

velous painting of Christ [the Holy Shroud, which contains] internal design and external design, love and pain. The one is in the spirit, the other in the senses; the one is in the volition, the other in the execution. The one offers, the other suffers. The one chooses to suffer, the other actually suffers. The internal one is content to undergo an ugly and ignominious death for the salvation of mankind. The other submits and subjects himself to all those martyrs and suppliants that the sins of men have earned. And who knows if this mystery is expressed in the duplication of the Holy Shroud itself. In the cloth, both on the one and on the other side, one sees the figure duplicated, almost as if to make reference to these two types of design.

The practice of design, whose function is to put into effect the concepts of the imagination, or objects that are seen, ordinarily operates among earthy painters in three different ways. The one is to make things up out of one's own brain, that is to say, to do it from practice, or from fantasy. Another is to be guided precisely by the rules of perspective. The third is to draw on [examples found in] nature.

The first method, being the most rapid of the three, is also the one most used by the majority of those who paint. Those who use it profit from what, through long practice in drawing, they have stored up in their minds. And this method usually turns out well or less well according to the degree of the painter's talent and application.

The second method, without doubt, is the most certain and secure. That way nothing is done by accident, but instead for good reasons and on the basis of proof and infallible demonstrations. Besides this provides the size, the diminution and the recession of constituted or imagined objects that one wishes to set back in space on a slant, or in reference to the visual pyramid, according to the different horizon lines, views and distances from which they are to be seen [in the painting]. This method teaches how to draw everything, as for example the various angles that apply to the various points of view.

But just as it is easy to draw regularly shaped objects in perspective, so it is difficult and takes a long time to draw the irregularly shaped ones. Thus it is more expedient for painters to use the third method, which is half way between the other two and makes use of both. This method is to copy visually, from nature, the things that are to be painted, or to reproduce them from models made for that purpose, or with the help of some mathematical instruments.

Neither of these last two methods was used by God in his Design. He made use neither of natural objects nor of the geometrician's compass, having no need of them. Being, besides, the Mind Eternal in which all concepts are resplendent, he could find no created thing that could

express so lofty an idea. What mathematical measure could circumscribe that love which had no measure?

The Head of Medusa on a Shield
By Michelangelo da Caravaggio

IN THE GALLERY OF THE GRAND DUKE OF TUSCANY

What foe will not, Sir, find himself congealed
Into cold stone on seeing on your shield
That Gorgon wild whose plentitude of snakes
So horribly, so very grimly makes
Among her locks a terrifying display?
But why, I pray?
List monsters not nor arms among your needs;
Your true Medusa is your valient deeds.

Mancini

Giulio Mancini (1588-1630), like Agucchi, belongs to that new breed of critic-amateur who were neither professional artists, as were most of the critics of the sixteenth century, nor professional writers and scholars, as was Bellori later in the seventeenth. Mancini was a physician. He was born in Siena and attended the University of Padua, where he studied medicine, astrology, and philosophy. In Rome he practiced medicine successfully but without special distinction until 1623, when he became personal physician to the Barberini Pope, Urban VIII, one of the great art patrons of all time. In 1628, two years before Mancini's death, the pontiff made him an apostolic protonotary and a canon of St. Peter's.

Mancini's writings remained unpublished until this century. He left in manuscript form what is perhaps the first modern guide to Rome: modern in the sense that it was written to identify not relics for the pilgrim but paintings for the art lover.¹ Mancini's principal work, his *Thoughts on Painting*, was published only in 1956.² He completed it largely between 1617 and 1621, but seems to have made additions and corrections until the time of his death.

Mancini was above all an art lover and a connoisseur. The most interesting and original parts of his treatise are those in which he offers advice to the collector. This includes how to arrive at the correct price for a painting, how to determine in what technique the work was made, how to discover in what period it was executed, to what country it be-

¹ Giulio Mancini, *Viaggio per Roma per veder le pitture che in essa si trovano*, ed. Ludwig Schudt (Leipzig, 1923).

² Giulio Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, ed. Adriana Marucchi and Luigi Salerno, 2 vols. (Rome, 1956-1957).

longs, to which region, and the like. He even discussed how paintings should be cleaned, varnished, and framed.

Already by the early seventeenth century the business of how to distinguish an original painting from a copy had become sufficiently troublesome for Mancini to devote a sizable section to the problem. We are amused at the sophistication of the *Seicento shyster* (new paintings aged in smoke or newly forged on genuine old canvases) but the thought of trying to uncover such forgeries now, after they are three and a half centuries old, is enough to make the head spin.

Mancini's passage on the proper placement of paintings has special relevance for the history of patronage. It tells us that the art market in Rome had grown to the point where, early in the seventeenth century, it was sustained at least in part by the *petit bourgeoisie*, that is, by persons of such modest circumstances that they could afford no more than two principal rooms, a living room and a bedroom. Even here he tells us where the paintings should go, so that we have some chance of imagining them in their intended environment. Mancini still lived under the shadow of the Council of Trent, but the shadow was fading. He cautions the collector against the public display of paintings that might be considered erotic, but his warning seems perfunctory. The burning of art, even erotic art, to improve public morals (as was done during Savonarola's theocratic rule of Florence in the late fifteenth century) quite obviously appalled him.³

From *Considerazioni sulla pittura*

Above all [it is important to know whether a painting] is a copy or an original, because sometimes the originals are so well imitated that it is difficult to tell. Besides, those who want to sell copies for originals darken them with smoke from wet straw, so as to give the painting a certain coating similar to that which time produces. Thus, when the bright strong colors that new pictures have has been removed, they seem old. Moreover, in order to make the deception more effective, they take old panels and paint over them. Even with all this, those who are experienced unmask all these forms of deception. The first thing to consider is whether the painting in question has the degree of perfection that is characteristic of the artists under whose name the work is offered and sold. Moreover, one should consider whether the painting reveals the assurance of the master himself, above all in those parts that are executed with a degree of boldness that cannot be well imitated. This is

³ The following sections are translated from Mancini, *Considerazioni*, I, pp. 134-35, 141-44.

especially true of the hair, the beard, and the eyes. When they have to imitate the ringlets of hair, they do so with a certain awkwardness that is apparent in the copy. But if the copier decides not to imitate it, then the copy lacks the degree of perfection that the master's work has. And those parts of the picture are like those passages and sections of writing that require the boldness and resolution of the master. You can see the same thing in those touches and dabs of highlights, scattered here and there. The master places them [on the canvas] instantly and decisively, with brushwork that cannot be imitated. The same thing can be seen in the folds and highlights of cloth, which depend more on the imagination and the fantasy of the master than on the actual appearance of the object.

Despite all these observations on how to distinguish a copy from the original, nevertheless it happens sometimes that the copy is so well made that it fools us anyway, even if both the artist and the buyer are intelligent. And what is more, having both the original and the copy, sometimes it happens that you cannot tell which is which. The Grand Duke Cosimo de' Medici, of happy memory, was heard to say that in such cases the copy should be preferred to the original because it contained both skills, that of the originator and that of the copier. Besides, it often happens that some painters enjoy imitating the manner of a famous and renowned master so well that it fools the most intelligent people. They have their works sold as by the hand of the famous painter not for the sale itself, which is a certain form of deception, but through their desire for honor, and in order to make themselves known and gain a reputation.

After the paintings are obtained they must then be put in place. Various owners differ as to the quality and commodiousness of their homes. Princes, who have a variety of residences, have many places where they are able to place pictures. In the case of a private person with a small amount of living space, we cannot apply rules for placing pictures in different locations, rooms and residences, but only in different kinds of light. For those who have only a bedroom, a living room and little more, the only rule is to decide the light that is suitable and that the artist had in mind in making them. They should also be placed so there is no difficulty in seeing and enjoying them. Moreover, they should be arranged with some distinction [as to subject matter]. Devotional works should be put in the bedroom, whereas cheerful secular works should go in the living room. In the case of the religious paintings, the small ones should go at the head of the bed and above the faldstools. Paintings of Christ, the Virgin, and similar subjects should face the door to remind whoever enters that he is in a private devotional place.

This is for a private house. Returning to the case of princes living in palaces with a variety of apartments, great care must be taken in the placement of works, both in respect to convention and to the emotions such works might evoke in those who look at them, for the prince is both the head of a family and a public personage. Thus, according to Ficino, discrimination should be used not only in placement, but also in what sort of person should be shown the paintings. Those who see them should be differentiated as to disposition and temperament, age, sex, usage, and the way of life one desires to maintain, augment, diminish, correct, or change for the opposite. Thus by pious edict it was forbidden to publish a picture that had not first been considered by the superiors. But in this regard I do not approve of the great severity shown by Savonarola, who had so many pictures burned in Florence for having a bit of paganism and eroticism in them, because in this way many fine paintings and remains of the old nobility went up in smoke. Vainly influenced by him, those families burned them without giving warning either to the Friar or to the people of Florence. Here in Rome in the churches there is respect for paganism, as one can see in S. Andrea in Cacobarbara and S. Costanza, and elsewhere. Besides, if they burned the ancient paintings that were perfect, modern painters would not be able to learn how to make pictures for our own religion. Hence Pius V, of blessed memory, being well aware of this, let [the statues of] the ancient gods remain in the Vatican Palace, although they contained something of the erotic. As for other similar gods and erotic things in the Sacred Palace, I let others judge.

In the case of a private individual with diverse living quarters and a varied family, this is the method that should be followed. Landscapes and cosmographies should be placed in the galleries, and the places where anyone may go. Sensual themes such as Venus, Mars, the Seasons, and female nudes should go in the galleries on the garden side and in the private rooms on the ground floor. The pictures of the gods should be put in the more generally accessible rooms on the lower floors. Erotic works should go in the private chambers. If the owner is the head of a family he should keep them covered, and should only uncover them when he goes there with his wife or a person in his confidence.

Paintings depicting civic affairs, or peace, or war, should be placed in the chambers and antechambers through which pass those who wait and who come to do business. Similarly, the portraits of persons illustrious for peace or war or for their contemplation, as well as the portraits of popes, cardinals, kings, emperors, and other rulers should be placed in the areas where anyone is allowed to go. There too may be placed coats of arms, emblems, and other paintings of the same sort. Those of Christ, the Madonna, the Saints, and, in short, the paintings of religious sub-

jects, should be placed in the chamber and antechamber where one sleeps. The miniatures and the small pictures richly ornamented should go at the head of the bed. But these places are not always sufficient to take care of the large quantity of pictures. Then, because this abundance of paintings provides richness and edification, one may make a picture gallery for all the paintings that are too numerous for the other rooms. Place it in some convenient spot where the light and air are good; where it is brushed by the north winds and shielded from the winds from the south.

Mancini, like Agucchi, belongs to a period of transition, around 1620. It was clear by then that mannerism was finished and that the realism of Caravaggio and his followers was losing ground in the face of the increasing success of the classicism of Domenichino and Guido Reni. The High Baroque was not yet in being. Mancini was favorable to classicism, but without the fervor of Agucchi or Bellori. His writings contain no attacks on the mannerists. He had no objection to unidealized realism (he goes so far as to praise the erosions of old age) provided no aspect is inappropriate to the subject that the artist has chosen to represent.

Mancini draws on Renaissance neoplatonism and the Aristotelianism of the mannerists, but his borrowings are fragmentary and at times unclear. He acknowledges briefly the divine origins of beauty, but primarily he identifies it with decorum. In fact, the doctrine of decorum lies at the heart of his theory. He sees it under two aspects. Decorum signifies the elimination of anything vulgar or indecent. It also means the inclusion of all aspects (appearance, attitude, movements, clothing, environment) that are appropriate to the character and circumstances of the person whom the artist represents. Thus, for Mancini, Caravaggio had violated the doctrine of decorum by showing the Madonna as a vulgar peasant or worse. But elsewhere he writes that in the case of the beauty of a young peasant decorum consists in depicting the type of body structure, coloring, attitude, and ability needed to work vigorously at peasant tasks. Even deformity has a beauty of its own.

The "Idea of Beauty" as an empirically based synthesis that improves on nature is a concept of great importance to Agucchi and central to the theory of Bellori, but it does not appear in Mancini at all. In the end he remains a dilettante. The voluminous but diaphanous overlay of theory that fills his writings serves to color but not to mask the physician's sensuous enjoyment of art.¹

¹ The following passages are from Mancini, *Considerazioni*, I, 120-21, 125-27.