

Fashioning foreign identities: Finelli's 'opportunism' of style

When one takes stock of sculpted portraiture in Rome around 1630¹ – that is to say, in the years around the threshold of the High Baroque – Giuliano Finelli stands out as an artistic personality who is markedly distinct.² His busts seem to have been the only alternative at this time to Bernini's near-monopoly (a fact that is due in part at least to the scarcity of able portrait-sculptors in the Rome of the 1620s). But when one considers the progress of Finelli from the first busts that may be assigned with certainty to him up to his departure for Naples, the picture changes decisively. Instead of a coherent progression, we are confronted by a surprising disparity: Finelli employs a range of styles that is far more varied than those of other sculptors. Not only is the iconography continually rethought, but his sculptural language also does not seem to be fixed. It fluctuates and avoids definitive solutions in terms of his expressive means: Finelli is not quite a Zelig in sculpture, but his work is characterized by considerable conceptual changes.

1. Giuliano Finelli, *Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger*, 1630, marble, h: 87 cm. Casa Buonarroti, Florence.

(photo: Andrea Bacchi et al., eds., *I marmi vivi*, exh. cat. (Florence, 2009), p. 278



If one compares the bust of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger of 1630 (fig.

1)³ with the half-length figure of Alessandro Peretti Montalto (fig. 2)⁴ of about 1633–34, two distinctly different modes of representation can be observed. The first portrait is distinguished by the roughnesses of surface that convey an almost 'crystalline' effect to the meticulous mimetic rendering, while in the second the sculptor is trying to define the personality by painterly means: the softened and almost swollen skin, the chubby face, the different textures of the drapery that are still minutely described, but in a more synthetic and unified way. Finelli employs even more varied methods of truncating the lower edge of the bust. During his few years of activity as a portraitist before leaving for Naples, Finelli exercised all the options, from the swallow-like curve that he chose for his *Domenico Ginnasi*,⁵ to the more geometrical solution in the *Francesco Bracciolini*,⁶ and finally to representations 'in action', in other words with arms included, such as the *Cardinal Montalto* or the *Unknown Gentleman* that I am still tempted to place in Finelli's first period in Rome.⁷



2. Giuliano Finelli, *Alessandro Perretti Montalto*, 1632/33–1635, marble, h: 91 cm. Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin. (photo: Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz)

It remains to determine whether this variation in style is the product of a fundamental uncertainty on the part of a sculptor still in search of his own artistic identity, or the result of a calculated attempt to catch the attention of his various clients by favouring their tastes, their artistic experiences and their backgrounds. The latter explanation – even if it does not argue for his creative vitality, since it betrays an opportunist artist rather than a true creator capable of infusing an image with his personal vision – tends to indicate an extraordinary virtuosity in the context of early seventeenth-century Roman sculpture. It seems likely that Finelli was a master not only of dissimulation in order to attract new clients, but also of a distinction of ‘manners’, in the sense that he was able to embrace various modes of expression instead of a single homogeneous style, thus having recourse to the method that Nicolas Poussin dealt with explicitly in a famous letter of 1647.⁸ So it is not necessarily true to say that Finelli wished to reinvent himself every time he was faced with a new commission. It is, therefore, perfectly possible that his variations of style reflect a deliberate strategy to promote himself, which we ought to recognize as being among his most particular gifts.

Indeed, I believe that the bust of Maria Barberini (pl. 10)⁹ marks the beginning of this case-by-case research on the part of the sculptor. In 1626 – according to Passeri, who was doubtless informed by Domenico Guidi, Finelli’s nephew – the artist undertook a visit to his native city.¹⁰ Whatever the reasons that impelled him to get away from Rome and from the workshop of Bernini, there are indications that on this occasion he did not limit himself to indulging his nostalgia for revisiting his home city, but took the opportunity of the journey to enlarge his repertory both of iconography and form, since he did not omit to pay a visit to Florence.

When he was commissioned to depict the niece of Urban VIII just after he had returned to Bernini’s household (‘fece il medesimo recapito della Casa Bernini’, to use Passeri’s words),¹¹ Finelli wanted to give free play to his ‘Tuscan’ impressions. The bust of the young woman is unique within the panorama of Roman portraiture, including that of Bernini. If one compares the *Maria Barberini* with images of other women, such as *Camilla Barbadori*¹² or *Diana Roscioli*,¹³ works by or after Bernini, one comes across an impassivity that cannot be accounted for simply by the fact that both are posthumous portraits. Maria Barberini had died in childbirth in 1621, and so Finelli had to rely on the guidelines of a portrait painted from the life, probably one that featured in an inventory of Barberini goods in 1648–49.¹⁴

In contrast to Bernini’s habit, when it came to depicting a deceased subject, of conveying an expression that is unattainably remote and sometimes almost

trance-like, as in the case of the bust of Monsignor Francesco Barberini,¹⁵ the woman is portrayed in the full flower of youth, animated and bursting with energy and life. The formulation of the bust is without precedent in any work by Bernini. The gracious unfolding of the bust, like a butterfly, results from the inclusion of the truncated upper arms. This compositional design relates the *Maria Barberini* to Florentine quattrocento portraiture, in which busts of women occur more frequently than in sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Rome.¹⁶ A still more striking comparison is to be found in the radiant expression on her fresh young face. Here the affinities with a marble bust of Marietta Strozzi by Desiderio da Settignano (fig. 3)¹⁷ extend to the very formation of the eyelids, eyebrows and mouth, with delightful dimples at the corners, to create an air of radiant youth and decorous virtue in the complete bust.

In the oldest piece of poetry dedicated to a marble bust, that of Albiera degli Albizzi, who died in 1475 at the age of fifteen, the deceased is made to say: 'But lest there be on earth any lovelier than the goddesses, / Death, at the command of the deities, carried me off.'¹⁸ Just such a phrase might well be coming from the lips of the Barberini girl whom Finelli has miraculously resuscitated. Even the form of the quattrocento Florentine bust refers to the dialectic between presence and absence, love and loss, which imposes a more differentiated treatment as compared with busts of men.¹⁹ Similarly, the *Maria Barberini* was designed to tug at the very heartstrings of her grieving relations.

By relating the portrait to Florentine prototypes, Finelli could count on the effect of recognition that would serve to gratify his client, whether it was Carlo Barberini or Maffeo Barberini himself. To transfer the fashions in portraiture of the fifteenth-century lady to the bust of a contemporary would serve as a nostalgic reminder to the patrons, for both of them were Florentine by birth, and

was thus a strategic ploy, as much as the inclusion of the jewelled pin in the form of a bee. Four years later, it was to be just such a homage to the bee of the reigning house of Barberini that ensured the success of the Buonarrotti bust (fig. 1) and ensured a hoped-for pension for its sitter, though the artist received nothing, in that case as in this.²⁰

Admittedly, the simple dress of the so-called *Marietta Strozzi* is in open contrast with the formal, court wear of Finelli's bust. His predilection for describing accurately every minute and precious detail follows another Florentine tradition, a more recent one, to be remarked in the canvases of Agnolo Bronzino (1503–72). In marble portraiture, this love of mimicry, typical of Florentine art of the middle and late cinquecento, is characteristic of sculptors such as Ridolfo Sirigatti, author of the bust of Cassandra Ghirlandaio, who died in 1578,²¹ or of Domenico Poggini, who carved the tender bust of Virginia Pucci, who died in 1568,²² the latter being a partial reprise of

3. Desiderio da Settignano (1430–64), *Marietta Strozzi*, c. 1460, marble, h: 52.5 cm. Staatliche Museen, Berlin.
(photo: Würzburg, Institut für Kunstgeschichte)





4. Giuliano Finelli, *An Unknown Gentleman*, c.1630, marble, h: 70 cm. Private Collection, Bologna.
(photo: the author)

the Florentine female portrait of the quattrocento and another point of reference for Finelli when he created the *Maria Barberini*. A coarser example, but one that still adheres to the same Florentine typology as far as concerns the long neck and ample neckline, is the anonymous bust of Lucilla Maffei, also in the Bargello. The bust of the Barberini girl is preceded by a few years by the monument to Arcangela Paladini in Santa Felicitá. In her portrait-bust, carved by Agostino Ubaldini at the request of the grand-duchess shortly after the death of the singer and painter in 1622, we find the same characteristics.²³ So, for the female portrait by Finelli one can enumerate three strategies to promote himself: the *iconographic* (the bee), the *stylistic* (the fifteenth-century inspiration) and the *sociological* (stressing the ‘Tuscan’ identity of the sculptor).

Finelli left Bernini at the end of 1628; there followed a notable decline in the number of portraits produced by the latter. This is a strong argument in favour of the hypothesis of Finelli’s substantial participation in producing the busts that came out of Bernini’s workshop up to that date, for the master

was preoccupied with the gigantic projects commissioned by Urban VIII. Passeri would have one believe – and one is only too willing to believe it, for his information finds support in documents – that Finelli had a faithful friend in Pietro da Cortona, who was also a Tuscan.²⁴ They came across one another around 1625 when both were collaborating on the decoration of Santa Bibiana, one on the frescoes in the nave and the other in a secondary position as an assistant of Bernini, the master who carved the statue on the high altar, and I have no doubt that the involvement of Finelli was considerable, even on this occasion.²⁵ The painter introduced Finelli to the Sacchetti family, who were Cortona’s greatest patrons in this phase of his career. From then on, Finelli tried to enter the private service of the Sacchetti, for whom he was supposed to have executed a series of portraits. We know nothing about the survival of these works, even though I am not yet convinced that the *Bust of an Unknown Gentleman* in Bologna does *not* represent a member of the Sacchetti family (fig. 4).²⁶ This hypothesis would find support in the iconography and in the style of the work. The magnificent vehemence and pent-up energy in the portrait, as well as the way in which it dominates the space around it, suggest a relationship with, if not a deliberate line of descent from, the bust depicting Cosimo I by Benvenuto Cellini.²⁷ The two works share the general contours, a similar truncation below, and above all the movement of the head, turned to stare at an imaginary point with such intense attention as to accentuate the furrow above the eyebrows.

The Sacchetti were also of Florentine origin. More than all the other nationalities (*nazioni*) of Italy, the Tuscan community in Rome remained faithful

to the ‘genius’ of their own birthplace. We may suppose, therefore, that it was the Sacchetti who made the contact between Finelli and Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger. In the veritable masterpiece that is Finelli’s bust of the Florentine poet (fig. 1), the sheer pleasure in description, in life-likeness and deception, in the alchemical-like transfer from one material to another – in other words the late Mannerist, veristic approach that is also noticeable in the sculpture of the early seventeenth century – reaches its culmination. In Rome this taste held sway among the Florentine exiles, while in Florence it was cultivated for the whole century. Finelli’s virtuosity even extends to the mass of folds that run in a diagonal direction; here, Finelli betrays the clear influence Pietro da Cortona’s manner of modelling drapery, an approach that may be noted as early as the bust of Antonio Barberini the Elder, which was perhaps the first portrait that was delegated to him to carve by Bernini.²⁸ The only reference to the classical world is viewed through the temperament of the friend who was in the process of rising to the rank of head of the Roman school of painting.²⁹ In the perception of the day, Cortona’s style was Tuscan, notwithstanding his obvious openness to the neo-Venetian taste. It should be emphasized that the *Antonio Barberini* is the first bust to come out of Bernini’s workshop in which the drapery begins to take on its own life, at much the same moment as that of the statue of *Santa Bibiana*. What is still more significant, Bernini does not show a particular interest in the ‘subject’ of drapery in his portraits, either in the bust of Thomas Baker³⁰ or in that of Paolo Giordano Orsini, the latter transmitted to us only via the copy at Bracciano,³¹ where the disposition of the folds does not go beyond the conventions of court-portraiture of the cinquecento.

5. Andrea del Verrocchio (c. 1435–88), *Girl with a Flower Bouquet*, c. 1475, marble, h: 61 cm. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence. (photo: Würzburg, Institut für Kunstgeschichte)



A characteristic that distinguished a certain number of Finelli’s works is that of showing the subject with one or both hands, lengthening the torso down to the belt and thus enriching the iconography with an ‘active’ element. Maybe Finelli once more stole from the portraiture of the quattrocento; as in the bust of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger (fig. 1) or that of the anonymous Gentleman (fig. 4), he was the first – outside the context of a tomb – to depict a sitter’s arms in his portrait busts, and it would be no surprise if his source of inspiration was the *Lady with a bouquet of flowers* by Andrea del Verrocchio (fig. 5).³² In the present case, however, it is the more definitive depiction of the hand as a creative instrument – ‘the hand that obeys the intellect’³³ – that establishes a link between Buonarroti the Younger and his homonymous and famous forebear. Michelangelo the sculptor placed an almost notorious emphasis, and one that was certainly designed to enhance his own myth, on the representation of the hand. So maybe the informal appearance and dishevelled image of Buonarroti the Younger is also a deliberate reference to the portrait by Rossellino of Matteo



6. Giuliano Finelli, *Ottavio Bandini*, 1629–34/35, marble, approx. life-size. San Silvestro al Quirinale, Rome. (photo: the author)

Palmieri, who was also a poet.³⁴ Furthermore, the motif of the hand in the drapery goes back to two busts that are still in San Giovanni de' Fiorentini, those of Antonio Coppola³⁵ and Pietro Cambi,³⁶ an iconographic concentration that would not have escaped Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger during his stay in Rome in 1629–30, where the hand could be understood as a sign of the subjects being Florentines.

Pietro Antonio Bandini, founder of the family chapel in San Silvestro al Quirinale, which his son was determined to bring to completion, was also a Florentine citizen. By way of an exception, Ottavio Bandini – notwithstanding his highly illustrious ancestry (his mother was a Cavalcanti) – did not set so much store by employing Tuscan artists. Apart from Finelli, whom we find in the Bandini chapel³⁷ (where his first proof of excellence in the field of funereal portraiture is to be found, shortly after his definitive break with Bernini), Domenichino and Alessandro Algardi, two Bolognese artists active at San Silvestro from 1628, shared in the decoration.³⁸ It was actually Domenichino who denounced the exploitation of Finelli's talent by Bernini, claiming that his fame

really should have belonged to his ex-collaborator.³⁹ Now, in the Bandini chapel, Finelli was working on a 'Bolognese' project, relying on a concept that had nothing to do with the 'bel composto' of Bernini which one sees taking life in other places, from the chancel of Santa Bibiana to the crossing of St Peter's. The half-figure of Cardinal Ottavio Bandini (1558–1629, fig. 6) was the point of departure for the busts of Algardi who had not so far – or perhaps only just – begun work as a portraitist.⁴⁰

With the bust of Costanzo Patrizi there began a convergence of style, as well as a friendship, also documented, between the two sculptors.⁴¹ This interpenetration of two languages of such different artistic formation did not occur in a unilateral way; thus, in Naples Finelli was to recall Algardi's statuary.⁴² After his return to Rome in the winter of 1650–51, Finelli assimilated the style that his friend had in the meantime developed in his portraiture: perhaps Finelli found himself in sympathy with the gravity that had distinguished his own Roman production, and that appears so conspicuously in a comparison between the busts of Scipione Borghese which he and Bernini had carved one after the other.⁴³ The half-figure for the tomb monument of Giuseppe Bonanni (fig. 7),⁴⁴ a work of the second Roman period, has an unmistakably Algardian flavour. But in its pendant, the *Virginia Primi Bonanni* in the same chapel (fig. 8) – whose execution is perhaps by Andrea Bolgi⁴⁵ – Finelli returns to his 'Tuscan' style, creating a slightly bloated version of the *Mona Lisa*. The Bonanni, proprietors of the chapel, were a Siense family, and hence Tuscan, closely related to the Piccolomini. One should not forget that the church is dedicated to the most venerated saint of Siena.

From the stylistic point of view, however, Finelli has reached a style that is less incisive and extrovert, but more synthesizing and settled, than what we have seen in his Roman productions of around 1630. The route towards this quieter manner had opened as early as the last years before his move to Naples. From the middle of the 1620s he was in contact with the Emilian Giovanni Lanfranco, who was painting the frescoes in the loggia of the Casino Borghese in 1624–25, the very years in which Finelli was working with Bernini on the group *Apollo and Daphne*. When on 14 April 1638 he gave his daughter in marriage to the sculptor, Lanfranco affirmed before the Neapolitan senate that he had known his future son-in-law for fourteen years.⁴⁶ It would be strange if this dialogue in family matters did not also touch on artistic concerns. This would have left an indelible impression on the young sculptor, and is perhaps discernible in his gradually abandoning his tendency to over-work his surfaces, as well as a growing preference for smoother textures and a greater feeling for the synthesis of forms.

7. Giuliano Finelli, *Giuseppe Bonanni*, 1651–53, marble, approx. life-size. Santa Caterina a Magnanapoli, Rome. (photo: the author)

8. Giuliano Finelli and Andrea Bolgi (1605–56), *Virginia Primi Bonanni*, 1651–53, marble, approx. life-size. Santa Caterina a Magnanapoli, Rome. (photo: the author)

But there is still more on the Emilian trail: on 13 April, the day before Lanfranco's appearance, a witness to the marriage, Francesco Peretti, a nephew of Cardinal Montalto, spoke before the senate. He explained that a 'pratica e servitù' had connected Finelli to his family for a period of fifteen years.⁴⁷ That is to say, counting backwards from 1635, the year of Finelli's definitive departure for Naples, the familiarity between the sculptor and the house of Peretti began during the collaboration of Finelli on the *Fountain of Neptune*, Bernini's work for the garden





9. Alessandro Algardi (1598 –1654), *Paolo Emilio Zacchia, ante 1654*, terracotta, h: 82 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. (photo: Würzburg, Institut für Kunstgeschichte)

of Villa Montalto.⁴⁸ It is highly probable that the same Francesco, who had in the meantime himself been elevated to the purple, commissioned the two busts of his father and uncle (fig. 2).⁴⁹ Once again, the iconography changes, and once again the underlying reason may be a consideration of ‘nationality’, this time not of the person represented but of the formation of his aesthetic taste.

Cardinal Montalto (fig. 2), one of the most generous patrons of the early seventeenth century, was responsible for the building and decoration of Sant’Andrea della Valle, where Lanfranco and Domenichino painted in competition with each other.⁵⁰ He was dedicated to Emilian art in all its aspects. When his nephew commissioned his posthumous portrait, Finelli decided to give it a decidedly ‘Emilian’ look. The portrait of the cardinal does not belong to any of the standard Roman types of commemorative bust, but contains a quite obvious

reference to the Bolognese tradition of half-figures ‘in action’, and it comes as no surprise that Algardi himself would very soon follow Finelli’s example.⁵¹ On the stylistic front, there is a notable approach to the style of the Bolognese Algardi, to whom the two Peretti busts were attributed until a few decades ago. In fact Algardi was influenced by *Cardinal Montalto* when, after 1650 and after his renewed contact with his recently returned friend, he conceived the grandiose half-figure of Paolo Emilio Zacchia (fig. 9)⁵² which, like its prototype by Finelli, was intended for private display.

Summoned to Naples in 1635, Finelli interrupted his work on these pieces, to the disadvantage of the bust of Michele Peretti, which is still in the blocked-out state in which it was abandoned by the sculptor. In the ambit of Naples, Finelli did not have to pay attention to Tuscans or Emilians, for here the social conditions of artistic life were very different from those of Rome. Yet, even in Naples, he showed an amazing awareness of the *identity* of his clients, a sensibility that now embraced not so much references to nationality, but to social status: the alternatives suggested by the class structure into nobility, bourgeoisie or priesthood occasioned contrasting solutions.⁵³

By contrast, in the Eternal City there was a conflux of people from other regions of Italy, all jealously on their guard to maintain their separate identity, according to their own original citizenship. It was a particular gift of Finelli as a portraitist to respond to elements drawn from this or that visual culture, and to the demands of ‘nationality’. For his own part, Finelli evolved a multiple identity. His stylistic flexibility, a flexibility that was self-interestedly and self-consciously calculated to promote himself, is among the reasons why Finelli is to be counted among the most able sculptors of the seventeenth century, but not among the greatest.

Translation: Charles Avery

I would like to thank Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, Gerhard Wolf and Alessandro Nova for their kind invitation to contribute to a study-day in Florence, organized by the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz (Max-Planck-Institut) in co-operation with the Museo Nazionale del Bargello. I would also like to thank Charles Avery for the translation of my Italian text.

1 For portraiture in the early baroque period, see A. Bacchi, C. Hess and J. Montagu (eds), *Bernini and the Birth of Baroque Portrait Sculpture* (exh. cat.), J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, and National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, 2008. See also M. Boudon-Machuel, 'La "ressemblance vivante" et le buste funéraire à Rome dans les années 1620', in O. Bonfait and A. Coliva (eds), *Bernini dai Borghese ai Barberini: La cultura a Roma intorno agli anni venti*, Rome, De Luca, 2004, pp. 64–75.

2 Among the most significant accounts are A. Nava Cellini, 'Un tracciato per l'attività ritrattistica di Giuliano Finelli', *Paragone Arte*, 11, 1960, no. 131, pp. 9–30; D. Dombrowski, *Giuliano Finelli: Bildhauer zwischen Neapel und Rom*, Frankfurt, Peter Lang, 1997, pp. 63–95; A. Bacchi, "'L'arte della scultura non habbi mai havuto homo pari a questo": La breve gloria romana di Giuliano Finelli', in A. Bacchi, T. Montanari, B. Paolozzi Strozzi and D. Zikos (eds), *I marmi vivi. Bernini e la nascita del ritratto barocco* (exh. cat.), Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence, 2009, pp. 136–63.

3 Florence, Museo Casa Buonarroti. Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 78–87, 325–27; and A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 2, pp. 278–81.

4 Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 70–73, 337–38.

5 Rome, Galleria Borghese, c. 1628. Dombrowski, *ibid.*, pp. 64–66, 316–17.

6 London, National Gallery, 1630–31. Dombrowski, *ibid.*, pp. 88–94, 336; A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 1, pp. 202–05; A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 2, pp. 282–85.

7 Bologna, private collection; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 61–63, 319–20. The dating is on the supposition that the sitter might be a member of the Sacchetti family. Marcello Sacchetti, Finelli's first patron as an independent sculptor, might have commissioned portraits of his relations. He died in 1629, which provides a *terminus ante quem*. While it is possible that it might be such a commission, even if the sitter proves to be someone outside the Sacchetti family circle I am convinced that it was executed before Finelli left for Naples in 1634. Bacchi, comparing it with the *Michelangelo Buonarroti* and the *Francesco Bracciolini*, dates it to around 1640 when Finelli was fully

established in Naples; as at note 2, pp. 290–93. The Roman works of the sculptor are marked by their variety of style, a quality almost immediately lost in Naples, where contemporaneous portraits tend to share a style, more summary and synthetic than before, and in every case far from the compositional refinement and rendering of the minutest details, the imposing grandeur and spontaneous, speaking-likeness of this bust, which awaits identification.

8 N. Poussin, *Lettres et propos sur l'art*, ed. A. Blunt, Paris, Hermann, 2nd edn, 1989, pp. 133–37. For the theory of the 'modi' expressed in Poussin's letter, see J. Bialostocki, 'Das Modusproblem in den bildenden Künsten. Zur Vorgeschichte und zum Nachleben des *Modusbriefes* von Nicolas Poussin', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 24, 1961, pp. 128–41; R. Zeitler, 'Il problema dei modi e la consapevolezza di Poussin', *Critica d'arte*, n.s. 12, 1965, pp. 26–35; W. Messerer, 'Die Modi im Werk von Poussin', in J. A. Schmoll (ed.), *Festschrift Luitpold Dussler*, Munich, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1972, pp. 335–48; O. Bätschmann, 'Zum Problem von Sprachcharakter und Modus in Werken von Nicolas Poussin', *Kunstchronik*, 34, 1981, pp. 16–17; A. Mérot, 'Les modes ou le paradoxe du peintre', in P. Rosenberg and L.-A. Prat (eds), *Nicolas Poussin 1594–1665* (exh. cat.), Grand Palais, Paris, Royal Academy, London, 1994, pp. 80–86; F. Hammond, 'Poussin et les modes: le point de vue d'un musicien', in O. Bonfait, C. L. Frommel, M. Hochmann and S. Schütze (eds), *Poussin et Rome*, Paris, Éditions de la Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1996, pp. 75–91; M. Ferrando, 'Il canto silente della pittura. La teoria dei modi e l'idea di "modus" in Poussin', in Massimo Venturi Ferriolo (ed.), *La polifonia estetica: specificità e raccordi*, Milan, Guerini, 1996, pp. 275–81.

9 Paris, Musée du Louvre, 1626; V. Martinelli, 'Il busto originale di Maria Barberini, nipote di Urbano VIII, di Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Giuliano Finelli', *Antichità Viva*, 26, 1987, no. 3, pp. 27–36; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 38–41, 309–11 (before the return of the bust to the Louvre in 1999); M. Fagiolo dell'Arco, *Berniniana: novità sul regista del Barocco*, Milan, Skira, 2002, pp. 58–59; G. Bresc-Bautier, in Bacchi et al., as at note 2, pp. 242–45.

10 J. Hess, *Die Künstlerbiographien von Giovanni Battista Passeri*, Leipzig, Keller, 1934 (repr. Worms, Wernersche, 1995), p. 247.

11 *Ibid.*

12 Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst, 1619. See V. Martinelli, 'Novità berniniane: 1. Un busto ritrovato: la madre di Urbano VIII', *Commentari*, 7, 1956, pp. 23–40; I. Lavin, 'Five new youthful sculptures

by Gianlorenzo Bernini and a revised chronology of his early works', *Art Bulletin*, 50, 1968, pp. 236–37; R. Wittkower, *Gian Lorenzo Bernini: The Sculptor of the Roman Baroque*, rev. H. Hibbard, T. Martin and M. Wittkower, Oxford, Phaidon, 3rd edn, 1981, pp. 192–93; A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 2, pp. 120–23.

13 Foligno, Museo Diocesano, ante 1640. Vedi V. Casale, 'Due sculture di Gian Lorenzo Bernini: i ritratti di Bartolomeo e Diana Roscioli', *Paragone Arte*, 39, 1988, pp. 3–30.

14 See Martinelli, as at note 9, p. 31.

15 Washington, DC, National Gallery of Art. Wittkower, as at note 12, p. 246; C. Hess in Bacchi et al., as at note 1, pp. 124–27.

16 J. Pope-Hennessy, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*, New York, 3rd edn, 1985, p. 50.

17 Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Skulpturensammlung, c. 1460; M. Bormand, in M. Bormand, B. Paolozzi Strozzi and N. Penny (eds), *Desiderio da Settignano: Sculptor of Renaissance Florence* (exh. cat.), Louvre, Paris, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence, National Gallery, Washington, DC, 2006, pp. 150–53.

18 'Ne tamen in terris formosior ulla deabus / Esset, more iussu me rapuit superum.' These are the last two verses of the epigram *Ad bustum marmoreum*, composed by Alessandro Braccesi, as was noted by I. Lavin, 'On the sources and meaning of the Renaissance portrait bust', *Art Quarterly*, 33, 1970, pp. 207–26, here pp. 214 (English trans.) and 226 (original Latin text); see also the valuable comment of A. W. B. Randolph, 'The bust's gesture', in J. Kohl and R. Müller (eds), *Kopf/Bild: Die Büste in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Munich, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2007, pp. 285–303.

19 As Randolph has convincingly demonstrated, as at note 18.

20 Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 82–83.

21 London, Victoria and Albert Museum; J. Pope-Hennessy, 'Portrait sculptures by Ridolfo Sirigatti', *Victoria and Albert Museum Bulletin*, 1, 1965, no. 2, pp. 33–36.

22 Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello. C. Ricci, 'Ritratti di Virginia Pucci Ridolfi', *Bollettino d'arte*, 9, 1915, pp. 374–76; M. Weinberger, 'Marmorskulpturen von Domenico Poggini', *Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst*, 58, 1924/25, pp. 233–35; U. Middeldorf and F. Kriegbaum, 'Forgotten sculptures by Domenico Poggini', *Burlington*, 53, 1928, no. 304, p. 9 n. 3.

23 C. Pizzorusso, *A Boboli e altrove. Sculture e scultori fiorentini del Seicento*, Florence, Olschki, 1989, pp. 69–70.

24 Hess, as at note 10, p. 248.

25 Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 29–30, 57–59, 114–15.

26 Dombrowski, as at note 2.

27 Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, 1545–47. J. Poeschke, *Die Skulptur der Renaissance in Italien: Michelangelo und seine Zeit*, Munich, Hirmer, 1992, p. 212.

28 Rome, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, c. 1623–24 (according to others, c. 1627–28); Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 38–39, 298; A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 2, pp. 238–41.

29 J. M. Merz, *Pietro da Cortona: Der Aufstieg zum führenden Maler im barocken Rom*, Tübingen, 1991, *passim*, esp. pp. 137–39; J. M. Merz, 'Cortona giovane', in Anna Lo Bianco (ed.), *Pietro da Cortona 1597–1669* (exh. cat.), Palazzo Venezia, Rome, 1997, pp. 55–66.

30 London, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1637–38; R. Wittkower, 'Bernini studies—II: the bust of Mr Baker', *Burlington*, 95, 1953, pp. 19–22, 138–41; D. Shawe-Taylor, in T. Clifford and A. Weston-Lewis (eds), *Effigies and Ecstasies: Roman Baroque Sculpture and Design in the Age of Bernini* (exh. cat.), Edinburgh, National Gallery, 1998, pp. 74–75; C. Hess, in Bacchi et al., as at note 1, pp. 240–43.

31 Bracciano, Castello Orsini, 1629–31; I. Faldi, 'I busti berniniani di Paolo Giordano e Isabella Orsini', *Paragone Arte*, 5, 1954, no. 57, pp. 13–15; Wittkower, as at note 12, pp. 257–58; C. Benocci, *Paolo Giordano II Orsini nei ritratti di Bernini, Boselli, Leoni e Kormmann*, Rome, De Luca, 2006, pp. 71–72, 79. The bust was attributed to Andrea Bolgi by V. Martinelli, 'Andrea Bolgi a Roma e a Napoli', *Commentari*, 10, 1959, pp. 137–58, an attribution supported by D. Dombrowski, 'Aggiunte all'attività di Andrea Bolgi e revisione critica delle sue opere', *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte*, ser. III, 19–20, 1996–97, pp. 251–304. It has been contested by Benocci, in preference for a sculptor known as 'Guglielmo fiammingo', traceable only through unspecified Orsini payments; *ibid.*, pp. 71–72.

32 Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, c. 1475; G. Passavant, *Verrocchio: Sculptures, Paintings and Drawings*, London, Phaidon, 1969, pp. 33–34, 180–81; A. Butterfield, *The Sculptures of Andrea del Verrocchio*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1997, pp. 90–103, 217–18; D. A. Covi, *Andrea del Verrocchio: Life and Work*, Florence, Olschki, 2005, pp. 135–38.

33 'la man, che ubbedisce all'intelletto'; a line in Michelangelo's sonnet n. 151, 'Non ha l'ottimo artista alcun concetto', of c. 1537.

34 Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, 1468; J. Poeschke, *Die Skulptur der Renaissance in Italien: Donatello und seine Zeit*, Munich, Hirmer, 1990, p. 139.

35 Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini, 1612. C. d'Onofrio, *Roma vista da Roma*, Rome, Edizioni 'Liber', 1967, pp. 106–13;

Lavin, as at note 12, pp. 223–24; C. Hess, in Bacchi et al., as at note 1, pp. 88–89.

36 Pompeo Ferruccio, 1630; Lavin, as at note 12, p. 224; A. Bacchi and S. Zanuso, *Scultura del '600 a Roma*, Milan, 1996, p. 806.

37 Nava Cellini, as at note 2, p. 14; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 96–98, 323–25; Bacchi, as at note 2, p. 144.

38 M. G. Bernardini, 'La cappella Bandini a San Silvestro al Quirinale', in C. Strinati and A. Tantillo (eds), *Domenichino 1581–1641* (exh. cat.), Palazzo Venezia, Rome, 1996, pp. 318–29.

39 Confirmed by an undated letter of Virgilio Spada, probably written at the beginning of 1629; published by M. Heimbürger Ravalli, *Architettura, scultura ecc. nell'archivio Spada*, Florence, Olschki, 1977, p. 77. See J. Montagu, *Alessandro Algardi*, 2 vols, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985, I, pp. 244–45; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 57–58; Bacchi, as at note 2, p. 137.

40 Possibly the funeral bust of Alfonso Manzanedo de Quiñones (Rome, San Isidoro, c. 1628/29) should be assigned to Algardi: see Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 438–39. It would be Algardi's only portrait before 1630.

41 Rome, Santa Maria Maggiore, c. 1630; Montagu, as at note 39, II, pp. 440–41; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 70, 265–67, 472 doc. D. 22. The rapport between Finelli and Algardi has been rejected by Bacchi who relates

the Algardian *Bust of a Gentleman* (formerly Genoa, Palazzo Spinola, now Milan, private collection, c. 1650) to the bust of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger; Bacchi, as at note 2, p. 160. A similar case of stylistic assimilation is to be found in the *Bust of an Unknown Man* (Kingston Lacy, Dorset, National Trust, c. 1650), which recalls the stylistic characteristics of both sculptors to the extent of precluding an attribution to either, or perhaps to Domenico Guidi; Dombrowski, as at note 2, p. 428; J. Montagu, 'A mysterious masterpiece: a bust by Algardi at Kingston Lacy', *Apollo*, 149, 1999, no. 446, pp. 14–15.

42 See Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 70, 265–7, 472 doc. D. 22.

43 Bernini, Rome, Galleria Borghese, 1632; A. Coliva and S. Schütze (eds), *Bernini scultore e la nascita del Barocco in casa Borghese* (exh. cat.), Galleria Borghese, Rome, 1998, pp. 276–89; C. Hess, in Bacchi et al., as at note 1, pp. 186–89. Finelli, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1631/32; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 68–70, 332–33; A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 1, pp. 212–15; A. Bacchi, in Bacchi et al., as at note 2, pp. 304–07.

44 Rome, Santa Caterina a Magnanapoli, 1651–53; see Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 262–65, 416–17.

45 *Ibid.*; and Dombrowski, as at note 31, pp. 301–03.

46 See Dombrowski, as at note 2, p. 461 doc. A. 19.

47 *Ibid.*, doc. A. 18.

48 London, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1622–23; Wittkower, as at note 12, pp. 177–78; H. Kauffmann, *Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini: Die figürlichen Kompositionen*, Berlin, Mann, 1970, pp. 39–43; Coliva and Schütze, as at note 43, pp. 170–79; T. A. Marder, 'Bernini's Neptune and Triton fountain for the Villa Montalto', in Bonfait and Coliva, as at note 1, pp. 119–27.

49 Berlin, Staatliche Museen, 1632–35; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 70–73, 337–38.

50 A. Coliva, 'Sant'Andrea della Valle', in Strinati and Tantillo, as at note 38, pp. 283–97; A. Costamagna, 'L'aria dipingeva per lui: Giovanni Lanfranco e la gloria del Paradiso a Sant' Andrea della Valle', in A. Costamagna, D. Ferrara and C. Grilli (eds), *Sant'Andrea della Valle*, Milan, Skira, 2003, pp. 195–235.

51 Suffice it to mention the example of the portrait of an unknown man, formerly called Giacomo da Vignola (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, c. 1550), to appreciate the closeness in iconography; J. Pope-Hennessy, *Catalogue of Italian Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum*, II, London, HMSO, 1964, p. 507.

52 Only the terracotta model is autograph (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, before 1654); the indifferently executed marble may be

attributed to Domenico Guidi (Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, post-1654). Montagu clarifies the secular destination of the bust, and affirms the first use in Rome of a half-figure independent of any architectural setting, noting that the type was common in Emilia; Montagu, as at note 39, I, p. 165, II, pp. 447–48.

53 Compare the *Marchese di Torrecuso* (San Giovanni a Carbonara, Naples, 1643), unapproachable and eager for military glory, the *Giovanni Camillo Cacace* (San Lorenzo Maggiore, Naples, before 1650), with its bonhomie and well-being of the rank of senator, and the *Cardinale Gennaro Filomarino* (Santi Apostoli, Naples, 1649), angrily confronting the perennial challenges of the other strata of society; Dombrowski, as at note 2, pp. 158–62 and 380–81, 165–67 and 394–95, 173–76 and 400–01; Dombrowski, *Il genio bellicoso di Napoli: The warrior ethos of the Neapolitan aristocracy as mirrored in contemporary portraits*, in K. Bußmann and H. Schilling (eds), *1648: War and Peace in Europe* (exh. cat.), Westfälisches Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, Münster, and Kulturgeschichtliches Museum, Osnabrück, *Essay Volume II: Art and Culture*, Munich, Bruckmann, 1998, pp. 525–31.