



The Market for Italian Art in the 17th Century

Francis Haskell

Past and Present, No. 15 (Apr., 1959), 48-59.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0031-2746%28195904%290%3A15%3C48%3ATMFIAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

Past and Present is currently published by Oxford University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/oup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MARKET FOR ITALIAN ART IN THE 17TH CENTURY

THE "WHIG INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY" REMAINS DEEPLY EMBEDDED in current Italian writing. The origins of the Risorgimento and the noble but limited Enlightenment receive considerable attention; while the corrupt societies of declining principalities, such as seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Rome, Bologna and Venice, are almost ignored except for picturesque gossip. In particular the economic history of these societies has scarcely even been touched on.¹ This neglect puts the historian of culture at a very serious disadvantage, for it is regrettable but true that during these two centuries the visual arts flourished more vigorously in decadent than in "healthy" societies. Lacking not just the facts but even the tools for investigating them, he can only deduce a general situation from those aspects of it which affect the particular sphere of which he has special knowledge. This is what I have had to do in the following article. I have made use of such general histories of the period as exist, but much more specifically of detailed sources concerning the arts, such as contemporary lives of painters and so on. It is primarily from such indirect material that I have tried to suggest a general picture. I realise all too well how much the points I am trying to make would be strengthened by a serious investigation of changes in prices and other more strictly economic factors; but I do not feel that the situation to be outlined here would be drastically altered by such work. I hope at least to show that political and economic decline went hand-in-hand with — indeed was an essential prelude to — an artistic expansion of incalculable importance to European culture as a whole. This thesis may therefore help to justify studies which an art historian is unqualified to undertake but which would prove of immense benefit to him.

In 1664 the painter Salvator Rosa wrote from Rome to his friend G. B. Ricciardi in Florence: "As for commissions, for the last year there's been absolutely nothing — even from a dog! If the war gets any worse I might as well go and plant my paint brushes in the garden".² Rosa had by this date good reason to be pessimistic; already two years before he had written: "For the last seven months people have been talking of nothing but reforms and economies",³ and his letters throughout the early years of the sixties are filled with characteristically vigorous and coarse complaints of the difficulties

of earning a living. Yet by 1669 he could write to the same friend Ricciardi: "Every day I have to turn down commissions (and important ones at that) from all over Europe".⁴ The great contrast in Salvator Rosa's fortunes between 1664 and 1669 vividly sums up a general situation that I want to discuss in the following pages.

During most of the first forty years of the seventeenth century, Rome was the centre of a quite unprecedented boom in artistic output. The fabulous wealth of the city in the 1620s was pointed out by the Venetian ambassador at a time when Urban VIII was more than rivalling his predecessor Paul V in lavish expenditure on artistic patronage despite some rather vague disclaimers and proposals to economise in this field.⁵ The example set by the Pope and his nephews was naturally followed by their entourage, and in consequence artists flourished as never before even in the golden days of the Medici. The results were obvious: an influx of painters into Rome from all over Italy and indeed Europe, and the widest possible scope for artistic experimentation. At the same time artists could afford to neglect the offers of foreign patrons: Charles I for instance was only the most generous of those European sovereigns — dazzled by the revival of the arts in Italy — who tried to entice to his court some of her leading artists. But he had no success.⁶ When work was so plentiful at home there was no need to put up with impossible climates and strange foreign languages. Painters were perfectly content to paint the odd picture for a foreign prince, while their main output helped to assuage the almost insatiable demands of newly built churches and palaces in Rome itself.⁷

Such a situation was too good to last for ever, and the first serious blow fell even before the magnificent Urban VIII was replaced on the Papal throne. The futile, and now almost forgotten, war of Castro made very serious inroads into the Barberini incomes, and though some families naturally benefited from the confusion, art patronage was severely reduced.⁸ 1642 was a year of financial panic in Rome, as the Duke of Parma's troops seemed to threaten immediate invasion, and the confiscation of private silver was ordered.⁹ Though peace was restored soon enough, the war was only a foretaste of things to come. The great days for Italian artists had gone for ever. Only two years later, in 1644, Innocent X succeeded to the throne, surrounded by a family as rapacious but far less munificent than that of his predecessor. The Barberini in fact were forced to flee to France largely owing to the enormous funds they had expropriated (and, incidentally, spent on the arts). Innocent X decided to enforce the most stringent economies, and to use such money as he had on

other ventures. Nepotism, of such benefit to artists during the two previous reigns, now languished, more for reasons of personal hatred than of moral reform. Cardinal Pamfili renounced his cardinalate to marry and was forced to live outside Rome for some time.¹⁰ All the sources agree that the first few years of Innocent's reign were very difficult for artists.¹¹ It is not my intention here to examine just how these difficulties operated, but certain points are worth emphasising in order to make clear the place held by the arts in seventeenth-century Roman life. The policy of beautifying and glorifying Rome which had been developed by the Popes as a direct result of their decline in international political status was by now much too important to neglect even during times of financial stringency.¹² Consequently the painters who suffered most seriously were not so much the large-scale frescoists still needed to cover churches and palaces, though it is significant that the great experiments of previous years gave way to a tamer phase of consolidation¹³; Bernini himself was for a time dismissed from the Papal court because of his too close association with the Barberini. Rather the blow fell heaviest on those relatively independent figures working outside official circles, and on artists newly arrived in Rome who had not yet had the time to establish their reputations. We know that men of this kind suffered severely in the depression of the late forties and fifties. These were years of great bitterness, reflected in such works as Bernini's *Truth Unveiled* and Salvator Rosa's satires and savage allegories on the mutability of human fortunes. It is now too that we first begin to hear of the widespread activities of art dealers, often commissioning works to be sent abroad — a clear sign that the once almost feudal relationship between artists and patrons was breaking up.¹⁴ Yet another effect of the general decline in patronage was the natural favour that cheap pictures began to find with noble and princely collectors, and this meant that academic artists began to grow seriously alarmed at the invasion of what had until then been largely their exclusive preserve.¹⁵

The accession of Alexander VII Chigi in 1655 — a member of the rich banking family and a direct descendant of Raphael's patron — must have seemed a good omen, but its impact was immediately dimmed by the terrible plague which devastated Italy in 1656-7¹⁶; and, soon after, political troubles, mainly with France, were to occupy the Pope more and more. It is true that spectacular works (among them Bernini's colonnade for the Piazza S. Pietro) were built during this reign, but Alexander was much more interested in architecture than in painting, and once again artists suffered who

were not implicated in the lavish propaganda that he and his court sponsored. This is the background to Salvator Rosa's letter of 1664. As can be seen from this very brief resumé, the conditions he described had been accumulating for about twenty years; and in Rome itself the situation was to get still worse. For one thing the Popes themselves seemed to die sooner, and hence their courtiers had less time to enrich themselves; then the Papacy declined drastically in international importance and revenues from abroad suffered accordingly¹⁷; by the end of the century nepotism was effectively stopped. One result of all this was very noticeable and was of immense importance for the development of Italian art. More and more we hear of painters refusing to come and settle in Rome despite apparently flattering invitations — a situation that would have been quite inconceivable during the first half of the century. Luca Giordano, Solimena, Crespi and Sebastiano Ricci (to name only the most important figures of the next fifty years) were only sparingly represented in Roman collections. Once again Italy had to do without a "capital". How then was Salvator Rosa able to write with such satisfaction in 1669, and how was Italian art able to survive at all on a large scale? The clue lies in the last words of the phrase quoted from Rosa's letter. Europe intervened to redress the balance. Of course Italian artists had often worked for foreign courts before now, and some of her leading figures had spread to France, Spain and even England the glories of her Renaissance. Leonardo himself had died at Amboise; and Titian's relations with Charles V and Philip II are familiar. But these figures had none the less been exceptions, compelled by political pressure or attracted by spectacularly flattering offers from a few outstanding sources. Their work for foreigners had been limited, and had not represented a general trend among Italian artists. And in any case such visits had ceased for a long time. But now everything was to change. It is scarcely an exaggeration to claim that between the last decades of the seventeenth century and the end of the eighteenth nearly every first-rate Italian artist provided a significant proportion (and often a decisive proportion) of his output for foreign customers. Without these customers it is scarcely possible that Italian art could have survived in the way that it did. And so we will be faced with the strange situation that at no time was Italian art more widespread in Europe than when Italy itself was going through a mortal crisis of art patronage.

Before looking briefly at who the new customers were it is worth considering some of the effects on Italy itself of this collapse of Rome

as a centre. The immediate impact has already been noticed. Artists came less and less to Rome, and consequently "provincial" cities such as Bologna, Naples, Florence and Venice developed schools which followed more independent lines and which threatened to remain completely isolated from the main developments of European art. This is not the place to consider how the threat was averted, though the story is a deeply interesting one. After some years' crisis and hesitation artists rapidly recovered the ground they had lost, and prices demanded by a painter successfully employed by a foreign prince rose steadily. Thus in 1671 Don Antonio Ruffo of Messina, one of the most perceptive of Italian art patrons, was severely snubbed by the Venetian painter Girolamo Forabosco. He was told that he would have to wait two years for a picture, and that when it came he would have to pay eighty *doppie* for two half length figures. It was no use, he was told, asking a painter of Forabosco's standing for cheaper work, as he was daily implored by the leading princes of Europe who were ready to pay anything he asked for the smallest head, and who considered it a real favour to own anything by him at all.¹⁸ And so more and more of the best work of the leading Italian artists found its way abroad, while Italian collections generally lost that richness and variety which had played such a part in encouraging the experiments of the first part of the century.

The natural patron for Italian art when the crisis broke appeared to be France. The tradition of François I was still very much alive, and much more recently the painter Romanelli had paid two important visits to France. Mazarin, the greatest collector of the century, was of course an Italian and he had encouraged his contemporaries in his mother country. Very soon the Italians began looking towards France. Bellori's *Le Vite de Pittori . . . Moderni* of 1672 was dedicated to Colbert, and Malvasia's *Felsina Pittrice* (lives of the Bolognese artists) of 1678 was dedicated to Louis XIV. Pietro da Cortona and other Italian artists had worked for the French even in the heyday of Roman patronage, and Pier Francesco Mola was on his way to Paris when he died in 1666.¹⁹ But despite these good omens, Louis XIV's assumption of power and the enormous filip his early successes gave to French self confidence soon put an end to such promising beginnings. More and more the French turned against contemporary Italian art. By 1674 the revolt against architecture was well under way and Boileau could write:

Evitons ces excès: laissons à l'Italie
De tous ces faux brillants l'éclatante folie.²⁰

and very soon painting (except, of course, for the "old masters") was

meeting the same sort of hostility. An examination of French inventories will show how extraordinarily few works by Italian artists of the late seventeenth century entered the country.²¹ This was not for want of trying: the Italians did everything they could to "crash the French market". It is not excessively cynical to suspect that something more than political principles underlay the great admiration for Louis XIV felt by the Bolognese painters Cignani and Quaini, which their biographer recorded.²² The Neapolitan Mattia Preti painted an allegorical portrait of Louis XIV which he intended to present to that king, no doubt in the hope that it would lead to profitable commissions; however, when war broke out between France and Spain, Preti (who was living in Malta at the time) found it more prudent to sell the picture elsewhere.²³ But, though Louis XIV did in fact give pensions to a number of Italian artists, France no longer proved the benefactor she had once been.

Spain was rather more satisfactory. The royal family always kept a watchful eye on the development of Italian art, and many leading painters in Rome and elsewhere sent works to Madrid. But it was, of course, Naples that benefited most from Spanish patronage, for the Viceroyalty were sometimes important collectors.²⁴ The climax came with the departure for Spain of Luca Giordano in 1690. This is an event of considerable significance, not just for its effects on Spanish art, striking though these were, but because it marks a new stage in the process we have been considering. For by 1690 Luca Giordano was already nearly sixty, an established master with a great reputation. Apart from Romanelli he was the first considerable Italian artist to leave the country since at least the beginning of the century, and his visit to Madrid was the prelude to those of Giaquinto and eventually Tiepolo.²⁵

But despite all this it was not from France or Spain — the traditional patrons of Italian art — that salvation was to come, but from two nations which had only recently entered the field of art patronage — Germany and England. Until the middle of the century Germany made little enough impact on the arts in Italy. But almost as soon as the great war was over we begin to notice signs of that longing for southern art which has always played such a large part in German culture. This tendency grew rapidly as the Turkish menace to Austria was gradually overcome. By 1658 the well-known Venetian artist Pietro Liberi was in Germany painting altar and gallery pictures which found their way to Wurzburg, Schleisheim and elsewhere; and a decade or so later a large number of Italian artists were at work in Munich.²⁶ As the great palaces of Austria and South Germany

sprang up Italian artists were required to decorate them. It very soon becomes impossible to keep check of the flood of commissions that poured down from Germany. Here I can do no more than indicate two or three of the more spectacular patrons. The place of honour must go to the Schönborn family, whose palace at Pommersfelden still today contains what is probably the greatest single collection of Italian late baroque painters, notably works by Balestra and Lazzarini from Venice; Luti, Carlo Maratta and Trevisani from Rome; Luca Giordano and Solimena from Naples; and Cignani from Bologna — to mention only a few of the best known contemporary artists they employed.²⁷ There were the Princes of Liechtenstein, of whom Johann Adam (1662-1712) commissioned forty-two pictures from the Bolognese painter Franceschini alone, not to mention large numbers of other works by his contemporaries.²⁸ There was Prince Eugen, another patron who especially favoured the Bolognese school, and employed its most distinguished member G. M. Crespi for five years.²⁹ One could extend the list almost indefinitely. The heirs to the Barberini were to be found in Germany. It was only in these German courts that a representative collection of all that was best in the Italian painting of the day could be found. The significance of this to the Germans is evident: what has never been stressed is its vital importance for the Italians. By the end of the century — after a depression which had threatened their very livelihoods — almost every Italian painter was working more than ever before.

It is worth indicating a few of the similarities and differences between these new German patrons and the Italian, especially Papal, families by whom artists had until now usually been employed. Like them the German princes were autocratic, mostly Catholic, and interested in glorifying their families. For them, too, art fulfilled a vital social need which, notoriously, was often given precedence over more humdrum duties such as ensuring the well-being of their subjects. There was therefore no pressure on the Italians to make any essential changes in their traditional type of painting — large scale “histories” and religious works were still the main requirements, though the demand for salaciousness was stressed more than it had been in Italy. But the distance between patron and artist, and the comparative aesthetic ignorance of these German upstarts meant that there was a further considerable weakening of the old intimate relationship. Much more was left to the artist’s imagination: “As for the subject”, writes the Prince of Liechtenstein to Franceschini, “I leave that to your good taste: perhaps a Flora with a few putti

would be a good idea; or some figure representing Spring: in any case something that alludes to gardens".³⁰

The English who began their Grand Tour during the last quarter of the century seemed at first to acquiesce with equal submissiveness in the traditional patterns of Italian art. The first collections, made by such men as Lord Exeter and Thomas Isham, though modest compared to those of the Italians or Germans, showed no particular difference in orientation.³¹ But very soon the "history paintings", the spectacular family apotheoses, the pietistic religious imagery and dogma began to appear uncongenial to an essentially Whig, Protestant and commercial society — except when painted long ago by safely dead "old masters". The English poured down into Rome and wanted to have their portraits painted — an indignity deeply resented by the leading artists who considered this an inferior branch of art.³² But money won the day, and soon Carlo Maratta, the leading Papal painter³³ was immortalising the English *milordi*. New patronage began to change the whole nature of Italian painting. In Rome Luti, Trevisani and later Batoni (one of the first artists, incidentally, to be "launched" by the English³⁴) were all "history painters" who were forced by the shift in taste to turn extensively to portraiture (much to their advantage we may feel today); in Bologna Crespi painted for an Englishman "a series of small paintings on copper, which shows the career of a singer who begins life in a poor and humble condition; but within a few years, by making use of her youth and beauty (or other advantages if she is not beautiful) she lives well, surrounded by all the pleasures of existence . . . But then when her youth is over she remains a broken wreck, thus showing the deplorable end that such a life meets with".³⁵ How we recognise the national characteristics in this countryman of Hogarth's! As for Venice it is an Englishman who encourages Rosalba Carriera to take up pastels,³⁶ and she becomes the first Italian artist, who, though living in Italy, works mostly for foreigners; it is hardly necessary to point out that Canaletto painted more than three quarters of his pictures for Englishmen; that as a result he was looked upon as impossibly expensive by everyone else;³⁷ and that when wars stopped Englishmen going to the continent he decided to come to England where he lived for ten years.³⁸ For by now the mountain was quite used to coming to Mahomet. This second stage in foreign patronage had been most familiar in Venice. Sebastiano Ricci, Pellegrini, Amigoni, Bellucci — at first the "history painters" travelled impartially between England and Germany. Then national taste made itself felt; it is symbolised by the remarkable situation in the

first years of the 1750s when Tiepolo was at work in Bavaria depicting the Four Corners of the World paying homage to Carl Philip von Greiffenklau, Bishop of Würzburg, while Canaletto was painting the country houses of Warwick and Northumberland. For views and landscapes, neither of which had very deep roots in Italian taste, were branches of painting insisted on by the English; and soon all over Italy artists were at work on their standardised Arcadias for the Grand Tourist.

Once again it is the impact on Italy that I want to stress. Contemporary Italians viewed with a mixture of pride and ruefulness the astonishing expansion of their art. For while London, Paris, Vienna, Munich, Madrid, Lisbon, St. Petersburg seemed insatiable in their demands, only Italy itself lagged behind. It was deeply humiliating to have to admit that Popes and princes could no longer maintain artists on the scale that had once been possible³⁹; that where foreigners stopped coming the arts died out⁴⁰; and, worse still, that foreign taste was perverting Italian production: "If Buonarroti was now at work on his *Last Judgement*" complained the Bolognese writer G. P. Zanotti to the Vatican Librarian Bottari in the middle of the eighteenth century, "he would have to turn his Judging Christ into some English *Milord*, and his saints into *madame* and *madamoselle*".⁴¹ But Zanotti need hardly have worried all that much. For all the pressures of foreign patronage Italian art gave far more than it took until the end of the eighteenth century.

And so a tendency which had begun tentatively in the 1640s and 1650s, and had gathered weight in the ensuing decades, largely owing to massive German intervention, reached a climax in the first half of the eighteenth century. During this latter period Italy was repeatedly harried by foreign wars, and it is ironical that here too her misery should have been accompanied by still further opportunities for artists. There was hardly a general or a visiting politician who did not commission something, and many of them took painters back to their native countries. Thus from the beginning of the seventeenth century Italy was in a state of almost constant decline militarily, politically and economically, relative to the rest of Europe. Yet as twin brother to this decline went a quite unparalleled cultural expansion. The English and French who are rightly proud of their spectacular literary, philosophical and political progress during these two centuries of enlightenment would find it quite impossible to compete in artistic exports with declining, priest-ridden and poverty-stricken Italy.⁴²

NOTES

¹ With the notable exception of Carlo M. Cipolla's classic *The Decline of Italy* (Economic History Review, Second Series, Vol. V, No. 2, 1952) on which I lean heavily; and for eighteenth century Venice: Massimo Petrocchi's *Il tramonto della Repubblica di Venezia e l'assolutismo illuminato* (Venezia 1950) and Marino Berengo's *La società veneta alla fine de '700* (Sansoni 1956).

² 2nd January 1664 — from De Rinaldis *Lettere inedite di Salvator Rosa a G.B. Ricciardi* (Fratelli Palombi, Roma 1939), pp. 161-2.

³ 17th March 1662 — *ibid.*, p. 150.

⁴ 8th June 1669 — *ibid.*, p. 221.

⁵ Nicolo Barozzi e Guglielmo Berchet: *Relazioni degli Stati Europei lette al Senato dagli Ambasciatori Veneti nel secolo decimosettimo*, Serie III — Italia, Relazioni di Roma, Vol. I (Venezia 1877), p. 200: "ma ben spendersi più et vedersi abbondante correr l'oro, che in qual si voglia altro luogo: poichè ciascheduno il suo meglio vi porta". This, along with many other details of the magnificence of Roman life, comes from the report of Pietro Contarini who was in Rome from 1623 to 1627. But at about the same time the delegation sent from Venice to congratulate the new Pope reported that "Biasima quei predecessori che hanno consumato l'erario della Chiesa in fabbriche, ed altre cose tali . . ." (*ibid.* p. 230).

⁶ Charles I seems to have invited Guercino to England almost immediately after his accession in 1625 (see Denis Mahon: *Guercino's paintings of Semiramis* in *The Art Bulletin*, Sept. 1949, Vol. XXXI, No. 3, p. 221).

⁷ Note for instance Guido Reni's dilatory fulfilment of a commission from the King of Spain, as recorded by Jane Costello in *The Twelve Pictures "Ordered by Velasquez"* (*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. III, 1950, Nos. 3-4, July to December, p. 247).

⁸ See Pastor *Lives of the Popes*, Vol. 29 of the English edition for the causes and course of the war.

⁹ For the effects of the war in Rome, see Giacinto Gigli *Diario Romano a cura di Giuseppe Ricciotti* (Tumminelli, Roma 1958), pp. 203-240.

¹⁰ Ignazio Ciampi: *Innocenzo X Pamfili e la sua corte* (Roma 1878).

¹¹ The confusion is vividly described by Passeri (*Vite de' Pittori* etc., edited by J. Hess, 1934, p. 301), who adds: "si tiro avanti alcuni anni tra gl'ozzi delle scarse occasioni . . ."

¹² For a comparison with the situation today we must look at the priority given by successive governments to expenditure on defence and the social services, in contrast to the niggardly allowances to the arts.

¹³ See the summary in Ellis K. Waterhouse *Baroque Painting in Rome*, 1937, p. 26.

¹⁴ De Dominicis in his *Vite dei Pittori . . . Napoletani*, (Napoli, 1843 edition, Vol. IV, p. 19) comments on the difficulties that faced artists coming to Rome, and refers to a dealer Pellegrino de Rossi "che in quel tempo faceva traffico di buone pitture, ed accoglieva quei virtuosi, che stavano disoccupati, e gli trattava assai bene . . ."

¹⁵ Malvasia in his *Felsina Pittrice* (Bologna 1841 edition, Vol. II, pp. 179-80) quotes the correspondence between Sacchi in Rome and Albani in Bologna, which bitterly criticises the so-called *bamboccianti*, i.e. those painters, often Flemish, who specialised in small, realistic genre scenes. This has frequently been commented on as indicating the attitude of the academic artists to this "inferior" branch of painting. What has never been pointed out is that the letters with their attack on those patrons, often of the highest rank, who supported these *bamboccianti*, are dated 1651 — in other words nearly a quarter of a century after the arrival in Rome of Pieter Van Laer, the originator of the genre. This suggests that it was only now, when conditions were difficult, that the *bamboccianti*, because of their relative cheapness, first began to present a serious menace to established artists.

¹⁶ Cipolla (*op. cit.*, p. 184) refers to the devastating effects of the plague.
¹⁷ Barozzi e Berchet (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 214), Relazione di Angelo Correr, 1660: Non vi è Principe oggi, che non miri al bene dei propri sudditi, a non lasciar uscire dai suoi Stati le rendite dei benefizii ecclesiastici, e massime le opulenti, il quale voglia permettere li possessi delle medesimi ai forastieri, et a Roma ne pazienzano e ne sofferiscono il rammarico per non incontrare li disconci peggiori.

¹⁸ Vincenzo Ruffo: *La Galleria Ruffo nel secolo XVII in Messina* (Bollettino d'Arte, X, 1916), p. 289.

¹⁹ Liono Pascoli: *Vite de' Pittori . . . Moderni*, Vol. I, 1730, p. 122.

²⁰ Quoted in Charles Mauriceau-Beaupré: *L'Art au XVIIème Siècle en France, Deuxième Période 1661-1715* (Paris, 1947), p. 10.

²¹ See, for instance, the inventories in Bonaffé: *Dictionnaire des Amateurs Français au 17ème siècle* (Paris 1884) and [Dezallier D'Argenville] *Voyage pictoresque de Paris*, (Paris 1749).

²² Giampietro Zanotti: *Storia dell' Accademia Clementina di Bologna*, (Bologna, 1739), Vol. I. Of Cignani, Zanotti remarks: ". . . e trattandosi di Principi, e di Monarchi, egli estimava il massimo degli eroi Luigi XIV", (p. 155).

²³ De Dominicis (*op. cit.*), Vol. IV, p. 50.

²⁴ Especially the Marqués del Carpio, who was Viceroy from 1683-1687. See M. E. Ghelli: *Il viceré marchese del Carpio* in Archivio storico per le provincie napóletane, N.S. XIX, 1933, pp. 240-318; XX, 1934, pp. 257-282; also Enriqueta Harris: *El Marqués del Carpio y sus cuadros de Velázquez* in Archivo Espanol de Arte, Num. 118, 1957.

²⁵ For his visit see De Dominicis (*op. cit.*), Vol. IV, p. 165.

²⁶ Emilio Lavagnino: *L'Opera del Genio Italiano all'Esterò*, Gliartisti in Germania, Vol. III (Roma 1943).

²⁷ For full details on the Schönborn commissions see P. Hugo Hattsch, Andreas Scherf and Max. H. von Freeden: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Barocks in Franken unter dem Einfluss des Hauses Schönborn* (Würzburg, 1931 and 1955). See also the summary catalogue of the existing collection at Pommersfelden.

²⁸ See F. Wilhelm: *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des fürstlich Liechtensteinschen Kunstbesitzes* in Jahrbuch d. Kunsthistorisches Istitutes der K. K. Zentralkommission, 1911, p. 89).

²⁹ There is a short account of Prince Eugen as a collector by Hans Tietze: *Eugenio di Savoia amico dell'arte* in Le Vie d'Italia, Agosto 1933.

³⁰ F. Wilhelm (*op. cit.*), Letter of 28th August 1706.

³¹ See the still existing Isham collection at Lamport Hall, Northants., which contains mythological and religious works by Lodovico Gimignani, Giacinto Brandi and other Roman painters. Apart from contemporary references in the lives of the various artists he commissioned, Lord Exeter, who died in 1700, is briefly discussed by Hugh Honour: *English patrons and Italian sculptors in the first half of the eighteenth century* in The Connoisseur, May 1958.

³² Pietro da Cortona's bitterness on the subject of painting portraits is mentioned in a letter of 1670 from A. Breughel to Ruffo, see Vincenzo Ruffo (*op. cit.*), pl 186.

³³ Bellori (*Le vite inedite di Bellori* a cura di Michelangelo Piacentini, Roma 1942, p. 107/108) reports that Carlo Maratta was employed neither by Innocent XI nor by Alexander VIII.

³⁴ Benaglia, Francesco: *Abbozzo della vita di Pompeo Battoni pittore . . .*, published by Angelo Marchesan (Treviso, 1894): ". . . in una parola furono gli inglesi i primi a far cogliere al nostro Battoni onorati e ricchi frutti del suo talento, della sua industria e del suo valore . . ."

³⁵ Giampietro Zanotti (*op. cit.*), Vol. II, p. 59.

³⁶ Vittorio Malamani: *Rosalba Carriera* (Le Gallerie Nazionali Italiane, Anno IV, 1899).

³⁷ De Brosses: *Lettres d'Italie* (Dijon, aux éditions du Raisin, n.d), Vol. I,

p. 282: "Les Anglais ont si bien gaté cet ouvrier, en lui offrant de ses tableaux trois fois plus qu'il n'en demande, qu'il n'est plus possible de faire marché avec lui."

³⁸ See Hilda F. Finberg: *Canaletto in England* (Walpole Society, Vol. IX).

³⁹ Joseph Baretti: *An account of the Manners and Customs of Italy* (London, 1768), Vol. I, p. 278-280.

⁴⁰ Verci: *Notizie intorno alla vita . . . de' pittoti . . . di Bassano, 1775.*

⁴¹ Letter from Giampietro Zanotti to Bottari, dated 9th July 1762 in Bottari/Ticozzi: *Raccolta di Lettere sulla Pittura, Scultura ed Architettura* (Milano, 1822), Vol. IV, p. 221.

⁴² In this article I have only considered the position of painters — and then only in its barest outlines. Much the same could be said of musicians, dancers, actors, etc.