barberini Landscape is an example of the sacral-idyllic landscape, a genre classification term coined by Mikhail Rostovtzeff in 1911 to describe ancient frescoes depicting a bucolic scene with a shrine. Although few, if any, such landscapes had appeared in Rome prior to the excavation of the Barberini fresco, scholars recognized that the arch did not present a typical country scene, but instead illustrated a sacred place. Even if the exact meaning of the sacredness of the arch was debated, antiquarians agreed that the landscape embodied nature as revered and holy. The harmonious incorporation of architecture within the rocky arch exemplified the idea of man working seamlessly within nature. In addition to the connection to religious connotations, the idea of a rock arch implied a notion of fantasy as the structure of the arches, which do appear in nature, particularly off the coast of Naples, and artistic invention as the form mimics the

---

471 Mikhail Rostovtzeff, “Die hellenistisch-römische Architekturlandschaft,” *Römische Mitteilungen* 26 (1911): 1-185. See Ling, *Roman Painting*, 142-49 for the genre of landscape painting, which developed out of topographical imagery, such as in the Nile Mosaic from Palestrina, and rose to popularity during the reign of Augustus. The sacral-idyllic type was most commonly employed in Second Style decoration, but did occasionally emerge in the later Third and Fourth Styles. The styles, however, do not follow a strict chronology and examples from earlier styles do appear in later years in Rome. For more on the history and development of the genre of landscape in general, see W.J.T. Peters, *Landscape in Romano-Campanian Mural Painting* (Assen, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 1963), and for more on landscape painting in ancient Rome and nature as a sacred space, see Bettina Bergmann, “Exploring the Grove: Pastoral Space on Roman Walls,” in *The Pastoral Landscape*, ed. John Dixon Hunt (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1992), 21-46.

472 Massimo likely owned a landscape of the type by around 1670, see note 63.

473 Bert Meijer, “‘Un motif essential:’ l’arco di roce,” in *Arte collezionismo conservazione: Scritti in onore di Marco Chiarini*, ed. Miles L. Chappell et al. (Florence: Giunti, 2004), 255-264, discusses the history of rock arch in landscapes, which did not, of course, first appear in the seventeenth century. The motif is found in early landscape painting, especially in Northern works, such as the paintings of Joachim Patinir, Paul Bril and Jan Brueghel the Elder. According to Meijer, the arches were inspired by nature and imagination, sometimes based on real places. Meijer disputes Marco Chiarini’s argument that the motif was first invented by Claude. He goes on to conclude that the arch may represent a mysterious metamorphosis, where natural stone becomes a sort of architectural element. While his conclusions are certainly valid and a useful contribution, for patrons and artists in the mid-seventeenth century, who were aware of the Barberini Landscape, the image of the rock arch could not be completely divorced from the ancient fresco. Despite the history of the motif, all arches would remind educated viewers of the antique painting. Ann Sutherland Harris, in a personal communication with the author, believes that the incorporation of a rock arch was a strategy used by landscape artists to display their inventiveness.
triumphal arches of ancient Rome. The arch in the landscape becomes an interplay between art and nature as the creation of an inventive genius and the original Creator. In painting, the arch is then a metaphor not only for sacred nature, formed by God, but also for the imagination and power of the artist.

The rock arch is a motif that recurs throughout Dughet’s work, appearing in around ten percent of his known and accepted paintings. As Poussin’s pupil, he would have accompanied the older artist on visits to the Barberini palace to view the fresco, certainly upon his arrival in the studio, which was soon after the discovery of the landscape. One of the earliest examples of a rock arch in Dughet’s oeuvre is the fresco from the frieze at the Palazzo Muti-Bussi (fig. 4.30), which was completed a few years after he left Poussin’s studio. In the fresco, the arch frames the two shepherds, the typical inhabitants of his paintings, whom his patrons and their visitors would have recognized as characters from pastoral literature, thus underscoring a deeper connection to ancient Rome. Interestingly, Dughet has manipulated the original source. Instead of the double arch of the Barberini Landscape, Dughet’s arch has only a single level. He still, however, maintains the cave structure on the right, with a large boulder at the front.

Rubens, in a letter dated March of 1636 to Peiresc, found fault with the illogical construction of the Barberini Landscape, calling it “purely an artist’s caprice.”

---

474 Claire Pace, “‘The Golden Age . . . The First and Last Days of Mankind’: Claude Lorrain and Classical Pastoral, with Special Emphasis on Themes from Ovid’s ‘Metamorphoses,’” Artibus et Historiae 23, no. 46 (2002): 149, also notes that interplay between art and nature, poet and shepherd (the idealized world of the imagination and reality) that is present in pastoral literature.

475 The full breakdown is approximately 50 of the 400 works catalogued in Boisclair.

476 Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 48, fig. 67, 180-81.

477 For the letter see The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, 402-404, no. 238, in which the artist states that the painting could not possibly represent “any place in rerum natura” as the double arches would have been
had learned of the existence of the painting through the Republic of Letters and had received a colored print from Peiresc in February of 1636. In his own artistic response to the ancient fresco, he strove to amend the errors by including a more rational, single level arch in his Feast of Venus of c. 1636 (fig. 4.31), where spring deities frolic by the sacred grotto during a ceremony described by Ovid. Like Rubens, Dughet has “corrected” the perspective and logical problems with the original fresco while still underscoring the importance of the ancient landscape, which, similarly to Rubens, he must have concluded represented a nymphaeum.

impossible to build and that there was not enough space for the temples at the top. The small reservoir “is of no use” as it has too many “wide outlets.” He believes that the small temple was dedicated to nymphs and the square one was a tomb for a hero. The unattended goats could be sacred to a particular deity. While calling the picture “by a good hand,” Rubens nevertheless disparages the perspective as “faulty.” He notes that the same problems occur in images of buildings on ancient medals and bas-reliefs, however these errors can be forgiven in sculpture, but not in painting. Peiresc learned of the discovery almost immediately and although he first expressed doubt about the authenticity of the fresco, soon accepted it and requested a print or drawing from dal Pozzo. For the summary of the letters, addressed to dal Pozzo and Holstenius, see Jaffé, “The Barberini Circle,” 131-32 and for the complete letter to dal Pozzo, see Peiresc, Lettres à Cassiano dal Pozzo: 1626-1637, 266-67, no. XCIV.

478 Jaffé, “The Barberini Circle,” 132. Peiresc had requested permission from dal Pozzo to send the print and then immediately conveyed Rubens’ assessment of the fresco to dal Pozzo. Dal Pozzo responded favorably to the assessment in a letter to Peiresc in May of 1636: “Darò a Sua Eminenza il giudito del Sig.re Rubenio su la Pittura antica che meglio non poteva ititolarsi, che Nimfeo, com’esso dice, e mi sa fà il suo discorso interamente credibile. Dico che sia Pittura non di proposito ma di capriccio, e con quell’errorretti che esso vi ha notato; non resta però che non dia gusto il vedere quell componimento e capir la richezza del inventare che gli Antichi havevano quando si scorge in un soggetto sterilissimo fecondità di pensieri,” (I will give to his Eminence Ruben’s judgment on the antique painting which could not be better titled than Nymphaeum as he says, and to me his discourse is entirely believable. I say that it is a picture, not of anything particular but of a fantasy and with those little errors that he has pointed out to you. None the less, it is agreeable to see the composition and to appreciate the richness of invention that the ancients had when one perceives the wealth of ideas contained in such a sterile subject), from Jaffé, “The Barberini Circle,” 133 and 141 (translation Jaffé).

479 Interestingly, the arch in Rubens’ painting, with its brick-like configuration around the edge of the arch, closely resembles the usual depiction of caves in the Vatican Vergil and Roman Vergil manuscripts.

480 The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, 402-404, no. 238, Rubens argues that the “confluence multorum fontium undique scaturientium (of many fountains flowing from all sides), or importance of water, demonstrates that this must be a space dedicated to nymphs (translation by Magurn). Lavagne, “Une peinture romaine oubliée,” 767-68, observes that Rubens was the first scholar to use the term nymphaeum on record regarding the Barberini Landscape.
The arch appears again in Dughet’s first major public commission, at the Carmelite Church of San Martino ai Monti from 1648 to 50 in the series of frescoes depicting scenes from the lives of the prophets, considered the founders of Carmelite order. In a scene that depicts Elijah on Mt. Horeb, where he sought shelter in the same place that Moses received the Ten Commandments, the artist includes a motif that clearly reflects the *Barberini Landscape* (fig. 4.32).\(^{481}\) In the overall shape of the rock arch at left, which is somewhat low to the ground, and in the positioning, in which the viewer is looking up and able to see the underside of the arch, the connection to the ancient fresco is irrefutable. Beyond the shape of the arch, Dughet sets a dying tree to the right, which is also found in the original fresco, and a stream flows to the right, relating back to Holstenius’ reading of the painting as Porphyry’s Cave of the Nymphs as a site of rebirth and renewal.\(^{482}\)

By placing an arch in the scene, Dughet is reworking an image from the ancient past within a Biblical setting, similar to Poussin’s use of images in the *Palestrina Mosaic*. Whereas scholars in the seventeenth century believed that the original intent of the fresco was to represent the sacredness of the space for nymphs, Dughet has transformed the painting to fit into a Christian model of the power of God within nature. The writings of Cardinal Federico Borromeo best exemplify the importance of nature as a manifestation

---

\(^{481}\) Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre*, cat. no. 87, fig. 114, 193-99.

\(^{482}\) Porphyry stresses the importance of water as a source of regeneration that originates with the nymphs, see. Porphyry, *On the Cave of the Nymphs*, 25-27, where the nymphs are described as having power over the springs and the genesis of souls. Also see Louise Rice, “*Apes philosophicae*,” 183-84 and McTighe, *Nicolas Poussin’s Landscape Allegories*, 107-08
of God’s greatness, where one can revel in His creation, as discussed in Chapter 2. Borromeo himself was a major early seventeenth-century patron of landscape paintings. In his various treatises and in letters, he stresses the necessity of meditating on natural scenes to become closer to God. For Borromeo and other church reformers, nature, and its representation in painting, were considered sacred, similar to the interpretation of the Barberini Landscape proposed by Holstenius, Peiresc, and Rubens. The choice of a rock arch that denotes the rustic setting as sanctified in the decoration of a Carmelite church is particularly apt as the order focused on leading a contemplative life away from human interaction. Dughet was not the first artist to use the motif in a religious painting as Poussin includes the arch in his Israelites Gathering Manna from the late 1630s (fig. 4.33), executed for Paul Freart de Chantelou. For both artists, the motif is employed to

483 See Chapter 2 for a much fuller discussion of Borromeo’s importance on the history of landscape painting as well as the influence of Alberti’s arguments for the display of landscapes in villas and the relation to health.


485 Blunt, The Paintings of Nicolas Poussin, cat. no. 21, and Wright, Poussin Paintings, cat. no. 113. Also see Francis H. Dowley, “Thoughts on Poussin, Time, and Narrative: The Israelites Gathering Manna in the Desert,” Simiolus 25, 4 (1997): 329-48 and McTighe, Nicolas Poussin’s Landscape Allegories, 109, who reads the inclusion of the arch as Poussin’s attempting to locate the narrative “within a landscape that was genuinely that of antiquity.” Only later in his career was Poussin able to incorporate the complex allegorical meanings of ancient landscapes discussed in the circle of Cassiano dal Pozzo. This assessment discounts the important religious connotations of the arch as a sacred space and dismisses Poussin’s ability to fully participate in the intellectual circle of the Barberini family. Interestingly, there were important literary precedents for this incorporation. As noted by Michael C.J. Putnam, “Virgil and Sannazaro’s Ekphrastic Vision,” Ramus: Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature 40, no. 1 (2011): 73-86, Sannazaro’s poem De Partu Virginis emulates Virgil’s ekphrastic descriptions in both the Aeneid and the Georgics. Through the references to language and elements employed by Vergil, Sannazaro places his poem “at a series of intersections: of ignorance and knowledge, present and future, continuities and initiations, the pagan and Christian worlds, the Old and New Testaments, Augustan Rome and Renaissance Naples, of verbal and visual art, of then and now in the arc of poetry’s evolution,” 84.
elevate the setting of the Biblical scene by appropriating an ancient work that was viewed as embodying sacred Roman beliefs.

The painting of Diana and Actaeon, a commission from Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna of around 1657, is another collaboration between Dughet and Carlo Maratta, who executed the figures (fig. 4.34). Dughet has located the narrative underneath the arch, appropriate for a scene of Diana and her nymphs, as it connects his and Maratta’s work with contemporary scholarly opinion about the arch’s true meaning. Dughet and Maratta populate the painting with precisely the kind of mythic figures to whom the antique fresco is dedicated. The use of the arch within this particular setting was apparently quite popular, as a number of copies of the painting have survived, and Dughet and Maratta’s composition was repeated in at least three different versions that can be seen today.

Claude copied the Barberini Landscape in a drawing of 1661, likely done after the watercolor in dal Pozzo’s album (fig. 4.35). He includes a natural arch in the Perseus and the Origin of Coral, painted for Massimo in the early 1670s and hung in the

---

486 Boisclair, Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre, cat. no. 164, fig. 202, 223-24. At least three copies of the painting exist today, including the excellent one in the Hermitage illustrated here instead of the illegible black and white original reproduced by Boisclair. Beyond the use of the rock arch, the painting also includes a quotation from Domenichino’s Archery Contest of Diana and Her Nymphs of 1616, from the collection of Scipione Borghese. The nymph at lower left who stares directly and defiantly at the viewer, confronting his or her seeming intrusion on the scene, is lifted from the earlier painting.

487 Michael Kitson, Claude Lorrain; Liber Veritatis (London: The British Museum, 1978), 167, no. 184. Earlier in his career, Claude had included the motif in frescoes for the Palazzo Muti-Bussi and in paintings for the Crescenzi family. Marcel Röthlisberger, Claude Lorrain: The Paintings (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1961), cat. no. LV184, 433-36, has connected the motif to Claude’s trip to Naples and the influence of Agostino Tassi, but Lavagne, “Une peinture romaine oubliée,” 764-65, rightly notes that these works were probably influenced by the discovery of the Barberini Landscape, particularly in a painting dated 1628-30 now in the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston, where a small circular temple sits atop the rock arch.
galleria of the Palazzo Massimo alle Quattro Fontane (fig. 4.36). To further emphasize the connection to ancient painting, beyond the inclusion of the rock arch, the work, which depicts the birth of Pegasus, was positioned near the entrance to the stanza ultima dei musaici. The ceiling fresco of the stanza was a copy of the ancient painting Pegasus among the Nymphs, recently discovered on the vault in the Tomb of the Nasonii in 1674. Massimo devised the program for Claude’s work and, as with Dughet’s and Maratta’s collaboration, his circle of friends would have been aware of the connotations of the natural arch formation and its connection to the Barberini Landscape, thus elevating the paintings by referring back to a Roman work that symbolized sacred space and man’s harmonious relationship with nature. As Beaven states, with the Perseus and the Origin of Coral, “Claude triumphantly succeeds in creating the mood and atmosphere of an ancient Roman landscape.” Dughet and Marrata’s Diana and Actaeon accomplishes the same goal of establishing a connection to ancient Roman art.

One of the finest examples of Dughet’s innovative use of the natural arch is part of the series executed for Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna between 1671 and 1673 (fig. 4.37), in which the shepherd, placed between a waterfall and a dead tree, appears to be contemplating the arch – perhaps pondering the transience and regeneration of life and

---


489 Bellori and Bartoli published the find in Le pitture antiche del sepolcro de’Nasoni in 1680.

passage of time as reflected by the constantly moving water.\textsuperscript{491} Much like the didactic figures from the Vatican Vergil discussed above, the shepherd’s pose and the placement of his staff direct the viewer to both the waterfall and the arch, stressing their importance as the true “subjects” of the painting. The small figure is rendered insignificant in comparison to the landscape. He merely serves to invite Colonna and his circle of friends and visitors to consider the connotations of the arch and its relationship to the gushing waterfall, intimately tied to Holstenius’ reading of the \textit{Barberini Landscape} as Homer’s Cave of the Nymphs.

The relationship to ancient painting is especially relevant since the medium here is gouache (or opaque watercolor) on canvas, resulting in an even brighter palette and thicker, drier finish, nearly replicating the look and color of antique frescoes, even more so than Dughet’s oil paintings. By commissioning this series, Colonna may have been attempting to create his own collection of “ancient” paintings.\textsuperscript{492} Although unable to acquire a vast number of antique frescoes, as compared to a patron like Massimo who was devoted to archaeological studies and collecting, Colonna chose the next best

\textsuperscript{491} For a further discussion of the nature of time and mortality in relation to landscape painting, see Chapter 2. See Boisclair, \textit{Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre}, cat. no. 351-362, figs. 386-403, 278-82; and Eduard A. Safarik, \textit{Palazzo Colonna} (Rome: De Luca Editori d’Arte, 2009), 148, for rest of series, which includes another scene with a rock arch (fig. 1.34).

\textsuperscript{492} The series hung in a room with other landscape paintings, located at the end of the galleria on the piano nobile of the Palazzo Colonna. The larger room was rebuilt in the last decades of the seventeenth century and the vault decoration was completed in the early eighteenth century. Dughet’s paintings remain in the same position as when Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna commissioned them; they are interspersed with other contemporary works by mostly northern landscape specialists (see fig. 1.33). The series is not the only example of gouache paintings on canvas from the seventeenth century as ten large landscapes are recorded in the inventory of Antonio Barberini’s collection. See Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, \textit{Seventeenth-Century Barberini Documents and Inventories of Art} (New York: New York University Press, 1975), 315-22. Additionally, five small paintings attributed to Dughet with figures by Francesco Allegrini are now in the Palazzo Corsini, see Sivigliano Alloisi, \textit{Arcadie e vecchi merletti: Paesaggi della Collezione Corsini} (Rome: Gebart, 2002), 53-59. The paintings, dated by Alloisi to around 1640, are not catalogued in Boisclair, \textit{Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son œuvre}. 
solution – employing an artist whose style and knowledge of antiquarian scholarship could “recreate,” or even surpass, the greatness of Roman painting. Just as a number of patrons commissioned copies after ancient paintings, in particular the *Aldobrandini Wedding* and the Vergil manuscripts, Colonna, through Dughet, pushes this a step further. Rather than simple copies after an earlier model, Dughet’s paintings transform the ancient frescoes within a new Christian context. Beyond scenes that celebrate pagan rituals and rites, Dughet’s landscapes, based on Roman types and incorporating their motifs and style, testify to the glory of God’s creation.

**Conclusion**

The addition of a natural arch, centered on the model depicted in the *Barberini Landscape*, designated the represented landscape as especially sacred and emphasized respect for nature as God’s creation, which was the most common interpretation of the original fresco. By including these structures in his work, Dughet demonstrated his knowledge of both ancient frescoes and the discussion of their meaning. Such explicit references to antiquity elevated his paintings as more than simple pastoral images, transforming them into visual metaphors on the connection between ancient Rome and the contemporary landscape, as well as on the significance of nature itself. After the discovery of the *Barberini Landscape* and its ensuing popularity through painted, drawn, and printed reproductions, audiences in the seventeenth century would have found it impossible to dissociate any image of a rock arch from the ancient fresco. Thus, all artists, whether intentionally referring to the nymphaeum or not, were associated with the...

---

493 For more on copies of ancient paintings in the seventeenth century, see Joyce, “Grasping at Shadows,” 219-46.
connotations of sacred nature embodied in the fresco. Rubens, Claude, and Poussin specifically alluded to the *Barberini Landscape* in several works, but, as evidenced in the preceding chapter, Dughet also consciously sought to connect his own work with the ancient landscape. Dughet’s paintings for elite Roman patrons, such as Massimo and Colonna, are thus more than simple decorative images; his work embodies multiple levels of meaning through connections to antiquarian culture and writings. Patrons from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries actively strived to assert their power and legitimacy through commissioning art that directly related to antiquity. As this chapter demonstrates, the relevance of antiquarian culture and the study of ancient art on seventeenth century landscape painting surpass the simple inclusion of motifs and stylistic borrowings. Artists like Dughet completely absorbed lessons from the past to create works that reflected on the significance of ancient Rome and on nature.

---

494 One of the best recent books to explain this phenomenon, however in relation to the Renaissance interest in ancient Egypt rather than Greece or Rome, is Brian Curran, *The Egyptian Renaissance: The Afterlife of Ancient Egypt in Early Modern Italy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).
Conclusion

For artists and patrons in seventeenth-century Rome, art served a purpose, conveying a message on status, political aspirations, religious devotion, display of erudition, or another didactic function. Landscape painting was no different in this sense from history painting. Although artists like Gaspard Dughet have been dismissed by scholars in the past as somewhat unsophisticated in their approach to the rhetorical and poetic nature of painting, this study has demonstrated that Dughet was more than a simple landscape painter whose work embodied no intellectual aspirations. Instead, Poussin’s brother-in-law was engaged in scholarly discussions on the very meaning of landscape and its relevance to his noble Roman patrons. Once described as an artist who merely decorated the homes of the highest classes in Rome, Dughet was, in fact, able to market his particular talent for representing nature and the countryside to produce paintings that perfectly reflected the goals and desires of his patrons.

Landscape painting, especially images of the Roman Campagna, were more than just decorative images meant to invoke the natural world. These paintings embodied political and social status as papal families sought to profit from their newfound power, purchasing and constructing estates within the area around the capital of the Catholic Church. Pictures of the countryside fulfilled another need as well by providing a painted place of retreat where the nobility and their visitors could reflect not only on their own work and philosophical goals, but also on the power of God. For viewers in the seventeenth century, images of nature could not be divorced from the contemplation of God’s creation. Dughet’s naturalistic images of the countryside, which hung in country
villas and palaces within the city, were also recreations of the pastoral world – the idealized vision of nature conjured in the poetry of Vergil, Sannazaro, and Tasso. Populated with classical herdsmen, Dughet’s paintings fit perfectly within the pastoral tradition in art and literature. The artist’s patrons specifically chose him for his ability to portray this world where contemporary spirituality and the world of ancient Rome co-existed in perfect harmony.

Most importantly for this dissertation, Dughet was also aware of ancient frescoes found in the city and of the debates surrounding the meaning of these enigmatic works, including the *Aldobrandini Wedding* and the *Barberini Landscape*. Through his connection to Poussin, Dughet met Cassiano dal Pozzo, gaining access to the *Museo Cartaceo* and the discussions and writings within the Barberini circle. Dughet purposefully included references to known ancient frescoes, either through stylistic choices or iconographical motifs. The drier finish and rough brushwork of his paintings, an aesthetic choice that he employs throughout his career, is modeled on his study of works such as the *Aldobrandini Wedding* or early Vergil manuscripts. By competing with the past, Dughet provided his patrons with paintings that were connected to ancient Rome and displayed the triumph of Christianity over paganism. Through the incorporation of a rock arch, Dughet’s Roman patrons and their viewers could immediately recall the *Barberini Landscape* and the scholarly arguments on the sacredness of the fresco. The countryside depicted by Dughet was thus directly linked to the sanctified world represented in the original painting.

This dissertation is a case study for the intellectual aspirations of one particular landscape artist in seventeenth-century Rome and it should serve as a model for the study
of other artists of the time. Dughet was certainly not the only painter to engage with the pastoral genre, the sacredness of nature, and with the *Barberini Landscape*. As noted by both Marco Chiarini and Bert Meijer, the rock arch motif was enormously popular and, as briefly covered in the final chapter, contemporary scholars have addressed how Rubens, Poussin, and Claude have engaged the *Barberini Landscape*, but this needs to be expanded to include other artists, including Rosa and the numerous Dutch and Flemish painters whose works were avidly collected by the Roman nobility. By adopting recent scholarly approaches to the study of landscape painting – understanding images of the natural world as more than just decorative or fitting within a linear progression toward the aesthetic movement – the representation of the countryside can be approached on political terms, through the survey of relevant literary history, the examination of contemporary religious practice, contemporary scientific developments, and an analysis of antiquarian culture. As a result of this type of study, scholars can begin to fully address the intellectual objectives and intentions of landscape painters in the seventeenth century.
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