

Bernini and the Vacant See

by KAREN J. LLOYD

REPORTS SUMMARISING CONTEMPORARY events – known as *avvisi* – were sent to courts throughout Italy and Europe.¹ Written anonymously, they provided news of marriages, births, baptisms, political appointments, papal audiences, dinner parties and diplomatic visits. They followed a clear pattern – a series of short notices organised by date and city, including, among others, Rome, Venice, Vienna, London and Warsaw. Those in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano have been gathered chronologically into volumes dated by year. However, a page inserted in a volume ostensibly covering the period 1670 to 1673 contains material relating to the Vacant See following the death of Pope Urban VIII (Barberini) on 29th July 1644 (see Appendix below).² Two of the episodes related in the notice are well known, while two are hitherto unrecorded.

The first report recounts how, after the news of Urban VIII's death was made public, a mob converged on the Campidoglio intent on venting its anger against the deceased pontiff by destroying his statue that had been erected in the Palazzo dei Conservatori four years earlier (Fig. 19). The assault was unsuccessful for the mob was barred from ascending the Capitol by a group of armed men sent by Contestabile Marcantonio Colonna, a relative by marriage to the Barberini.³ His troop closed the Campidoglio, leaving only one small staircase open,⁴ and was later joined by reinforcements that specifically guarded Urban's statue. The author of the *avviso* noted that 'at present' the armed group surrounding the statue could still be seen on the Campidoglio ('... *la quale al presente anco si guarda* . . .'), an indication that this page was written very shortly after the pope's death.

In the final years of his pontificate, Urban became increasingly unpopular, largely because of the crippling taxes he had imposed on the citizens of Rome in order to compensate for the drain on the papal finances caused by the War of Castro.⁵ This period of lawlessness, known as the Vacant See, provided the populace with an opportunity to express their resentment publicly. The attempted attack on the statue of Urban demonstrates that in times of political unrest such statues could take on the role of an effigy, not only as a representation of an individual but as a symbol of a despised reign. That Bernini's work could have been a target for hostility is particularly interesting in the light of what can be seen as a pattern of violence against pontifical statues in previous *Sede Vacante* and times of turmoil. One of the best-known examples of this was the destruction of Michelangelo's bronze statue of Julius II in Bologna in 1511, but numerous other instances are known, including the



19. *Pope Urban VIII*, by Gian Lorenzo Bernini and assistants. 1635–40. Marble, 260 cm. high. (Sala dei Capitani, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome).

shockingly violent destruction in 1559 of a statue of Paul IV which was decapitated, the head dragged around Rome for four days, while the 'body' was thrown into the stables of the Campidoglio.⁶

The second note reports on the mob's next target – a stucco statue of Urban erected in the courtyard of the Collegio Romano.⁷ The *avviso* writer says that the Jesuits were alerted that their statue might attract the crowd's attention. The writer's information apparently ended there, but that was not the full story. Others, notably Teodoro Ameyden, inform us that eventually the crowd did storm the college and the statue was destroyed.⁸ The lacuna in the *avviso* author's information suggests that he was either unaware of what happened to the statue or that he wrote this note just before the mob carried out their

I would like to thank Tod Marder, Patrizia Cavazzini and Jennifer Montagu for their generous guidance and assistance in the preparation of this article. I gratefully acknowledge the Samuel H. Kress Foundation and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their financial support of my research in Rome. I am also grateful to the staff of the Vatican Secret Archives for allowing me to carry out research there and to the Bibliotheca Hertziana for having me as a fellow and for facilitating my research through the library's collection.

¹ On *avvisi* in the seventeenth century, see M. Infelise: 'Roman "avvisi": information and politics in the seventeenth century', in G. Signorotto and M.A. Visceglia, eds.: *Court and politics in papal Rome, 1492–1700*, Cambridge MA 2002, pp.212–28.

² Rome, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Segreteria di Stato Avvisi, vol.40, fol.120r. For the most extensive discussion of the *Sede Vacante* in 1644, see L. Nussdorfer: *Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII*, Princeton 1992, pp.230–35 and *idem*: 'The Vacant See: ritual and protest in early modern Rome', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 18 (1987), pp.173–89. Nussdorfer gives the date of Urban's death as 29th July, a Friday morning; *ibid.*, 1987, p.231. However, Stanislao Fraschetti, based on a note from Giacinto Gigli, puts Urban's death on 28th July between ten and eleven in the morning; see S. Fraschetti: *Il Bernini: la sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo*, Milan 1900, p.157.

³ The *avviso* does not provide a first name for the 'Contestabile'. Nussdorfer identifies him as Filippo Colonna, Duke of Paliano, whose daughter Anna was married to Taddeo Barberini; Nussdorfer 1992, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.234. However, as Filippo Colonna died in 1639, this identification cannot be correct. Instead, the Contestabile in this case must be Filippo's son, Marcantonio V Colonna (1607/09–59), who inherited the title following the death of his elder brother Federico in 1641. For the Colonna family tree, see C. Strunck: *Bernini unbekanntes Meisterwerk. Die Galleria Colonna in Rom und die Kunstpatronage des römischen Uradels*, Munich 2007, pp.446–47. My thanks to Carol Nater for helping me clarify the Colonna family situation in these years.

⁴ Precisely where the '*scaletta a lumaca*' was unclear. The detailed plans of the Campidoglio do not include a small spiral staircase; see G. de Angelis d'Ossat and C. Pietrangeli: *Il Campidoglio di Michelangelo*, Milan 1965.

⁵ For the War of Castro, see Nussdorfer 1992, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp.205–27.

⁶ Fraschetti: *op. cit.* (note 2), p.153; and Nussdorfer 1987, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.179.

⁷ Fraschetti: *op. cit.* (note 2), p.153, suggested that this statue may have been the model for the Campidoglio bronze, but this is impossible to confirm.

⁸ Nussdorfer 1992, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.234. Ameyden noted that 'the pope died at quarter past eleven and by noon the statue was no more'.



20. Tomb of Pope Urban VIII, by Gian Lorenzo Bernini. 1627–47. Bronze, partly gilt and marble, life-size. (St Peter's, Rome).

attack. In any case this detail agrees with the time frame suggested by the first note, and corroborates a date of 29th July for the page.

The third report concerns an event that has so far been unknown. The writer notes that the Barberini family thought it wise to send the *caporione*, or head of law enforcement, in the *riione* of Colonna, to protect Bernini's house on via delle Mercede.⁹ Bernini had a 'statua' of Urban there, and it was thought that if the mob did not find satisfaction at the Jesuit College it might then turn its rage on the artist and the work in his studio. While it has been recognised that Bernini suffered professionally after the death of his papal protector, and that the period following Urban's death was particularly difficult for him, until this note was discovered it was unknown that Bernini was held to be in any immediate danger following Urban's death.

⁹ Via delle Mercede was in the *riione* of Colonna. Bernini purchased a house there in 1641 and extensively remodelled it throughout the 1650s; see F. Borsi, C.A. Luchinat and F. Quinterio, eds.: *Gian Lorenzo Bernini. Il testamento. La casa. La raccolta dei beni*, Florence 1981, pp.13–37.

¹⁰ G. Gigli: *Diario di Roma*, ed. M. Barberito, Rome 1994, pp.253–54. Based on circumstantial evidence, the monsignor has been identified by Nussdorfer as Filippo Cesarini; see Nussdorfer 1987, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.179. The monsignor's virulent dislike of the Barberini is curious. The Cesarini family was not mistreated by Urban VIII: Urban made Alessandro Cesarini junior, Filippo's uncle, a cardinal in 1627; for Alessandro, see L. Bertoni: 'Cesarini, Alessandro', *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Rome 1980, XXIV, pp.182–83. Another uncle, Virginio, was a close friend to Maffeo Barberini and served as his Maestro di Camera; see T. Ameyden: *La storia delle famiglie romane*, Rome 1910, p.302, and C. Mutini: *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Rome 1980, XXIV, pp.198–201. Virginio was also probably acquainted with Bernini, and it has been suggested that Bernini carved the bust for Virginio's tomb; see A. Sutherland Harris: 'Bernini and Virginio Cesarini', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 131 (1989), pp.17–23. It would seem that Filippo Cesarini ought to have been a supporter of Urban and Bernini. In private correspondence Martin Delbecke has suggested that a possible explanation for Cesarini's antipathy toward the Barberini may stem from the persecution suffered by the Accademia dei Lincei after Galileo's 1633 trial and condemnation, persecution which may have extended to the Cesarini family. Virginio Cesarini was a prominent member of the Accademia, and the association caused the publication of his works to be blocked until the 1660s. As a result, there may have been lingering rancour in the Cesarini family toward the Barberini. On the interweavings of Bernini, the Barberini and the Accademia dei Lincei as well as its various members, see E. Bellini: 'From Mascardi to Pallavicino: the Biographies of Bernini and Seventeenth-Century Roman Culture', M. Delbecke, E. Levy and S.F. Ostrow, eds.: *Bernini's Biographies*, University Park PA 2006, p.275–313; and E. Bellini, *Umanisti e*

The page ends with the mention of a certain Monsignor Cesarini, a figure who appears in several contemporary accounts of the Vacant See in 1644, such as Giacinto Gigli's *Diario*.¹⁰ Cesarini incited the crowd at the Campidoglio to violence by declaiming that the time had come to avenge themselves against the barbarian tyrants (*I Barbari tiranni*), a play on the pope's family name), before leading them on to the assault on the Jesuit college.¹¹ On the same day Cesarini was said to have remarked sarcastically to Bernini that he needed a large statue of Christ on the cross to place in the apse of St Peter's between the tombs of Urban VIII and Paul III; together the statues would re-enact the crucifixion of Christ between two thieves.¹² The pope's favourite artist would receive the monsignor's commission to be placed in St Peter's where Bernini had undertaken so much work for Urban VIII.¹³

The writer of the *avviso* records that while Cesarini was travelling by carriage toward the Sapienza, he saw pictures of the 'Casa Barberini' affixed to a wall and reportedly remarked that 'the comedy is finished, as the comedians are out'.¹⁴ These pictures were probably portraits of members of the Barberini family, set out by an entrepreneurial shopkeeper to advertise his goods or his skills.¹⁵ Cesarini's ironic comment alludes to the political events of Urban's long reign and to the theatrical entertainments staged by the Barberini. The phrase '*la commedia è finita*' is commonly used to suggest that a deception or fraud has been revealed, and Cesarini fits the expression neatly into a barb which unites politics and the theatre. His comment points to another source of popular dissatisfaction with the Barberini pope and his family – namely the elaborate theatrical spectacles they staged even in times of economic crisis.¹⁶ In this *avviso* and in diary entries of the time Cesarini represents the voice of popular dissatisfaction, and his actions appear to have focused the outpouring of discontent that led to the destruction of the stucco statue of the pope.

As noted above, the *avviso* indicates that Bernini had a statue of Urban VIII in his studio, but gives no further clue as to which work this might have been. The use of the word '*statua*' could suggest that this was a monumental full-length figure, but this was probably not the case.¹⁷ Bernini made three documented life-size statues of Urban, all of which were *in situ* before 1644. The marble statue of Urban commissioned by the Roman Senate was erected in the Palazzo dei

lincei: letteratura e scienza a Roma nell'età di Galileo, Padua 1997. On the contrary, it should be noted that in 1624 Urban VIII approved funds to erect a monument to Virginio Cesarini in the Palazzo dei Conservatori on the Capitoline. On the latter and its associations with the Accademia dei Lincei, see Sutherland Harris, *op. cit.*, pp.17–23. Filippo Cesarini abandoned his ecclesiastical career in 1665, after the death of his brother Giuliano when he inherited the family titles and lands, including Genzano, Civitalavina and Ardea (Ameyden, *op. cit.*, p.302). He died in 1685, apparently unmarried and childless, and the family patrimony reverted to his niece Livia. He is buried in the chapel of S. Filippo Neri in S. Maria Maggiore in Civitalavina (today Lanuvio). My thanks to Lothar Sickel for informing me of the location of Cesarini's tomb and for confirming that a 'Monsignore Cesarini' in these years is most probably Filippo, regardless of the vicissitudes of Barbarini/Cesarini family relations.

¹¹ Gigli, *op. cit.* (note 10) p.254.

¹² Frascchetti, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.153. If the story has even a kernel of truth, it suggests that Bernini did not remain in his house on 26th July 1644 under the protection of the *caporione*, but perhaps, as Frascchetti has suggested, went to the Campidoglio in an attempt to protect his other statue. There he could have encountered the belligerent monsignor – perhaps it was this encounter that reminded Cesarini of the artist's other works depicting Urban, including the stucco at the Jesuit college.

¹³ For Urban Bernini made the Baldacchino (1623–34), re-systematised the crossing and designed his tomb (1627–47) in the niche to the right of the apse. A work by Bernini did eventually fill the niche between the tombs of Urban VIII and Paul III: the Cathedra Petri (1657–66), for which, see R. Wittkower: *Bernini. The sculptor of the Roman Baroque*, London 1997, pp.278–80.

¹⁴ My thanks to Patrizia Cavazzini and friends for their assistance in deciphering this phrase and for alerting me to its ramifications. The metaphor may have been generally associated with the Vacant See, as another variation on it appears in an *avviso* from 25th July 1670, following the death of Pope Clement X. The *avviso* reads: '*Quante*



21. Bernini's Bust of Pope Urban VIII (see Fig. 22) with its dedicatory inscription (Spoleto Cathedral).



22. Bust of Pope Urban VIII, by Gian Lorenzo Bernini. 1640–44. Bronze, 132 cm. high. (Spoleto Cathedral).

Conservatori on the Campidoglio in 1640. From 1626 onwards Bernini had also been at work on the tomb of Urban VIII and its life-size bronze statue of the pope (Fig. 20). This took a notoriously long time to complete and was not unveiled until 1647. However, the figure of the pope was one of the first elements to reach completion, and John Evelyn records that he saw the work on a temporary base in St Peter's before 1644.¹⁸ A third life-size bronze statue of Urban by Bernini had been placed in the main piazza at Velletri in 1633.¹⁹ The statue that was in Bernini's house when Urban VIII died was probably one of the numerous busts that the artist made of the pope.

At least twelve extant busts of Urban are usually given to Bernini, and several more are recorded but lost.²⁰ They were made throughout his pontificate, and dating most of them is difficult. The bust most likely to have been in Bernini's studio in 1644 appears to be

that now in Spoleto Cathedral (Figs. 21 and 22).²¹ In 1640 Urban ordered this bust from Bernini, and payments began the same year and lasted through 1644.²² Bernini was paid 333.50 scudi for the work in two instalments, on 18th February 1640 and on 22nd March 1642. Between 1640 and 1644 Ambrogio Lucenti received payments for casting the work. Stanislo Fraschetti has noted that the bust was probably finished slightly earlier than is suggested by the final payment date to Lucenti, as the documents indicate that the payments covered work done in preceding months. It thus seems reasonable to believe that the statue would have been in Bernini's studio in early 1644 for finishing and polishing following its casting by Lucenti and before being sent to Spoleto.

The bust is now placed high above a doorway on the interior façade of Spoleto Cathedral. A large inscription beneath it records

condoglienze sudirono [= s'udirono] mercurdi: "ma a quanti la condoglienza su le labra se converti in congratulatione". tenero visite si gia regnanti che lasciato il fasto si rendevano ossequiosi a tutti poiche tirata la tenda vidde ogn'uno terminata la comedia alla quale s'aspetta, che succeda la tragedia altrettanto privata quanto quella è stata publica'; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 6415. fol. 559v.

¹⁵ Patrizia Cavazzini has shown that these kinds of pictures were bought by Romans and put up in shops and in the home; see P. Cavazzini: 'La diffusione della pittura nella Roma di primo Seicento: collezionisti ordinari e mercanti', *Mercanti di quadri. Quaderni storici* 39 (2004), pp. 353–74. For a full examination of this topic, see P. Cavazzini: *Painting as business in early 17th century Rome*, University Park PA 2008.

¹⁶ For the Barberini and the theatre, see F. Hammond: *Music & spectacle in Baroque Rome: Barberini patronage under Urban VIII*, New Haven 1994.

¹⁷ The *avviso* writer is frustratingly, and characteristically for his vocation, vague in his terminology. Seventeenth-century writers did refer to busts as statues (see Bernini's letter to Cardinal Antonio Barberini in Domenico Bernini's biography of the artist; D. Bernini: *Vita della del Cavalier Gio: Lorenzo Bernino*, Rome 1713, p. 67; and also the letter by Henrietta Maria, wife of Charles I of England, to the artist in the same text; *ibid.*, p. 66), although it was certainly more common to refer to busts as *busti*, *testi* or *ritratti*.

¹⁸ C. Avery: *Bernini: genius of the Baroque*, London 1997, pp. 119–21. Payments dating to the summer of 1644 indicate that at that time the work was being gilded by Girolamo Crippa; see O. Pollak: *Die Künstätigkeit unter Urban VIII*, Vienna 1931, II, p. 604, nos. 2422 and 2423. Although it is unclear exactly where the gilding took place, it is likely that the work would have remained in St Peter's or in the Vatican foundries, and not have been returned to Bernini's studio. I would like to thank Jennifer Montagu for bringing this issue to my attention, and to extend her observation that the processes of bronze casting and finishing have not been extensively studied. Aspects of artistic production, such as where gilders worked and, in the case of bronze sculptures, the division of labour between the individual responsible for the

model and the individual responsible for the bronze, remain murky. My thanks to Carolin Behrmann for advising me on this issue, and confirming that the tomb statue would have remained in St Peter's through the 1640s.

¹⁹ For a discussion of this work see F. Petrucci, ed.: 'La Statua di Urbano VIII a Velletri, opera perduta di Gianlorenzo Bernini: memorie e un documento inedito', *Castelli Romani. Echi del Barocco*, Ariccia 1997, pp. 105–19. The statue was destroyed in 1798. Petrucci has noted that probably many copies of this statue were produced, and the same is true of the Capitoline statue. For example, a life-size, seated marble statue of Urban VIII is known to have been in the Ginetti palace in Velletri, where it was paired with a seated statue of Augustus; see P. Cavazzini: 'Palazzo Ginetti a Velletri e le ambizioni del Cardinale Marzio', *Römische Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* 34 (2001–02), pp. 255–90. That statue was commissioned in 1638 by Cardinal Marzio Ginetti and was in all likelihood a copy of the statue in the piazza. It is possible that this copy is the work referred to in the *avviso*, although circumstantial evidence mitigates against it. Extant letters by Cardinal Ginetti refer to his commission of a copy, but make no reference to Bernini as the artist responsible for it. Moreover two seventeenth-century descriptions of Velletri also give no attribution for the Ginetti palace statue, while they do note Bernini's authorship of the statue in the piazza; see V. Romani, ed.: *Il palazzo e il giardino dei Cardinali Ginetti a Velletri in due descrizioni del sec. XVII*, Velletri 1972, pp. 24 and 31. Finally, Cardinal Ginetti returned permanently to Rome in 1642. His concern for the work in Velletri would have probably waned thereafter that date, making it probable that the statue would already have been in place.

²⁰ See Wittkower, *op. cit.* (note 13), pp. 240–44.

²¹ V. Martinelli: 'Il busto di Urbano VIII di Gian Lorenzo Bernini nel Duomo di Spoleto', *Spolegium I–II* (1954–55), pp. 43–49; repr. in *idem: Gian Lorenzo Bernini e la sua cerchia: studi e contributi, 1950–1990*, Naples 1995, pp. 149–57.

²² Martinelli notes that the statue may have been finished earlier, but there is no indication that it was sent to Spoleto before 1644; *ibid.*, p. 152.

that Urban renovated and redecored the cathedral in 1644, the work being supervised by his nephew Cardinal Francesco.²³ Presumably the bust was not sent to Spoleto before the reconstruction was completed, and could have been in Bernini's studio in the summer of 1644. Moreover, the unrest that followed Urban's death would suggest that Bernini would have wanted to get the bust out of his studio as quickly as possible, making its presumed installation date of 1644 at Spoleto probable.

There is another reason to identify the Spoleto bust with the statue mentioned in the *avviso*. The work is unusually large, measuring 1.32 metres high, making it unique among Bernini's portraits of the pope. It is also one of the most elaborate and visually rich of Bernini's statues of Urban, and Rudolf Wittkower called it 'the grandest surviving portrait of the Pope'.²⁴ Its unusual scale might explain why the writer referred to the work as a 'statua' rather than as a bust or head. Bernini made many busts of the Pope, and even more were turned out by his studio with minimal involvement on his part. The suggestion that the bust could be a focus for the Roman people's discontent suggests that the work may have had exceptional importance in the eyes of the Barberini family;²⁵ they would have been aware of its presence in Bernini's studio awaiting installation in the provincial cathedral. Since the *avviso* is the only known source indicating that Bernini's studio was under threat it may be that the writer of this note was relaying information from a source close to the Barberini rather than from first-hand experience of the events. All earlier recorded attacks on papal statues were made on life-size ones in public locations, which rendered them particularly vulnerable to public unrest. The situation on 26th July 1644, as conveyed by the *avviso*, was decidedly different. While the mob may have intended to attack a statue on the Capitoline, the Barberini believed that in their frustration the crowd might move on to less immediately obvious targets (as it did at the Collegio Romano). The idea that Bernini and his work

could come under attack suggests how closely the artist and the deceased pontiff were associated.

The possibility of a backlash against the artist and his work during the period of the Vacant See can perhaps be seen as a precursor to the professional setback that Bernini suffered under Urban's successor, Innocent X, Pamphilj (reigned 1644–55). As Laurie Nussdorfer has shown, during the Vacant See public tension and anger was released, often without direct political consequences. However, such events could effect relationships with the successive pope, particularly for those who had held coveted papal positions.²⁶ The immediate effect of Urban's death on the Barberini family was severe. Sensing how far their fortunes had fallen, his nephews, Cardinal Antonio, Cardinal Francesco and Taddeo, fled Rome for the comparative safety of Paris.²⁷ Innocent X reportedly threatened to raze the Barberini palace to the ground after learning of their flight.²⁸ Bernini did not have to flee from Rome, nor did he lose his official positions, such as that of the architect of St Peter's. However for the first time in his professional career he received no papal commissions. The extent to which his reputation suffered can be seen in the public scandal over the supposed cracks in the dome of St Peter's and over the debacle of its bell towers.²⁹ It took time to restore his reputation, in large part through private commissions such as that for the Cornaro Chapel and through minor deceptions, such as gaining the commission for the Four Rivers fountain through subterfuge on the part of Bernini and a sympathetic patron, perhaps Niccolò Ludovisi.³⁰ The previously unknown episode in 1644 suggests how closely Urban and Bernini were linked in the minds of their contemporaries, and foreshadows the artist's subsequent, temporary, fall from favour. It also suggests that Innocent X had serious political reasons to shun Bernini. Indeed the new pope's resistance to Bernini and his work may have been motivated by and perceived as a means of pacifying the citizens in the aftermath of the Barberini papacy, with its extravagant patronage, nepotism and rash foreign policy.³¹

Appendix

'Avviso' describing a rampaging mob, the protection of Bernini's studio and remarks of Monsignore Cesarini after Urban VIII's death, 29th July 1644.

Rome, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Segretaria di Stato Avvisi*, vol.40, fol.120r.

Successa la morte di Papa Urbano subito il popolo in grosso numero accorse nel Campidoglio, di ciò avvisati li Barberini e dubiosi di qualche novità fecero chiamare il Mileti e il Nari loro familiari et conservatosi da loro deputati per questa sede vacante i quali andono subito dal Contestabile Colonna a fare istanza che li desse qualche numero di gente per guardia del Campidoglio dal quale li fù concesso da 60. huomini armati quali furono posti in guardia di esso Campidoglio per evitare che il

popolo non strascinasse la statua di Papa Urbano collocata in detto Campidoglio et di li a poco anco vi accorse un'altra compagnia di huomini armati per maggior guardia di detta statua la quale al presente anco si guarda, et fù serrata la porta grande di detto Campidoglio et solamente si tenne aperta la scaletta a lumaca.

Li Padri Gesuiti di ciò avvisati anch'essi hanno fatta levare la statua di Papa Urbano che stava collocata in mezzo dell Collegio Romano, acciò non li succedesse un inconveniente simile.

Si è anco dato ordine al Caporione di Colonna che [d'appresso?] di volta verso la casa di Cavaliere Bernini nella cui casa vi è una statua di Papa Urbano per il medesimo dubbio.

Monsignore Cesarini passeggiando in Carrozza verso la Sapienza vidde affissi al muro tutti li ritratti di Casa Barberini che li lasciava esposti fuori un pittore ciò vedendo disse è finita la comedia che li comici son fuori.

²³ The inscription reads: D.O.M./FRANCISCVS CARD. BARBERINVS/S.R.E. VICECAN-CELLARIVS/VRBANI VIII PONT. MAX. EX TRATRE NEPOS/QVOD DE COLLABENTIS HVIVS CATHEDRALIS/REPARATIONE/PATRV O LIM EPISCOPO COGITAVERAT/EO AD PONTIFICATVS APICEM EVECTO/RE COMPLEVIT/ANNO DOMINI MDCXLIV; see *ibid.*, p.151. Maffeo Barberini was bishop of Spoleto from 1608, but only with his election to the papal throne in 1623 did he gain the necessary funds to renovate the cathedral. The construction dates are unclear. Martinelli records that as soon as he was elected pope, Maffeo Barberini received a delegation from Spoleto and that he promised them that he would entrust his nephew Francesco with the renovation and decoration of the church. However, the plaque's date of 1644 is clearly much later, and Martinelli suggests that either the construction took a considerable length of time or that it was not begun until many years after the 1623 meeting; *ibid.*, pp.151–52. The project is mentioned by Giovanni Baglione in 1642, indicating that the project was at least underway by that time; see G. Baglione: *Le vite de' pittori, scultori, architetti ed intagliatori dal pontificato di Gregorio XIII del 1572 in fino a' tempi di Papa Urbano VIII nel 1642*, Rome 1642, p.180.

²⁴ Wittkower, *op. cit.* (note 13), p.243.

²⁵ It could be argued that the destruction of the Jesuit's stucco statue, not a particularly important work, mitigates against this assumption. However, as there were relatively few life-size statues of the pope, even a stucco work of this kind would have had enormous cultural resonance, especially given the contemporary controversy over raising a commemorative statue during the pontiff's lifetime.

²⁶ Nussdorfer 1987, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.189, note 70.

²⁷ J. Beldon Scott: *Images of nepotism. The painted ceilings of Palazzo Barberini*, Princeton 1991, pp.198–99; and L. von Pastor: *The History of the Popes, from the close of the middle ages*, St Louis 1923, 29, pp.399–404; 30, pp.51–52 and 56; see also E. Rossi: 'La fuga del Cardinale Antonio Barberini', *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria* 59 (1936), pp.303–27. Taddeo never returned, dying in Paris on 24th November 1647. Cardinal Francesco was back in Rome by February 1648 and Cardinal Antonio in July 1653.

²⁸ Beldon Scott, *op. cit.* (note 27), p.199.

²⁹ For the scandal over the bell towers and the concurrent discussion concerning cracks in the dome of St Peter's, see S. McPhee: *Bernini and the bell towers: architecture and politics at the Vatican*, New Haven 2002.

³⁰ For this version of the story, see F. Baldinucci: *The Life of Bernini*, transl. C. Enggass, University Park PA 1966, p.36. With Ludovisi's help a modello of Bernini's design for the fountain was placed in Palazzo Pamphilj where Innocent X was sure to see it, with the assumption that the Pope would inevitably be won over by it.

³¹ Innocent's resistance to Bernini is aptly demonstrated by his comment on the modello for the Four Rivers Fountain, namely that the only way to avoid patronising Bernini was to avoid seeing his work altogether. The origins of this story can be found in F. Baldinucci: *Vita del Cavaliere Gio. Lorenzo Bernino ed altre operette*, Milan 1948, p.61. I would like to thank Tod Marder for indicating the ramifications this brief note holds for Innocent's relationship with Bernini.